

# BUILDING A MEMORY PALACE THROUGH VIDEO INSTALLATION

Shaun Wilson, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

## Abstract

This paper will reflect on the Ars Memoria tradition by establishing new knowledge in the way in which mnemonic rhetoric can be integrated into video installation evidenced through the significant 'Memory Palace 2017' (Wilson, 2017) installation. It will position these traditions in relation to the different ways of thinking about memory which will begin with the Greek place and object memory system and end with Matteo Ricci's late Renaissance Chinese memory palace. One of the key values in the wider Ars Memoria tradition was to locate objects and images into specifically imagined spaces which represented a cognitive way to recall memories through a categorised, cognitive database. These databases were established through specific guidelines located in several key texts that when considered shall first, inform a method by which the video installation can be later developed and second, to attest new knowledge in the ways we might ought to come to terms with the integration of spatialising memory through studio practice.

**KEYWORDS:** Ars Memoria, memory palace, art of memory, video installation

## INTRODUCTION

The history of Western mnemonics established a way of thinking about memory that enabled users of its technique to build and move through mental spaces coined 'memory palaces'. These dwellings housed intentional objects and images that represented the topics sought to be stored, re-accessed, and then recalled from memory. As the process of construction enabled an imaginal network of rooms and spaces by which sectioned mnemonic narratives were ordered and catalogued, this paper will consider how video installation can facilitate Ars Memoria traditions whereby the interactivity of the user is engaged by experiencing and moving through a designated physical space. While one might consider an interactive video game or virtual reality device, for example, to be a type of memory palace in that the gamer uses the same kinds of approaches to navigate through cordoned spaces in the exact way as they might employ their own memory to advance from one section to another, this paper will instead focus on witnessed, as opposed to navigated, video installations located inside of gallery environments to

investigate how historical mnemonic principles, established in several key texts through the classical *Ad Herennium*, the medieval *Rhetorica Novissima* and very late Renaissance *Treatise on Mnemonic Arts*, can be attested to subjective spaces integrating video art.

Throughout its 2500 year history, Western mnemonics otherwise known as the *Ars Memoria* tradition and more recently, the art of memory, established a premise for its user to employ their memory to navigate often complex spaces which, as later discussed, ranged from a single room to networked localities and cities filled with objects and images set in an intentional order. The process of its technique, mnemonics, was understood to the ancient world as being a system of artificial memory introduced to Western philosophy in aid of improving recollection. The Greek method pioneered the modern *Ars Memoria* technique but much earlier examples are known to have existed through Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilisations although these methods were more rudimentary and did not, as much as we know, involve the spatialising of objects through memory in the same way as what later incarnations had established. Thus, this paper will consider the Greek tradition to be the foundation of the art of memory.

## OVERVIEW OF THE ARS MEMORIA TRADITION

The Greek poet Simonides of Ceo founded the Greek object and place memory system around 500 BC as he attended the banquet of Scopas, a nobleman of Thessaly. Briefly departing the banquet hall he returned to find the roof had collapsed and the victims were so dismembered that their relatives could later not identify the bodies. Offering a solution, Simonides recalled the places where each guest was seated; and one by one, as he matched the seating arrangement to his memory of the where each guest was located, he identified each body. 'Thus, Simonides discovers the art of memory: the holding in memory of a particular order of places, with a mnemonic image housed in each.' (Perlman, p.47)

The foundations of this technique were upheld as the basis of mnemonic practice throughout Greek and Roman times and arguably, well into the medieval and Renaissance periods. Like Simonides, who imprinting places and objects to memory, the technique of memorising objects and recalling them by ordered method erected structures within the imagination that were later to be understood as cognitive-based memory palaces. These dwellings were thought of to house objects and images, stored within rooms or chambers, reminding the user of what they need to remember yet the more intertwined contextualisation of such practice evolved 'to provide storage spaces for the myriad concepts that make up the sum of our human knowledge' (Spence, p. 1).

From this method, there evolved complex and at times absurd suggestions – as found in Roman times, for example, prompting the inclusion of images which depicted goats eyes and sheep’s testicles - elaborating on methods of how to remember and moreso, how to remember *spatially* which, as Jesuit Chinese missionary Matteo Ricci further elaborated, ‘the more [rooms] there are the better it will be’ (Spence, *ibid*).

