

**CARTOGRAPHIES OF MEMORY: 14TH ISTANBUL BIENNIAL:
SALTWATER: A THEORY OF THOUGHT FORMS (2015) AND ABY
WARBURG'S MNEMOSYNE ATLAS (1924-1929)¹**

Mehmet Berkay SÜLEK²

ABSTRACT

The question of memory has been a prominent subject of study in contemporary art scene during the last few decades. One can argue that it is important to look at moments when this increased interest was expressed at full. Therefore, I would like to analyze two projects which were produced hundred years apart from each other with different intentions. These are Aby Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas and Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev's 14th Istanbul Biennale: Saltwater Theory of Thought Forms (2015). Although those projects were constructed in different manners, they share similarities at the structural end. One can argue that both of those projects were constructed around the questions of memory and invisible memory in particular. Furthermore, they raise these questions around the notion of memory in a specific way. In this thesis, I would like to argue that it is the willingness to create a map and how it interacts with the photographic and cinematic ways of communications.

**BELLEK KARTOGRAFİYALARI: 14. İSTANBUL BİENALİ: TUZLU SU:
DÜŞÜNCE BİÇİMLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR TEORİ VE ABY WARBURG'UN
MNEMOSYNE ATLAS'I (1924-1929)**

ÖZ

Bellek sorunsalı son otuz yıllık süreç içerisinde, güncel sanat platformunda önemli bir tartışma konusu haline geldi. Bu sorunsalın tam anlamıyla ifade edildiği anların incelenmesi önemlidir. Bu çalışmada, birbirinden yaklaşık yüz sene aralıkla üretilmiş olan Aby Warburg'un Mnemosyne Atlas'ı ve Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev'in 14. İstanbul Bienali: Tuzlu Su: Düşünce Biçimleri Üzerine Bir Teori (2015) ele alınacaktır. Bu projeler farklı amaçlarla üretilmiş olsalar da yapısal olarak benzerlikler taşımaktadır. Her iki proje de bellek ya da "görülme" bellek sorunsalını kendilerine has bir yöntemle ele almaktadır. Bu makalede, çalışmaların sinematik ve fotografik iletişim yöntemleriyle oluşturulan nasıl dinamik birer harita modeli ortaya koyduğu tartışılacaktır.

Key Words: Aby Warburg, 14th Istanbul Biennial, memory, cinematic, Mnemosyne Atlas

¹ Bu çalışma daha önce Leeds Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar, Sanat Tarihi ve Kültürel Çalışmalar Fakültesi'ne sunulmuş Yüksek Lisans Tezinin kısaltılmış halidir.

² berkaysulek@hotmail.com

Introduction

The notion of memory and cultural memory has taken over creative and intellectual projection since the 1990s (Megill, 2001: 194). One can argue that contemporary art scene has answered this increased interest to a great extent. Thus, it is important to analyze the moments when this increased interest is expressed at different points of art history in order to understand how it actualizes itself. Therefore, this paper looks at Aby Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas and Carolyn-Christov Bakargiev's 14th Istanbul Biennale (2015). However, this paper aims to achieve looking at two distinctive projects not in comparative ways. Rather It will try to gloss he formulations behind these structures which are highly interested in the question of memory at different points of the history of art.

This is a difficult task because of the fact these projects were constructed in different manners and produced hundred years apart from each other. This is also because of the difference between the accessibility of those projects. One could visit the 14th Istanbul Biennale and access to exhibition catalogue and guidebook whereas only fragments of information written by Warburg is accessible. However, despite these differences, both of these projects share a certain level of similarities with each other.

First of all, these both projects have come to life at the moments when the photographic or moving images productions were dominant or newly emerging in art practice. Aby Warburg was a student when the influence of photography on art history was crucial. In fact, it is argued that without the invention of photography, art history as a discipline could not have emerged in academia (Bredenkamp, 2003: 419-421). This effect of photography on Warburg can be detected early in his life. It is known that even early as 1889 Warburg demonstrated his interest in building his library and a photographic collection while he was still a student in Florance (Forster, 1999: 3). It is clear that Mnemosyne Atlas was the result of this interest. It consisted of photographic reproductions of artworks and objects such as maps, manuscript pages, images selected from contemporary magazines and newspapers which were layered on 79 panels covered with black cloths. However, the actual Atlas has not survived, there are only photographs of this project left which give us insight into this project (Johnnson, 2017). The invention of photography was not the only development which helped art history as an academic. The usage of the slide projection

with the photography was the true reason for the rise of this newly emerging discipline. This dual usage opened the way to the slide projection which led to before and after projection or pattern of art history (Keller, 2001: 192). One can argue that by juxtaposing artworks from distant periods of time, Warburg was opposing to this before and after projection. Therefore he suggested to look art history in a multidirectional way (anachronistically) and interpreted it in a way that this two-sided before and after projection cannot achieve. One can argue that Warburg offered a mental projection which has many ends, therefore, a meandering whereas two-sided before and after projection offers a singleroute. I would like to argue that this impulse for the trajectory of memory is one of the most important aspects which bring 14th Istanbul Biennale and Mnemosyne Atlas.

In the 14th Istanbul Biennale, Bakargiev extends the spaces of the exhibition to the city and uses the histories and memories as part of the exhibition. Furthermore, she chooses to use not only art gallery and museums but also hotels, houses and car parks. Thus she forces visitors to explore the city itself and create their own meandering for the exhibition. She does not only emphasize on the flow of water through Bosphorus but also produces a flow inside a city through the exhibition spaces which were spread along the city and giving the spectator the role of voyager. Furthermore, one can argue that by extending the exhibition spaces, she creates many layers which the exhibition lies upon and thus creates a multi-directional way of looking at artworks suggest an image of the city. In this regard, Bruno argues that the image of the city constructed from the flow of memory and history that is because of the fact that the image of city comprises in its space all of its past histories, with their intricate "layers of stories". Furthermore, she argues that the image of the city is the result of collectivity and cultural experience and and because of this characteristic it is a moving image. In other words, it is not emerged or constructed by individual acts but the result of the collective exploration of the city (Bruno, 2014: 189-191). Therefore, one can argue that both of these projects suggests to look at their subject of studies in a cartographical way or in multi-projectional rather than highlighting a single route. I would like to argue that this aspect of these projects indulging the question cinematic. Thus, Bruno argues that our era of postcinema transforms into precinema and developing new ways of exhibitionary possibilities of art of projection. She further suggests to look at precinematic exhibitionary

experiments in order to unfold the multiple screenings of the postcinematic times. By looking at the precinematic times, she argues that one can detect how exhibition developed in a cinematic ways (Bruno, 2014: 141). In this study, I would like to raise the question of Mnemosyne Atlas as the catalogue of an exhibition which has never come to life during his lifetime. Thus, looking at these two distinct projects which were produced in very distinct parts of the history will us to unfold this phenomenon and what it entails: the question of memory.

In the first chapter, this paper will analyze 14th Istanbul Biennale and its foundations and address to questions of history and memory than the question of cinematic will be raised as a curatorial strategy in specific to Istanbul Biennale. Therefore, the Sergei Eisenstein's theory of montage and Bruno's formulations of moving image and architecture-museum influenced by Eisenstein will be highlighted. In the second chapter, the foundations of Aby Warburg's thinking and Mnemosyne Atlas will be investigated. Secondly, Mnemosyne Atlas will be analyzed in detail and its influences regarding photography-moving image and memory. Finally, the question of cinematic will be glossed both for Atlas and Istanbul Biennale in order to in what points these projects correlates to each other. However, this chapter will not be a comparison of these projects but rather analyze the foundations of these projects and in what points they overlap with each other.

1. 14th Istanbul Biennale: SALTWATER Theory of Thought Forms

In the catalogue essay of 14th Istanbul Biennale: Salt Water A Theory of Thought Forms, Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev quotes Donna Haraway, an American anthropologist: "It matters what matters we used to think other matter with; it matters what stories we tell to tell other stories with; it matters what knots knot knots what thoughts think thoughts, what ties tie ties" (Bakargiev, 2015: XLVV) In this short quote, one can find the reminiscences of Bakargiev's formulation of this exhibition. That is, her denial of giving this exhibition a general concept which is almost essential in today's curatorial practice. It can be very well argued that the given title to this exhibition signifies an overall concept and that may be true but Bakargiev's latest big-scale exhibition, 13th Documenta which also did not attempt to indicate an overall theme, indicates Bakargiev's disinterest in determining a theme. Therefore, one can argue that Bakargiev is not particularly interested in a theme but

interpretations of the exhibition. This is particularly evident in how she structured and used the city itself as an exhibition venue.

Istanbul is one of the largest cities in the world with a population over 14 million people. During its long history, it was the capital of three empires: Romans, Byzantine and Ottomans, respectively. Therefore, one can find the reminiscences of those three massive empires. In this exhibition, Bakargiev forces visitors to travel along the city, even to places which may be unknown to locals of Istanbul. One of the most intriguing sites in this regard, is the Trotsky House in Prince Islands which hosted Adrian Villar Rojas's work, *The Most Beautiful of All Mothers* (2015). Bakargiev address this strategy of wandering in the city as follows:

"The journey to reach the artwork is part of the work, which thus comprises the act of 'arriving'. To arrive at this return of the repressed, you pass through the front gate on a little street and enter a little garden filled with scent of fennel, wild broccoli, figs, flowers and grasses, and than through the ruins of old brick house, itself overgrown with vines, bushes and weeds Perhaps in an attempt to shed the uncomfortable yet exhilarating sensation of having intruded into the private space of a person who 'made' history, we may walk down a winding path towards the sea, in search of a peaceful moment. Our feet tread on tiles that were walked upon by Trotsky and his family, guards and assistants, and we feel the momentary cancellation of the gap between myth and fiction, on the one hand, and daily life and reality, on the other. (Bakargiev, 2015: LVIII)"

The exhibition catalog of this exhibition also plays an important role in order to understand it. In the exhibition catalogue, Bakargiev does not include texts which she finds relevant or even influence to the exhibition but also includes passages from poems, essays, novels and stories selected by the people who contributed to this exhibition. Therefore, it can be argued that it is essential to unfold the thinking and discussions behind the exhibition. One can be argued that by choosing such structure, she glosses the importance of the catalog. In the 80s, Kelly discussed the significance of the exhibition catalog for the exhibitions and large-scale exhibitions such as biennales and annuals. She argued that although temporary exhibitions first came to life in the 19th century, these exhibitions actually became prominent in the post-war period. Furthermore, those first exhibitions pointed out to shift of patronage from the private sector

to national institutions. At the same period, art publishing industry strikingly enlarged and art criticism also established itself as an academic discipline (Kelly, 1981: 41). However, Kelly suggested that critical writing, stresses the “signifying practice” rather than the description of artistic auteurs which voice the idea of the art’s embeddedness into the social context. According to Kelly, critical texts either choose to focus on individual artworks or on the general structure of general cultural categories and typologies of art. Therefore, she glossed the importance of exhibition catalogue which does not only give space to photographic reproductions of the works exhibited but also to the critical texts (Kelly, 1981: 57-58). Kelly formulates that exhibition catalogue suggests a specific reading and thus creates a closure. The exhibition catalogue and exhibition itself produces what she called “diatext” that is two individual texts which function collectively. For Kelly, It is the difference and their interaction which essentially creates a meaning. One of the reasons why Kelly puts emphasize on the catalogue is that durability of the temporary exhibitions. The exhibition remains on a particular site but the catalogue continues to exist. Therefore, she argues that exhibition catalogues along with art books and magazines. are the main resource of accessing artworks whereas the exhibition site is acknowledged by the those who are able to visit it (Kelly, 1981: 59-60). As a postgraduate student who actually visited the exhibition, I would like to address to the essays, extracts from stories, novels and poems selected by both curator and the people who contributed to the exhibition. That is because in a metropolitan city such as Istanbul, it is almost impossible to experience the whole exhibition and therefore likewise Kelly pointed out the exhibition catalogue fulfills a significant role.

One of the pieces selected by artists, scientists, scholars, is a passage from Hannah Arendt’s *Human Condition* (1958) in the exhibition catalogue. In this passage, Arendt argues that human affair is the result of the interactions between humans. These interactions create stories and these can be documented, can be subject to an artwork. But these depictions are completely different than the actual event. Furthermore, she argues that even though everyone is there hero of their story but the only one who created the story, resembles the real hero. In other words, somebody starts the story, sufferer and the actor but no one is author (Arendt, 2015: 168-169). In other words, Arendt argues that it is the context what matters the most. She continues to formulate her thinking as follows:

The invisible actor behind the scenes is an invention arising from a mental perplexity but corresponding to a real experience. Through it, the story resulting from action is misconstrued as a fictional story, where indeed an author pulls the strings and directs the play. The fictional story reveals a maker just as every work of art clearly indicates that it was made by somebody; this does not belong to the character of the story itself but only to the mode in which it came into existence. The distinction between a real and a fictional story is precisely that the latter was 'made up' and the former not at all. The real story in which we are engaged as long as we live has no visible or invisible maker because it is not made (Arendt, 2015: 168-169)

One can claim that Bakargiev's engagement with the Armenian Genocide overlaps with the Arendt's formulation. The selected works which can be seen in the domain of Armenian Genocide claim, do not carry representative or archival impulse. In other words, these selected works do not historicize this accident but rather look at the memoir and traumas which were shaped by this accident. Michael Rakowitz's *The Flesh is yours, The bones are ours* (2015) can be seen in this regard. It is a work which is influenced by famous Turkish phrase "Eti senin, Kemiği Benim" which means "The Flesh is yours, The bones are ours", precisely. It is a phrase generally used by student's parent's full support for the teacher's actions. This is of course, a very aggressive phrase and demonstrate the full dedication to what school represents, that is the state's ideology. Rakowitz uses this phrase to infer to an event which was carried by state's organizations. Rakowitz tells that the rise of Art Nouveau and the ethnic cleansing of Armenians overlaps to each other. In fact, one of the key architects who designed mouldings and friezes of the buildings, was Armenian Garebet Cezarlıyan. In this work, Rakowitz used dog bones which were remnants of abandoned dogs in Sivriada at the late period of Ottoman Empire and plaster moulds which echoes the Armenian impact on Art Nouveau renovation of Istanbul in early 20th century (14THB: Rakowitz, 2015). Etel Adnan's *laperello* book can be another sufficient example of this approach. It is based upon parents of Adnan's, diary which tells the relation between Armenians and Turks from the same period (14THB: Family Memoirs, 2015). Therefore, Bakargiev does not adopt a point which Armenian Genocide should be revealed in the context of this exhibition. However, one can very well argue that these works selected by

Bakargiev, carry a certain level of archival urgency but this is not the say that it necessarily bases itself to this specific history. It is the memory which was brought by these selected artworks. These works establish themselves on the thin borderline of history and memory. In this regard, one can argue that the exhibition functions as a lieux de memoire, rather than a milieux de memoire as described by French historian Pierre Nora.