Following the Simonides system, mnemonic techniques occupied interpretations of intellect, respectability, the supernatural and assumed intellectual superiority where the tradition became so highly considered in Greek and Roman times that it was used at the forefront of culture in the ancient world primarily for the use of recollecting words in speeches in the Roman senate. The Greek method was predominately image and word based, further developed in works published during Roman times that gave commentary of evolved methods yet the core foundation of such techniques all reverted back to the Simonides principle. Here, the interaction of place and objects were based on the Greeks development of memory systems passed down to the Romans that, in the case of the work undertaken by Cicero and later, Quintilian, advanced the idea of user experience. ‘The first basic fact’ writes Yates, ‘which the student of the history of classical art of memory must remember is that the art belonged to rhetoric, as a technique by which the orator could improve his memory, which would enable him to deliver long speeches from memory with unfailing accuracy’ (Yates, p.2).

‘Two thousand years ago Marcus Cicero used to make two hour speeches in the Roman Senate, without notes, by constructing in his mind a palace whose rooms and furnishings, as he imagined himself roaming through them, called up the ideas he wished to discuss: ideas were made memorable by locating them in space’ (Yates, 16).

For Cicero, the ability to navigate within mnemonic structures induced a dependency on movement. As he moved from one room to another within his imagination, the fluidity of dialogue in Cicero’s speeches rested on continued travel between these imaginary chambers where each room retained a new set of objects that reminded him of what was to be remembered. His method instructs the furnishing of a memory palace with objects, which in turn, reminded the user of words and topics - objects or ‘things’ became indicators of remembered events, points, or ideas. As the construction greatly depended on the adherence of mnemonic rules found within rhetoric, to place these objects sequentially Cicero found that without rules of order, memory inside a mnemonic dwelling would collapse. Moreover, to recollect through spatial categorisation gave the practitioner of Roman artificial memory a logical sequence by which to navigate although the disadvantage of such was that users could not simply construct their own dwellings in a creative fashion without conforming to the structured notions of what

was prescribed through rhetoric. It was considered that chambers were to be designed with a sense of order and if, say, a practitioner became lost within their own palace they then could move back to the last known chamber recalled through memory and start again.

During the classical period, memory was considered to exist in two forms: natural memory, that is to say, memory based on a natural ability, and artificial memory, that is to say, techniques used to improve the ability of natural memory. This was outlined in one of the most important texts of Roman rhetoric, *Ad Herennium*, which shaped the path of future methods for fifteen hundred years thereafter. Written in 86 BC by an anonymous teacher of rhetoric in Rome, *Ad Herennium* highlighted five parts of rhetoric thus being *Inventio*, *Dispositio*, *Elocutio*, *Memoriae* and *Pronuntiatio*. *Memoriae*, the only surviving document, is the fourth section of which the author describes as being ‘the custodian of all parts of rhetoric’ (Ad Herennium). Within this work, specific rules for remembering are discussed, dividing memory through both natural and artificial means.

Towards artificial memory, *Ad Herennium* distinguishes a memory palace with two independent features, being place - *locus* - and things - *images*. *Locus* establishes the structure of place thereby anchoring memory within geography. *Images* are concerned with representations of memory, cementing narrative, association, and experience together to form cognitive unity. Both *locus* and *images* internalise memory through chambers housing objects associated towards *what* is to be easily remembered. *Ad Herennium* states that ‘we ought, then, to set up images of a kind that can adhere longest in memory. And we shall do so if we establish similitude as striking as possible’ (Ad Herennium) which then instructs ‘the things we easily remember when they are real we likewise remember without difficulty when they are figments’ (Ad Herennium). ‘But this will be essential - again and again,’ Ad Herennium states ‘to run over rapidly in the mind all the original places in order to refresh our image’ (Ad Herennium).

At this stage of Roman Ars Memoria, *Images* were considered to be indicators of memory once placed inside their own mnemonic chambers whereby the practice was to create memory triggers to prompt the user of their desired memory yet the kinds of images that these triggers would activate was thought of as being necessary to host an oddity in their appearance or assemblage in a term often referred to as ‘striking’.