First of all, the term lieux de memoire is an abstract term which exists between the intersection between history and memory. According to Nora, a successful lieux de memoire communicates with minimum amount of signs. Therefore, it should lead to many interpretations as much as possible (Smith, 2009: 34-35). According to Nora, these two terms, history and memory also signifies a problem and suggests that what we identify as memory is already a history. It is statement towards the materilization of the so-called memory (Nora, 1989: 13) Nora tries to formulate the distinctions between history and memory as follows:

“Memory and history, far from being synonymous, appear now to be in fundamental opposition. Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name. It remains in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived. History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete, of what is no longer [...]History, because it is an intellectual and secular production, calls for analysis and criticism. Memory installs remembrance within the sacred; history, always prosaic, releases it again. Memory is blind to all but the group it binds-which is to say, as Maurice Halbwachs has said, that there are as many memories as there are groups, that memory is by nature multiple andyet specific; collective, plural, and yet individual. History, on the other hand, belongs to everyone and to no one, hence its claim to universal authority (Nora, 1989: 7-8)”

It can be argued that Nora, in this passage above, the distinction between history and memory is not clear. Therefore, he establishes his term lieux de memoire between history and memory. He describes lieux de memoires as a place where memory crystallizes and released itself at a particular historical moment (Nora, 1989: 7). One can argue that Bakargiev, by extending the exhibition space to

the cityscape, highlights the cityscape and what it signifies, that is the memories and the histories of the city. I would like to argue that this is achieved by certain curatorial strategy, that is the given emphasize on the voyage of the spectator and therefore highlighting the connections made by voyager-spectator. At this point, I would like to analyze the construction of this expanded space in 14th Istanbul Biennale.

1.1 Curating the City: Exhibition Space as Cinematic Construction

Bakargiev's exhibition is not the sole example of curation of the city, her documenta 13 and recent documenta exhibitions can be seen in this projection³. But one can argue that Bakargiev forces this trajectory even further with this exhibition. She did not only use galleries and museums in the city but also interact with the daily life of the city. There are sites that are inaccessible to public viewings such as Riva Beach and Casa Garibaldi. A fishing boat which tours the Bosphorus may be the most clear example of this situation or strategy which is used by Bakargiev. Secondly, there is a work which cannot be visited by visitors. That is the Pierre Huyghe's Abyssal Plain (2015- onwards) which was still under construction during the exhibition and even when it is finished, it will not be visible (14THB, Abysall Pain, 2015) But what does usage of multiple venues both art spaces and spaces such as Rumelihisarı which is coastal village near Istanbul or Riva Beach, Hrant Dink Foundation Adahan Hotel and Küçük Mustafa Paşa Hamamı? It can be argued that by structuring the exhibition along various locations in the city, Bakargiev creates an affect which echoes cinematic production of meaning. But how does cinema produce meaning?

In the 1920s, Russian filmmaker Lev Kuleshov made experiments with series of moving images which are accepted as Kuleshov effect later on. Kuleshov, in the first scene, filmed a man with a blank face looking directly to the camera. This scene is followed by a hot bowl of soup and thus it leads spectator to think that the man is hungry. In the next scene, Kuleshov shows us the same man with a blank face, and in the succeeding one, a child's tomb. Therefore, a spectator comes to a conclusion that man is mourning the deceased child which aspect of these succeeding scenes leads us to different

³ Peter Osborne argued that urban turn within the postconceptual practice points out to new departure in the art world. New constructivism at the exhibiton form(2013:160).

interpretations of the man's feelings although it is the same man with blank face in each? This is achieved by the basic principle of cinematic creation, that is the montage. It is not the single shot which creates the meaning but the interaction between two succeeding frames. Sergei Eisenstein who was one of the early film theorists and filmmakers, has developed a theory of montage extensively in his studies. Eisenstein looks at Chinese hieroglyphs, heue-i period in particular and emphasizes on their representational characteristic. He investigates the usage of two hieroglyphs in order to tell something by simple representative characters (Eisenstein, 1969: 28-29).

For example: the picture for water and picture of an eye signifies "to weep"; the picture of an ear near the drawing of a door "listen";

A dog+a mouth= "to bark"

A mouth+a child= "to scream"

A mouth+a bird= "to sing"

A knife+a heart: "sorrow" and so on

But this is montage (Eisenstein, 1969: 30)

Eisenstein thus suggests that it is the interaction of these two elements in these Chinese characters which creates a third meaning, a meaning that cannot be grasped by the latter or the former. On the other hand for Dziga Vertov, one of the early filmmakers, argued that the single frame constitutes a movement in itself. According to Vertov, there is no qualitative difference between the movement inside the shots and and between the shots. Therefore, Vertov concedes the autonomy of the single shot. One can argue that the distinction between Vertov's and Eisenstein's theory of montage lies in the fact their thinking on the perception of the image. Vertov argued that the subject who perceives the image is not the human but the machine. The perception is no longer subject to the human beings (Lundemo, 2012: 103-105). Eisenstein was much more interested in the art history and other art forms as well. He analyzed different art forms and cultures. According to Eisenstein, montage is the principal element of structuring Japanese haiku poetry, and Kabuki theater. But the methods of montage used by these art forms are distinctive for every art forms. For instance, spatial arts such as painting and sculpture are bound to stillness and therefore able to reenact a sensation of movement only through montage. The temporal arts such as poetry and music, indicates a spatial extension through montage. Therefore, both of these usages of montage creates a new

sphere on a conceptual level instead of on material level (Lundemo, 2012: 99). Eisenstein formulates his thinking on different techniques of montage as follows:

"[When talking about cinema], the word path is not used by chance. Nowadays it is the imaginary path followed by the eye and the varying perceptions of an object that depends on how it appeared to the eye. Nowadays it may also be path of followed by the mind across a multiplicity of phenomena, far apart in time and space, gathered in certain sequence into a single meaningful concept; 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 absorbed sequentially with his visual sense" (Eisenstein, 1989: 116).

Can we argue that Bakargiev's 14th Istanbul Biennale reenact cinematic production of meaning in the domain of Eisenstein's thinking of cinematic montage? It can be argued that Bakargiev's exhibition carries reminiscences of production of meaning through montage and cinematic creation. It is indeed based itself on the premise of "varying perceptions of an object that depends on how it appeared to the eye" (Eisenstein, 1989: 116). However, it is also true that it does not come to life in the presence of immobile spectator.

One of the main parts of the exhibition in Istanbul Modern was the Channel which actually formed as a channel in the museum space. It can be regarded as the central of the exhibition. Bakargiev explains The Chanel in the guidebook: "The Channel knots together inside and outside through different lines of fight, a Klein bottle- a form of with no outside nor inside, although it is a containing vessel[...] It provides an image for the exhibition, speaks to how an interior space (the exhibition) can create a different exterior(the world at large) in relation to itself" (14THB Guidebook, 2015: 53). One of the most important characteristics of this section of the exhibition is that its willingness to have space for non-art objects. This section includes Vilayanur S. Ramachandran's Mirror Box (1993), Charles Darwin's On the Various Contrivances by Which British and Foreign Orchids Are Fertilised by Insects: and on the Good Effects of Intercrossing (1862) Karl von Frisch's Bees: Their Vision, Chemical Senses, and Language (1950) and Karl Blossfeldt's Aspidium Filix Mass (1928). What does the exhibiting of these non-art objects lead us for interpretation of the exhibition? These objects can be very well read

in the favor of thinking of anthropocene which is certainly one of the interests of Bakargiev not just as a curatorial strategy but also as a critical discourse.