‘When we see in everyday life things are pretty, ordinary, and banal, we generally fail to remember them, because the mind is not being stirred by anything novel or marvelous. But if we see or hear something exceptionally base, dishonorable, unusual, great, unbelievable, or ridiculous, that we are likely to remember for a long time’ (Ad Herennium).

In Roman times, as sight was considered the dominant sense, insertion of images that were easily identified – striking - became quite complex in both their appearance and context. Not only were images representative of associated events, topics and things, but also became inclusive of individual words and sentences. The task of applying striking experiences by the instructed method resulted in *res* – things - designed to inform the user of the topics of their memory recollection and *verba* - words – designed to reflect individual elements located within *res*.

Unlike classical methods, the evolution of Roman traditions took on a religious dogma where medieval instructions modified the rules of place and things to include a preoccupation with judgment and the afterlife. Boncompagno da Signa, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas all rewrote or modified the rules of *Ad Herennium* to compliment Christian doctrine. Interpreting memory without a Christian alteration, including the practice of cosmology, faced accusations of heresy in many European countries at the time, which was in most cases punishable by death. For example, three hundred years later, Giordano Bruno, the last man burnt at the stake in Europe, was later executed for heresy due to his cosmological methods closely related to a hermetic interpretation of *Ars Memoria* still then under the tight control of Christianity and the church. The mediaeval world exclusively replaced artificial memory places that were suggested in the classical period with the locales of paradise, purgatory, and hell in what one might argue to be a religious fundamentalism propagated through scholastic intervention.

Mnemonic rules altered its original ancestry through a religious domination of the art of memory which were none the more fanatical as that of Boncompagno da Signa's *Rhetorica Novissima*, which highlights the dichotomy between the classical and mediaeval methods of replacing the *Ad Herennium* rule 'places must be memorable' with 'places must be either heaven, purgatory or hell'. Here the author dismisses the classical impartiality of *Ars Memoria* to instate the accusational rhetoric of twelfth century Christianity.

'On certain heretics' who assert that Paradise and Hell are matters of opinion. Some Athenians who studied philosophical disciplines and erred through too much subtlety, denied the resurrection of the body. . . Which damnable Heresy is imitated by some persons today. . . We however believe without doubt in the Catholic faith, AND WE MUST ASSIDUOUSLY REMEMBER THE INVISIBLE JOYS OF PARADISE AND THE ETERNAL TORMENTS OF HELL' (Boncompagno, p.278)

The medieval versions of the tradition became a teaching of the church to account for divinity and the then consideration of fear of going to hell yet the advancements of the period suggested a more somber experience for the user which took the once bright and well lit imaginal dwellings of Roman times to that of the recommended darkened places of solace so as to enable a realisation of divinity in the actualisation of imaginal dwellings.

The new relativism propagating from the Renaissance delivered equally diverse interpretations of memory places which, despite the dominance of Gothic Christian rule, flourished the opposing occult and hermetic traditions, lead in part by Giordano Bruno. Celestial memory systems through a quest to find the highest universal order began to concoct complex methods by the user would not necessarily visit one dwelling at a time and then pass through to another, but would instead climb in various orders to attain what was sought to be recalled through diagrammatic means. Lullist's rejected these claims and abolished artificial memory altogether in favor of the process of natural memory. At this point, few mnemonic practitioners adhered to the original *Ad Herennium* rules of place and things. Religion and the occult influenced these advancements through very different evolutions. However, Matteo Ricci, a Jesuit priest trained in mnemonic arts used the memory palace technique to a simplified version of *Ad Herennium* and Cicero's practice sparking the first and last major contribution to what was then a 2000 year old practice. Ricci applied this by an attempt to convert China to Christianity which was, nonetheless, a merger between Roman methods and the Aquinas advantagement of conversion and moral unity.

While attempting to convince the local population to the 'superiority of the west', Ricci modified images inside his palace towards Chinese imagery. His dwelling consisted of a single chamber where each corner housed an image and a picture. Both depicted Christian iconography adopting a Chinese interpretation of biblical parables and narratives. Simplicity gave Ricci a mnemonic lead that convinced parts of China to his teachings.