Bakargiev argues that art and this exhibition in particular invite people from all sort of background to think, question and experiment the questions and answers given to them through collectivism (14THB Guidebook, 2015: 53). One can argue that the selection of these kinds of non-art objects and artworks indeed creates a gap or a space for discussion. Furthermore, it does not necessarily emphasize on the single artworks and non-art objects that is because these objects are not correlated at first sight. When a spectator encounter with an exhibition, s/he expect to encompass with a central theme which is embedded in every object exhibited in the space. Therefore, a spectator only questions works individually and find a thematic premise in every individual work but one can argue that this may not be the case in this exhibition. A spectator is forced to find a meandering between artworks. In other words, Bakargiev puts emphasize on the third meaning which is created by the juxtaposition of these objects. Although Bakargiev takes this approach further ahead, it is part of a particular curatorial discourse. Osborne puts emphasize on the end of the curatorial strategy, that is the usage of the city as a whole. He argues that in this context, an artwork does not exist simply by itself in a given space but the occurrences between artworks produce a meaning (2013: 160). A site becomes a new sites which refer to somewhere else. Osborne reads this strategy as cinematic and thus suggests that curators embark on the position of the film director at the structural end (2013: 44). One can argue that cinema and architecture share some common features. Sergei Eisenstein was one of the theorists who touched upon this discussion: “the film spectator moves across an imaginary path, traversing multiple sites and times in the course of a filmic projection, as distant moments and far-apart places become connected on the screen. Film inherits the possibility of such an imaginative mental voyage from the architectural montage” (Bruno, 2002: 168). According to Eisenstein, film acquired the structure of mental voyage from architectural promenade (Bruno, 2002: 53). Moreover, architects such as Bernard Tschumi and Rem Koolhaas emphasized on the linkage between cinema and architecture (Bruno, 2002: 68).

Giuliana Bruno likewise Eisenstein analyzes other art forms from distinct periods and analyzes the usage of montage and cinema at the

structural end. She particularly put emphasize on the linkage between museum and art museum in particular and cinematic creation. She argues that cinema was born out of eagerness to share, document and collect the photographic imagery of different parts of the world (Connoly, 2009: 66). Therefore, she highlights the common feature of cinema and architecture, that is the memory or recollection.

“Working at the edge of the image, its dissolution into the next, and the ellipses of the assemblage, the prefilmic montage created by the spectorial browsing of the collection invites recollection. The art of memory- displayed as theatrum memoriae in the cabinet materializes in film’s own process of imaginative display. Furthermore, the museographic spectacle of framed views, reframed in spectatorial projections, incorporates a kinesthetic itinerary, a form of “picturesque” voyage. Such was the emotional spectacle-the itinerary of attraction-that was mechanically “re-collected” by motion pictures, which recreated their own kinesthetic travel effects (Bruno, 2002: 155)”

In this passage, one can argue that Bruno puts emphasize on the parallels between cinema and architecture and art museums in particular at the structural end. Furthermore, one can argue that the foundations of these two overlap with each other to a certain extent. Both of these are basically the inventions of 19th century and both encountered difficulties in the 60s and re-establish themselves in the 80s (Penz, 2012: 280). Likewise cinema, museums also creates a narrative or chronology though spatial arrangements (Penz, 2012: 288) This is particularly evident in national art museums which its educational purposes may be prioritized. One can look at NationalGallery in London as an example of this approach. The museum’s space is clearly arranged according to centuries and movements such as 19th century, 18th century or Impressionism etc. Furthermore, this approach can be seen in contemporary art institutions such as Tate Modern. If one tries to see two buildings of Tate Modern in London, s/he would realize that there are rooms arranged according to shapes and colors.⁴Therefore, the museum

⁴ Art Historical methodology which relies on the chronology of art movements can also be seen in the first documenta exhibitions. The selection of works were not by Arnold Bode but by Werner Haftman whose *Painting in the Twentieth Century (1953)* was widely read. Grasskampf argues that he, unlike many art historians, historicize the contemporary art (Grasskampf, 1996: 73-75)

space functions as a map to be followed by the spectator. In this regard, Bruno argues that cinema also functions as a map or an emotional map. She discusses that map is the visual record of our experiences. It captures and measures a place in order to deliver to the viewer. Bruno asserts that filmic site-seeing creates the same cartographic effect and even corresponds to a larger textual resemblance. That is because of the film's feature of existing on a two-dimensional level which may refer to the other sites including depth (Bruno, 2014: 275). One can argue that by extending the limits of exhibition space in 14th Istanbul Biennale, Bakargiev refers to the other dimensions which may be not accessible through the usage of art galleries and museum's structure alone. Bakargiev unfolds the interactions and similarities between film, architecture and the city as Bruno formulates:

"Architecture is neither static structure nor simply just built. Like all tangible artifact, it is actually constructed-imagined-as it is manipulated, " handled" by user's hand. And like a film, architecture is built as it is constantly negotiated by e(emotions), traversed by the histories both of its inhabitants and its transient dwellers. Seen in this way, architecture reveals urban ties.: the product of transactions, it bears the traces of urban (e)motion and its fictional scriptings. A relation is established between places and events that forms and transforms the narrative of a city: the city itself becomes imagined as narrative sites are transformed by the sequence of movements of its traveler dwellers (Bruno, 2002: 66)."

Mapping of the city is one of the crucial features of this exhibition but if one argues that Bakargiev's exhibition is based on the creation a cinematic space, does that also means that Bakargiev's exhibition incarcerate into the narrative? Bakargiev's practice clearly pushes the boundaries not just by curating artworks from different time-periods but also blurring the line between art and non-art objects. Therefore, Bakargiev curatorial strategy is the example of what Meijers called 'ahistorical' exhibition which abandons the traditional chronological arrangement and seeks to reveal the correspondences between different periods and cultures (Meijers, 1996: 8).

Today what is identified as film can be very diverse although structurally they are still based upon the premise of montage.⁵ But one cannot see the films in the cinema and video works exhibited in the art gallery and museum context. These kinds of works are often identified as the expanded cinema which opened up the path to challenge traditional structures of narrative through simultaneous multi-projection and physicality (Le Grice, 2011: 160). Therefore, it is distinctive from the moving image which is perceived by the immobile spectator whereas expanded cinema forces spectators to build their own meandering alongside the images presented. Le Grice who is one of the pioneers of expanded or experimental cinema argues that traditional narrative cinema is based upon giving emphasis on the represented time. On the other hand, experimental film artists try to reverse this priority and make the spectator time primary (2011: 163). Le Grice, tells how they reconfigure the narrative cinema, "Together with some experimental filmmakers, notably Kurt Kren and Peter Gidal, I sought to disrupt the narrative illusion through stressing the independence of each shot.[...] Disruption of narrative continuity makes new and latent meanings available to the spectator. The coherence of a work becomes problematic, belonging to the spectator rather than determined by a hidden ideology held in the narrative"(p. 162). If expanded cinema tried to impose the significance of every single of a shot in a sequence of moving image, can 14th Istanbul Biennale be seen in the sphere of expanded cinema? One can argue that this exhibition carries the reminiscences of both narratives and expanded cinema. Bakargiev does not reject the history of the city and highlight the presence of Christian population including Greeks, Armenians, French, Italian through the structures designed and built by them. While structuring an exhibition which questions the histories, memories and accidents, she also produces a space for discussions not just generated by the producers of this exhibition but also by the spectators. Bakargiev both creates a narrative and not at the same time but she aims to create an affect to evoke the invisible memory of the city. She both uses the structures of the museum and gallery space and disrupts it via the usage of non-art spaces.

⁵ The study shows that prior to 1906, vast majority of films produced in the US were non-fictional movies. See Tom Gunning, 'The Cinema of Attractions: Early Film, Its Spectators and The Avant-Garde' *Wide Angle*, 8 (1986), 63-70 (p. 64).

At this point, I would like to return to Aby Warburg and his latest project Mnemosyne Atlas which shares the similar impulses with 14th Istanbul Biennale.

2. Aby Warburg and Mnemosyne Atlas

Warburg is today widely accepted as an art historian by the academia. After the translation of his writings by Getty Research Institute in 1992 scholars in the Anglophone world have begun to shown interest in his studies (Woodfield, 2001: 69). One can argue that this interest is due to Warburg's interdisciplinary approach which is unavoidable in academia. He was not interested in artworks alone and thus he did not identify himself as an art historian but as an "image historian" (Bredekamp, 2003: 423). This interdisciplinary approach can be found even in his doctoral dissertation. In this research, Warburg analyzed Sandro Botticelli's Spring and Birth of Venus by using literary sources to identify Botticelli's moving female figure as nymph which will be one of the major themes in Warburg's studies throughout his career (Agamben, 1996: 97). Furthermore, this approach is particularly evident in his latest and unfinished project, Mnemosyne Atlas which includes photographic reproductions of manuscripts, newspaper clips and coins along with artworks from different periods. In this chapter will engage with the questions raised by Mnemosyne but before going into these questions, I would like to highlight Warburg's thinking which led him to this project.

According to Warburg, artworks are documents (Urkunde) of human occurrences throughout the history. An artwork could potentially highlight a long forgotten past and can be an aid to identify a moment, therefore artists, patrons and advisors were secondary aspects for Warburg (Forster, Britt, 1996: 16). Warburg was interested in the transmission of images or cultural artifacts by large. In this regard, Warburg identified himself as a "... seismograph of the soul, to be placed among the dividing lines between different cultural atmospheres and systems" (Blassnig, 2001). Pathosformel- an emotion signifier as described by Pollock (2007), is a vital term in order to understand Warburg's thinking which led him to Mnemosyne Atlas and his explanation of it as "a ghost story for truly adult people" (Agamben, 1996: 95). Furthermore, Warburg had a keen interest in Renaissance Art and survival of antiquity [Nachleben] throughout his career and has written extensively on this

subject (Rampley, 1997: 42). The figure of nympha was particularly intrigued. In his doctoral dissertation, he wanted to identify the moving female figure of in *Spring and Birth of Venus* by Botticelli as a "nymph". For Warburg, this figure of nympha illustrates a new iconographic model which both clarifies the subject of this painting and shows the mutual thinking or influence of ancient culture upon this period of time which this painting was produced (Agamben, 1996: 97). He was trying to place this painting to a larger context of quattrocento Florence through make comparisons with his contemporaries such as Leon Battista Alberti and Andrea Poliziano. Thus, he has identified similarities between Botticelli's painting and Poliziano's *Giostra* poem (Rampley, 1997: 42). However, Warburg was more interested in the transformation of figures rather than the preservation of Ancient Greek and Roman culture (Rampley, 2001: 306). In this regard, he was deeply interested in the classical forms in Quattrocento Florence and the recurrence of these motifs even in distant geographies and in the art of Flanders, Germany and Burgundy, although there was a clear lack of historical distance. Therefore, Warburg was drawn into the mapping of the evolution of a specific motif (Rampley, 201: 309-310). If one can put this notorious term of pathos formula Warburg in a nutshell, it "pinpoints the expressive gestures depicted in paintings and other visual media, which he considered to be memory symbols of fears and excitements that purportedly had been overcome" (Wiegel, 1995: 137). In this regard, Didi-Huberman argues that Warburg's studies form early period of his career starting with his thesis on Botticelli's painting, was an "archeological science of the pathos of antiquity and its fate in the Italian and Florence Renaissance" (Didi-Huberman, 2007: 14). Therefore, for Warburg, an individual artwork does not exist by itself or can be viewed only through its capacity to communicate. That was what distinguishes Warburg from his contemporaries and art historical methodology of his epoch. For art historical thinking symbol was not a mediator of cultural memory but the result of the inspiration of a genius artist (Schade, 1995: 502). Today, Panofsky is seen at the same camp with Warburg and this can be accepted to a some extent but there was also the crucial difference between these two scholars. For Panofsky the symbolic value generated by the artworks were imprints of artist's own personality (Agamben, 1996: 99). who is one of the earliest thinkers who realized the significance of Warburg, formulates his thinking in this regard as follows:

“As to Warburg, he would never have considered the essence of an artists’s personality as the deepest content of an image. As the intermediary zone between consciousness and primitive identification, symbols did not appear to him as significant insofar (or only insofar) as they made possible the reconstruction of a personality or a vision of the world. For Warburg, the significance of images lay in the fact that, being strictly speaking neither conscious nor unconscious, they constituted the ideal terrain for a unitary approach to culture, one capable of overcoming the opposition between history, as the study of “conscious expressions” and anthropology, as the study of “unconscious conditions” which Levi-Strauss identified twenty years later as the central problem in the relations between two disciplines.”(Agamben, 1996: 99-100).

One can argue that this state of transmission or in-betweenness of lies at the very central of his methodology and therefore at the construction of Mnemosyne. At this point, I would like to turn to Mnemosyne Atlas and what it entails regarding to the questions raised by Warburg.

2.1 Mnemosyne Atlas: Memory in Question at the Rise of Image in Motion

The last project of Warburg is highly enigmatic not just because of its complex structure but also lack of explanation of this project due to the sudden death of Warburg (Gombrich, 1970: 283). Atlas was constructed from over 1000 photographic reproductions pinned over black cloths but only photographs of this projects remain. The images Warburg used were from his personal photographic collection. Furthermore, he specifically c commissioned photographers to photographs objects related to his research areas (Finch, 2016: 288). Thereafter, Peter van Huisstede suggested dividing Atlas into five groups. These are introduction (A, B, C); antiquity (1-8); the period from antiquity to Renaissance(20-27); and Renaissance (28/29-64) (Schoell-Glass, 2008: 142). This project was the result of two main interest of Warburg: transformations of Olympian Gods in the astrological tradition and the pathos formulas particularly in Renaissance art and culture.

For Warburg, the notion of memory was clearly an important aspect of this project. The title he chose as a title, Mnemosyne is the Greek Goddess of memory which gave birth to inspirational muses (Leeming, 2014). Furthermore, his description of Atlas as “a ghost story for truly adult people” (Agamben, 1996: 92) signifies the

importance of the aspect of memory. Ghosts are not entities which merely exists in the present, on the contrary they live in the present as the reminder of the past. Although their entities belong to the past, they interact with the present and the future as a reminder of the death and thus the future. I would like to suggest that this description of Mnemosyne as a ghost story is not a simple allegory but also directly related to Warburg's perception of memory. In this regards, Warburg was influenced by Richard Semon and his notion of engram (Agamben, 1996: 99) According to Semon, memory does not exist in the limits of consciousness and it is the ability to react to an occurrences over a period of time. It is not an energy know to this world and it is what Gombrich identifies as the thing which distinguishes dead from the living. Engramm is the trace left by a specific occurrences to a subject and this trace or energy can be activated under certain circumstances because it remembers the previous event (Gombrich, 1970: 242). In other words, one can argue that it is not the real event but the recollection of the first event after an exposure in a similar manner. Michaud argues that this notion of engramm was particularly influential for Warburg while creating his picture atlas. Furthermore, he discusses that likewise, Semon's engramms Warburg's images are also reproductions, the photographic reproductions. By juxtaposition of images from distant periods and cultures, images which do not correlate at first sight, Warburg achieves to create a meaning larger than any individual image could possibly produce (Michaud, 2007: 255-257). This reading of Michaud addresses to Warburg's enigmatic term 'iconology of interval' which will be a major aspect of Michaud's discussion for Mnemosyne's cinematic qualities.

According to Warburg, the survival of antiquity can be found in the body which shows the bodily movements causes by whether interior or outer causes. However, Michaud argues that ten years after his dissertation Warburg's thinking took another path in 1902 with the publication of his two texts: one of them which analyzed the Ghirlandio's frescoes in the Sassetti Chapel of Santa Trinita Church in Florance and the second one which investigates series of portraits from 15th century Flemish School. In both of these studies of Warburg, the figures were not captivated by outer forces or showed physical movement, they were rather in static poses. But the question of movement has not vanished but it was transmitted into the universe of representation (Michaud, 2007: 30-31). Therefore, one can argue that the issues raised photography and moving image

(stillness and movement) were at the center of Warburg's thinking and his formulation of Mnemosyne Atlas. Although it carries, certain tendencies of formalism in certain individual panels, as a whole it was the rejection of art historical narration of art's progression.⁶ Michaud argues that Mnemosyne Atlas which sought to form a new art historical language, is similar to Eisenstein's visual syntax. In this regard, Michaud speculates that the very foundation of Atlas, that is the "iconology of interval" shows parallels with the dominant theories of montage which were established by Russian filmmakers in the 1920s. Therefore, as in the montage theories of that time, Michaud discusses that individual panels of the Mnemosyne Atlas does not hold a meaning but only through the juxtapositions of these panels, Atlas is able to create a new meaning (Michaud, 2007: 283). But can we see Atlas in the light of photo-montage as well? Kurt Forster argued that photo-montage works produced in 1920s and 1930s show similarities with Atlas in the constructive end (Forster and Britt, 1996: 19). But one can argue that Warburg did not want to create static work which is open to interpretation in a single way. Furthermore, despite the fact that Warburg juxtaposes these images, he did not manipulate the images. In other words, he was not interested in the creating a new imagery through the juxtaposition of different images but rather interested in the interaction between the images he arranged. One of the crucial arguments regarding Mnemosyne's cinematic premises, is Warburg's rearrangement of the individual panels during his lectures (Michaud, 2007: 277) Warburg's willingness to change individual panels indicates that his perception of this panels were not static. Therefore, he does not achieve to create a fixed art historical narrative but rather forces spectator to build their own meandering between these panels.

3. Cartographies of Memory

In this chapter, I will analyze of two different projects which were produced almost hundred years apart from each other. This is a difficult task to unfold because those projects were created at the

⁶ The Plate 47 can be given as an example in this regard. This plates is structured in order to follow the figure of nympha which was one of the key studies of Warburg's career. Panel was dominated by Ghirlandio's fresco *Birth of Virgin* from the cycle for the Tornabuoni Chapel in Santa Maria Novella, and this is followed by Filippo Lippi's tondo in the Uffizi which depicts a servant girl with a fruit basket, Raphael's watercarrier for the *Fire in the Borgo* and another variation of the same motif by Agostino Veneziano (Gombrich, 1970: 297).

other ends. 14th Istanbul Biennale was a project which came to life in its full scale but Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas is not a finished project and only fragments of Warburg's thinking on this project is accessible whereas there is a 540 paged catalogue and a guidebook which accompanies the biennale. Therefore, this chapter will not be constructed in order to make a comparison but rather to look at two distinct projects which share similar impulses. But one can argue that what those two projects, as distant as they can be by structure, they try to evoke a certain type of effects by mapping out their subjects of studies through a creation of cinematic space.

Warburg was interested in what he called *Wanderstassen des Geistes* which means the path taken by the mind, the observation from classical antiquity to Renaissance and to contemporary art of his age (Mcewan, 2006: 244). For Warburg, *Wanderstrasse* was the main route which ideas are placed in a half hidden way. This map was a way in order to see the full scope of his studies. In other words, by creating a *Wanderkarte* (map of images), he was trying to achieve a bird eye view. It was designed as a psychogeographical tool in order to lay out creation of humankind throughout the history as well as its memory (Mcewan, 2006: 251-252). Thus, it is clear that Warburg was very much interested in the functionality of mapping. I would like to argue that it is one of the most crucial elements which brings Bakargiev's 14th Istanbul Biennale and Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas together.

It can be argued that the perception of art as such by Bakargiev correlates Warburg's perception regarding to its foundation as the result of a conflict. Furthermore, for both of these thinkers⁷, perceive art as a treatment whether for collective or personal traumas or sufferings. But this does not mean that they regard as a step towards to reconciliation. In this regard, Agamben argued that by constructing Mnemosyne, Warburg first of all aimed to solve his personal conflicts and problems and it was designed as a mnemotechnical tool for Western culture. In this regard, one can formulate the similarities between these two thinkers by looking at a specific work curated in Istanbul Biennale. *Mirror Box* by Ramachandran is an important object and shows this formulation of art such in this biennale. First of all, Ramachandran is not an artist nor *Mirror Box* is an art object. Nevertheless, Ramachandran is

⁷ I choose the use this term thinkers because of their intellectual heritage and there is no term which is capable to identify these two figures in the same category.

regarded as one of the prominent behavioral neurology and visual psychophysics. He first developed his Mirror Box in 1993 and aimed to cure Phantom Limb Syndrome. This syndrome is caused by a lost arm or leg which is actually lost but the patient still feels the pain caused by this missing limb. In other words, a patient still feels the missing limb after its loss. Ramachandran built a two part box with a mirror inside which create an illusion, as if the missing limb is present. After a period of time of exercises, many patients do not feel the pain associated with missing or phantom limb (14THB, Mirror Box, 2017). One can argue that this work corresponds to questions raised by Bakargiev, these can be art as healing and recollections of the past occurrences. Furthermore, one can also argue that it also addresses to ghostly nature of photography because what Ramachandran produced also can be seen in the light of early photographic devices to a certain degree. The image produced in Ramachandran's Mirror Box is after all a reflection of the existing limb and therefore it echoes the photographic production. Therefore can we argue that Bakargiev addresses the memento mori characteristics of the early photography by placing this work at the very center of the exhibition? As I have outlined in the chapter of Istanbul Biennale, Bakargiev's curatorial strategy of expanding the exhibition space and curating non-art objects indicates a cinematic way of construction. However, it can be argued that Bakargiev is not merely interested in the photography per se but what photography signifies and that is the recollection of the past. In this biennale, Bakargiev brings historical sites which may be unknown to locals and therefore one can argue that she photographs certain sites and reveals the unknown or untold histories and memories of the city. It can be argued that this was the notion which Warburg sought as well, that is the migration of ideas, stories, figures and memories throughout his career. Furthermore, one can argue that both of these thinkers aim to create a map whether in the practical end as Bakargiev did or in the theoretical end as Warburg did with Mnemosyne Atlas. The idea of mapping out their formulations rather than proposing answers lie at the center of their methodologies. This strategy is one of the aspects which correlates their projects to cinematic end. One can argue that early moving image practitioners such as Muybridge and Maley were also the result will of documenting movements, gestures of living beings. In this regard, Michaud argues that Warburg's studies of motion in images interestingly correlates with the works by Etienne Jules-Marey

although they worked at the different ends (Michaud, 2007: 87) However, one can argue that neither Warburg nor Bakargiev uses the photographic or cinematic way of construction in a way to reveal the truth but puts emphasize on the trajectory to a remembrance of ideas, figures, stories and memories which are invisible and stuck in-between visible routes throughout human consciousness. In this regard, the usage of the space fulfills an important role. Bruno argues that Warburg was the art historian who recognized the changing structure museum as a multi-screen theater (re)collection with the construction of Mnemosyne (Bruno, 2014: 160). Therefore one can argue that Bruno reads Mnemosyne Atlas as a way of structuring museum space. Furthermore, Mnemosyne Atlas can be seen as the catalogue of an exhibition which has never come to life. In this regard, it can be argued that Warburg can be the first figure who understood the importance of the exhibitions for the art historical understanding not just for the academia but for the general public as well. Bakargiev's 14th Istanbul Biennale also fulfills a historical role although it did not has such premise. The importance of large-scale exhibitions such as biennales for the history of art is stated. In this regard, O' Neill argues that contemporary art is experienced and historized through large-scale exhibitions such as biennales and art fairs (2010: 243). Therefore, whether they were constructed for art historical understanding of art's progression or not, both of these projects share art historical reminiscences. However, they do not achieve this through the chronological narrative of art history. At this point, cinematic way of constructing plays a crucial for both of these thinkers.

According to Eisenstein, montage, first of all create a shock of thought through connections of disparate images and activates the hidden energies between these juxtaposed images. Eisenstein's early writing related to a montage of attractions were highly concerned with the theater. The usage of different medias and various form of presentations such as live acting, posters and sequences from films were the materials of this montage of attractions. In fact, Eisenstein converted the theater stage into a boxing ring for the theater production of *The Mexican* in Moscow in 1920 (Rossak: 330). One can argue that the notion of engramm correlates to Eisenstein's idea of montage and montage of attractions in particular. Both of these terms point out to not static imagery and a single image alone but the effect created by the image on the spectator. As I have outlined before, engramm was one of the key influences for Warburg's pathos

formula and his creation of Mnemosyne Atlas. It can be argued that his pathos formula (or dynagrom) is not embedded in the memory but it is a 'triggered memory'. It a representation which shapes the present rather than the past or an archive (Brown and Green, 2009: 173) Therefore, it can be seen in the sphere of Eisenstein's theory of montage.

It can be argued that Eisenstein's theories on cinema share similarities with the ways in which Bakargiev constructed her exhibition. Bakargiev does not only structure this exhibition on the Bosphorus which is a channel but also convert its structure into a channel. The main exhibition which places a channel as Bakargiev constructs it in the Istanbul Modern is the most clear example of this approach. Bakargiev explains: "The Channel knots together inside and outside through different lines of flight, recalling a Klein bottle-a form with no outside nor inside, although it is a containing vessel" (14THB Guidebook: 53). Therefore one can argue that likewise Eisenstein, Bakargiev aims to blur the line between the exhibition itself which is structured as channel and the city-bosphorus as Eisenstein aimed to achieve with his "cinema of attractions". But neither of these two thinkers offer a direct way to the treasury of knowledge or story.

In the Istanbul biennale, Bakargiev pushes this narratives layers to even further away by using the geography of the city and glosses the narratives the city as well. Bruno argued that film⁸ and this geography of travel culture share similarities particularly regarding its continuous reinvention of the space. Furthermore, the invention of cinema overlaps with the new architecture of the modernity such as, arcades, railways and pavilion of exhibitions. Those sites were all place of transits and mobility which were the main aspect of this new architecture (Bruno, 2002: 17). One can argue that both Mnemosyne Atlas and 14th Istanbul Biennale share this urgency to mapping out their subject of studies. Israel Rosenfield, a neuroscientist claims that there is an undeniable correlation between memory and movement. As a matter of fact, neuronal groups in our brains are into different maps which communicate with each other in order to produce the

⁸ Bruno here particularly addresses to travel film genre, particularly to films such as *Panoramic View of Boston Subway from an Electric Car* (Edison, 1901), *Panoramic View of the Brooklyn Bridge* (Edison, 1899) and *Panorama of 4st St Josseph* (*American Mutoscope and Biograph*, A.E. Weed, 1902). Furthermore she argues that this genre inscribed motion into the grammar of cinema. It was taking spectator to spaces and thus creating multiform travel effects (Bruno, 2002: 20).

notions which an individual possess. Furthermore, Rosenfield states all kinds of recollections requires some kind of motor activity in order to reenact those unique moments. Thus every human being at the end redoing the past. For this redoing, Bruno argues that we return to film and it becomes the reproducible memory of our mobile perception of space and explores our history of our personal emotional scale (2002: 263). Bruno further explains the functionality and the effect created by the film as follows:

“What is mobilized in film’s own emotional mapping is the plan of an unconscious topography in which emotions can “move” us, for they are themselves organized as a course. In the film, as in the emotional course mapped Scudery, sentiments come to be mapped as physical transformations, written as moving physiognomy. Indeed, emotional cartography is about an itinerary, the carnal knowledge by which one comes to know beings. It is the kind of cosmography whose compositional lines touch the most tender filaments of inner cells-a cosmography that draws the universe in the manner of an intimate landscape. This is a drawing whose texture is the very system of our interior, the text of our inner fabric: a place where pictures become a space, an architecture (2002: 263).”

In this passage, Bruno refers to Madeleine de Scudery’s *Carte du pays de Tendre* which was published in 1654 to accompany her novel *Clelie*. In this map, various of terrains were depicted such as land, sea, river along with several towns, bridges and trees in order to show the way to the “countries of tenderness”. Bruno argues that it depicts the itinerary of the novel and thus produces “a world of affects” visible to human beings. She further discusses that the visiting the land which Scudery created, produces a psychogeography. This roadmapping or meandering is the aspect which links the exterior and interior and therefore leaves no space for visible scar or wounds (Bruno, 2002: 2-3). One can argue this impact of blurring the lines between exterior and interior is the reason why Bruno’s correlation between cinema and Scudery’s creation. In this regard, can we perceive *Mnemosyne Atlas* as the visualizing or mapping of his personal meandering? One can detect premises of this notion of interior and exterior at the center of Warburg’s thinking. His term *Denkraum* (room for thought) which first appeared in his writing regarding *Age of Luther* shows Warburg’s willingness to create a space which is an imaginary space rather than a real one (Sacco, 2015: 63). Warburg states this idea in

his introductory text from the Atlas : “The conscious creation of distance between the self and the external world may be called the fundamental act of civilization. Where this gap conditions artistic creativity, this awareness of distance can achieve a lasting social function”. (Quoted in Gombrich, 1970: 288). One can argue that what Warburg called Denkraum is the transmissionary state, or the binary of the self and the external world. This approach also can be found in the Bakargiev’s discourse.

“Conversations between different fields of knowledge occur here, from Orhan Pamuk’s drawings in his sketchbook to recordings by oceanographer Emin Özsoy. It is difficult to commensurate what appears in commensurable. However, in the internet era, maintaining the boundaries between different fields makes little sense. We have an ability for deep thinking, which is an old ability that needs to be exercised and allied with our more recent ability to surf through a variety of interests and fields. Art offers a platform for experimenting and exercising such transversal alliances like-minded people, whether they are visitors, artists, scientists, historians, fiction writers or philosophers. Here in the Channel, a number of elements float together” (14THB Guidebook, 2015).

Therefore one can argue that this formulation correlates the thinking and structure behind the Mnemosyne. These both projects try to evoke an affect through the juxtaposition of not just images but also different disciplines as well and by doing that they are trying to open up a space for thought but for answers.

Conclusion

Sergei Eisenstein addresses to an anecdote in order to unfold his theory of montage. He tells his encounter with the city of New Yorks and states the fact of impossibility the memorization of New York’s streets at first. That is because streets are numbered such as Fifth Avenue, Forty-Second Street etc unlike the conventional way of naming the streets. Therefore, it becomes harder to remember the features of the streets and even the street itself. He discusses that one has to find distinctive aspects which can be identified with that particular street. Eisenstein suggests that there are two phases of this memorization. At first stage, one tries to imagine the different aspects of the individual streets but yet one is not able to know the street by its full form because the features of this street is not constructed as a full imagery. It is in the second stage when one

begins to understand the full scope of the street through juxtaposing all the features into a single image. In other words, a street can only be memorized through the fusing of different elements of this street (Eisenstein, 1957, 16).

In their projects, one can argue that both Bakargiev and Warburg wanted to activate memories of the spectators through juxtapositions of distinctive elements. In this regard, it can be argued that they share similarities with Eisenstein's formulation to a considerable degree. Furthermore, the given emphasis on the notion of memory or cultural memory is also another domain which moves Mnemosyne Atlas and 14th Istanbul Biennale to cinematic semisphere. But one cannot state that they are merely interested in specific historicities and memories alone. It is clear that for instance, Bakargiev is interested in the cultural history of Turkey and Istanbul in particular with given emphasis on the Levantine population of Istanbul and Armenian Genocide whereas Warburg was interested in the transmission of figures such as Nympha or Fortuna. However, they are also interested in laying out their formulations as a cartography which forces spectators to produce their own meanderings. Furthermore, those both projects were constructed in a way to blur the line between artworks and non-art objects. This juxtaposition of different kind of objects and disciplines suggest us to look at those projects as a whole. One can argue that this is also because of the ways in which they are structured. Both 14th Istanbul Biennale and Mnemosyne Atlas is composed of sections or panels of images. Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas was structured from panels of images which constitute specific themes whereas 14th Istanbul Biennale was laid out to several venues throughout the city. One can argue that by using this strategy, they aim to glosses the conflicts between these objects, ideas, venues and histories and memories. Thus this interrupted flow of images of Atlas and Istanbul Biennale leads to a creation of third meaning as moving image does.

One can argue that Semon's term engram can be correlated to the creation of third meaning through the juxtaposition of images. Engram is the trace left from an event on a living being which is activated by another event which occurs in a similar manner (Gombrich, 1970: 242). Thus it is not the memory itself but it is the "triggered memory" (Brown and Green: 173). One can argue that this is how a meaning is produced in films in the structural end. For instance, in the Kuleshov's experiment, a spectator is required the remember the man with a blank face first, than preceding scene

would create the effect. Therefore, it can be argued that these projects not just highlight personal and cultural memory as their context but also the way in which they are structured, rely on how the memory actualize itself through mechanical products such as photography and moving image.

Bibliography

14th Istanbul Biennale, *The Flesh is Yours, The Bones are Ours*. Retrieved from <http://14b.iiksv.org/works.asp?id=30>>

14th Istanbul Biennale, *Family Memoirs on the end of Ottoman Empire*. Retrieved from <http://14b.iiksv.org/works.asp?id=82>

14th Istanbul Biennale, *Abysall Pain*. Retrieved from <http://14b.iiksv.org/works.asp?id=95>

Agamben, G. (1996). *Potentialities: Collected Essay in Philosophy* Stanford: CA: Stanford University Press.

Blassnigg, M. (2011). 'Ekphrasis and a Dynamic Mysticism in Art: Reflections on Henri Bergson's Philosophy and Aby Warburg's *Mnemosyne Atlas*', *Trans technologyResearchReader* Retrieved 2 August 2017 from http://www.transtechresearch.net/wpcontent/uploads/2015/05/TReader2011_003_Blassnigg.pdf

Bloomfield, J. (Ed.) (1996). *Aby Warburg: The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity* Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.

Bredenkamp, H. (2003). *A Neglected Tradition? Art History as "Bildwissenschaft"*, *Critical Inquiry*, 29: 3,418-428.

Brown, L & Green, C. (2009). *Robert Smithson's Ghost in 1920s Hamburg: Reading Aby Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas as a Non-Site*, *Visual Resources*, 18,167-181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01973760290011824>

Bruno, G. (2014) *Surface: Matters of Aesthetics, Materiality and Media*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

---,(2002). *Atlas of Emotion: Journey in Art, Architecture and Film*. New York: Verso.

Christov-Bakargiev, C. (2015). 'Introduction' in Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev(ed.) *SALTWATER Catalogue* (pp. pp. XLIII-LXIII). Istanbul: Istanbul Foundation of Culture and Arts: Yapı kredi Publications.

Connolly, M. (2009) *The Place of Artist's Cinema*. Bristol: Intellect.

Didi- Huberman, G.(2007).Knowledge: Movement in Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion. New York: Zone Books.

Eisenstein, S. (1957) The Film Sense. New York: NY: Meridan Books.

---,(1969) Film Form. New York: NY: London: HBJ Books.

---,(1989)Yve Alain Bois, Michael Glenny, Montage and Architecture. Assemblage, 10. 110-131.

Forster, K. W. (1996). Introduction in Julia Bloomfield Aby Warburg: The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity, (pp.1-77) Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.

Forster, K. W & Britt, D. (1996) Aby Warburg: His Study of Ritual and Art on Two Continents, October, 775-24.

Grasskampf, W. (1996). For Example, DOCUMENTA, or, How is Art History Produced in (ed.) Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson&Sandy Nairne, Thinking About Exhibitions(pp.67-80) New York: NY: Routledge.

Gombrich, E. (1970) Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Life. London: The Warburg Institute.

Johnnson, C. D. (2013), About the Mnemosyne Atlas, Retrieved from <https://warburg.library.cornell.edu/about>

Kelly, M.(1981).Reviewing Modernist Criticism, Screen, 22: 3. 41-52.

Le Grice, M. (2011).Time and the Spectator in the Experience of Expanded Cinema in A. L Rees, David Curtis, Duncan White&Steven Ball, Expanded Cinema: Art, Performance, Film (pp. 160-170). London: Tate Publishing.

Lundemo, T. (2012) Quoting Motion in Angela dalle Vacche Film, Art and New Media: Museum Without Walls? (pp.103-105). New York: NY: Palgrave Macmillan

Mcewan, D. (2006)Aby Warburg's (1866-1929) Dots and Lines. Mapping the Diffusion of Astrological Motifs, Art History, German Studies Review,29, 243-268.

Megill, A. (2011). History, Memory and Identity in Jeffrey K.Olick (ed.) Collective Memory Reader. (pp. 193-197) Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press.

Meijers, D. J. (1996) The Museum and The 'Ahistorical' Exhibition: The latest gimmick by the arbiters of taste, or an important cultural phenomenon in Reesa Grenberg(ed.) Thinking About Exhibitions. (pp. 7-20) New York: NY: Routledge.

Michaud, P. (2007). Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion. New York: Zone Books.

Nora, P. (1989). *Between Memory and History Representations*, 26, 7-24.

Penz, F. (2012) *Museum as Laboratories of Change: The Case for the Moving Image in Angela Dalle Vacche*(ed.) *Film, Archive New media: Museum Without Walls?* New York: NY

Pollock, G. (2007). *Virtual Feminist Museum: Time, space and the archive*. New York: NY: Routledge.

Rossaak, E. *Figures of Sensation: Between Still and Moving Images in Wanda Streuven*(ed.) *Cinema of Attractions Reloaded*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Sacco, D. (2015). *Composing the Symbolic: The Denkraum Between Warburg and Eisenstein*, *Aisthesis*, 2, 59-75.

Schade, S. (1995). *Charcot and the Spectacle of the Hysterical Body: The 'pathos formula' as an aesthetic staging of psychiatric discourse- a blind spot in the reception of Warburg*, *Art History*, 18, 499-517.

Schoell-Glass, C. (2008) *Aby Warburg and Anti-Semitism*. Detroit: Wayne University Press.

Smith, D. (2009). *Debating Cultural Topography: Sites of Memory and Non-Places in the Work of Pierre Nora and Marc Augé*, *Irish Journal of French Studies*, 9, 31-48.

O'Neill, Paul, 'Curatorial Turn: From Practice to Discourse' in *Biennale Reader*, ed. by Elena Filipovic, and others (Bergen: Bergen Kunsthall: 2010)

Osborne, P. (2013). *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*, London: New York: Verso.

The Oxford Companion to World Mythology, ed. by David Leeming (2014), Retrieved 18 June 2017 from <http://0-www.oxfordreference.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/10.1093/acref/9780195156690.001.0001/acref-9780195156690>

Wiegel, S. (1995) *Aby Warburg's Schlangensymbol: Reading Culture and Reading Written Texts*, *New German Critique*, 65, 135-153.

Woodfield, R. (2001). *Warburg's Method* in Richard Woodfield(ed.) *Art History as Cultural History: Warburg's Projects*. (pp.259-293) Singapore: G+B Arts.