Notable opposition to this periodic stage of *Ars Memoria* included Cornelius Agrippa's *Of the Vanitie and uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences* where 'he felt the natural memory of men was dulled by the "monstrous images" concocted in the mnemonic arts; the attempt to overload the mind with infinite pieces of information often "caused madness and frenzy instead of profound and sure memory" (Agrippa) 'Religious thinkers (who were prominent during the late Sixteenth century) like Erasmus and Melanchthon saw these memory systems as going back to an earlier age of monkish superstition and felt that the systems were of no practical use'(see Spence).

As scientific rationalism of the Eighteenth century distracted new developments of mnemonic treatises, hybrid versions of memory palaces surprisingly emerged at the end of the Twentieth and early Twenty-First century with the aid of computer software, which created virtual spaces and unlimited virtual real estate. Ironically, the digital device which many might argue to be the replacement for the printing press returned the possibilities of *Ars Memoria* through its advancements of gaming and virtual reality technologies that now was creating new memory palaces amidst a revived interest into the mnemonic arts through the digital.

As a test case, this paper considers Matteo Ricci's dwelling as a significant example to aid the development of the visual work based on his deliberated in *Treatise on Mnemonic Arts*. Located in the *Jifa*, Ricci's single chamber memory palace featured an image and a picture inserted into each corner. Spence talks of this chamber as a 'reception hall, a fairly large formal space, supported by pillars, which I take to be the entryway to the memory palace proper.' (Spence) Ricci tailored his entrance hall design towards a Chinese audience, combining both mnemonic and biblical teachings. This also gave the Chinese an advantage over previous designs of incompatible memory palaces. One could extend the number chambers by attaching new buildings to the entrance hall, or increase the number of desired memories by inserting more images and pictures inside the entrance hall itself. As this design was essentially one room made up of corresponding images, the developed video installation uses this setup as closely related to a gallery environment making this kind of memory palace intervention through installation a more viable and easily attainable reference point.

Ricci incorporates four pictures and four images into his memory palaces developed from biblical stories: pictures of 'Christ and Peter at the Sea of Galilee, of Christ and the two disciples at Emmaus, of the men of Sodom falling blinded before the angel of the Lord, and of the Virgin Mary holding the Christ Child' (Spence, 198) The four images were developed from variants of Chinese ideographs. 'The first image was two warriors grappling, the second a tribeswomen from the west, the third a peasant cutting grain, the fourth a maidservant holding a child in her arms' (Spence).

A notable technique used by Ricci within his inclusion of ideographs was the modification of each character. Ideographs were separated into sections that imbedded other characters within the original ideographic meaning. An example of this can be found in the first image titled *Wu*, 'the Chinese ideograph for war' (Spence). As images referring to war, or battle, were standard features of mnemonic images - *Ad Herennium's* Sons of Mars and Quintilian's anchor - it is no surprise that Ricci continued this trend, which ultimately worked in his favour.

## THE RULES OF A MEMORY PALACE

The Rules of place stated throughout this history define the mechanics of building and moving through a memory palace which are discussed in the periodical instructions below:

### RULES OF PLACE: THE CLASSICAL

1. A building shall be spacious and varied.
2. A building shall not omit statues or ornaments.
3. A sense of sight is most important within buildings.
4. Places must be memorable.
5. Buildings are not too large or too small.
6. Buildings must not be too similar to each other.
7. Distinguishing between the 5th place (a hand) and 10th place (cross).
8. Places must be quiet.
9. Places must be well lit.
10. A common type of place is architecture based.
11. Building must be within solitary or deserted places.
12. Employ a large number of places.
13. Buildings must be set out in order.
14. Buildings must be about 30 ft. apart.
15. Buildings can be fictive, existing or both. (*Trt MR*)

### AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PLACE: MIDDLE AGES

1. Remember a place at night.
2. Buildings are to be of real structure, not imagined.
3. Buildings are to have minimal light.
4. A chamber must not have more than four corners.
5. Place can be paradise, purgatory, or hell.

### AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PLACE: RENAISSANCE [RAMISTS]

1. Places must be of real structure.
2. Imagination has no place in artificial memory.
3. Place is structured through a strict emphasis on method and order.



## AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PLACE: RENAISSANCE [HERMETIC AND THE OCCULT]

1. Groups of building can be connected to one another to form large complexes.
2. Place can exist in the heavens, in the cosmos, or the zodiac.
3. Buildings in place are connected with complex design and layout.

## AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PLACE: LATE RENAISSANCE

1. The more places the better.

## AMENDMENTS TO THE RULES OF PLACE: JIFA

1. The more places, the better it (a memory palace) will be.
2. Places and dwellings can be referential, fictive or both.

## THE MEMORY PALACE 2017

The new artwork was developed as to acknowledge and come to terms with the legacy of the Ars Memoria tradition by considering the representation of each major period thus discussed into components of the main installation that gives rise to exemplify how each evolution thought of and understood both artificial and natural memory. From here, the representations would allow the user to witness time-based performative video in a combination of sequences drawn out from the original rhetorical instructions where one video would prompt the other in ways that would oscillate between moving through a space and witnessing trigger objects and images to aid that progression, and forth.

The problem with this method is that various incarnations of periodic examples would often conflict with each other in terms of how one might ought to navigate through a space and, what kind of building this constitutes. An intention of the installation was to demonstrate the vastly different ways that these particular considerations of memory techniques were engineered, designed, and experienced by the user. This also gave a facilitation of new knowledge to come to terms with the style of visualising memory in that the cited volumes are purely text based rhetoric and not of visual means. However, once these texts were visualised through video then this changed the way the user might think about and come to terms with the practice of each individualised mnemonic tradition. This, of course, implicitly conflicts with much of the entirety of the Ars Memoria instructions in that the designs of such cognitive dwellings were only meant to be cognitively facilitated. However, this project seeks to consider the actuality in

building such dwellings as this gives rise to more meaningful and specific ways of understanding the context behind each periodic contribution. To be faithful to these ideas is certainly a limited process which must be placed into a contemporary context that would remain problematic if such ideas remained faithful to the authenticities of the writing of especially Greek and Roman literature when situated into the context of a gallery environment. Indeed, one might suggest that to intentionally not visualise these constructions in a contemporary sense risks the realisation that these classical texts may diminish in reference or disappear altogether if the contemporary advancements of these treaties and rhetoric remain without a realisation of visual base. There is an argument, of course, to say that if the technologies available to us now, such as digital media and communication platforms, were equally available to the past authors of *Ars Memoria* rhetorics then it is plausible to consider that, say, in the case of Cicero, for example, that if he had access to virtual reality and computer gaming software then his preoccupation with mental faculties might indeed be invested in the visualisation of spatialising memory instead of what he prescribed as only to be permissible of and remaining in the mind. This is not to say that the spatiality of memory is void when the subjective nature of text is visually employed however, with the advancements of technology that can digitally create what the *Ars Memoria* texts wrote, these kinds of technologies can only offer an advancement in the *Ars Memoria* tradition to what this paper suggests as a new twenty-first century incarnation of the art of memory and further, that the tradition did not cease during the enlightenment but rather, to consider it as ending a specific period of the ongoing evolution of rhetoric, which in this instance is now embraced as *visual rhetoric*.

Taking these thoughts into consideration, the *Memory Palace 2017* installation is comprised of four parts thus being Greek, Roman, Mediaeval, and the Renaissance traditions. Each of these parts locate dedicated instances of memory palaces which pertain to a combination of the recommendations that were made in each specific mnemonic period which, for example, made it easier for the gallery user to interact with the intention of illustrating the differences of the periodic methods and how each period considered memory and the traditions by which they upheld. This juxtaposition enabled the images and video in the installation to communicate with the user to first, demonstrate each periodic method and second, allow the user to make such a distinguishment by using their own memory of the linkages between the four parts themselves to engage within the artwork.

## METHOD

The responding video installation identified key differences between the four main episodic periods and represented this by way of demonstrating such differences in a way

where the user would experience each segmented component in sequential order. This also allowed for the analysis of the rules of places and images in each period to identify contextual similarities and moreover, in addition to establishing new knowledge by the experience of participating in the entirety of the Ars Memoria tradition with performative video used as the mediator.

To enable a visual cohesiveness between all parts, the same characters were featured in the video segments wearing the same outfits positioned with unusual and out of place props such as a rams skull, an oversized candelabra, and a railway lantern in each tableau as a way to exemplify the idea of striking while at the same time allowing the user to experience each type of memory palace with a memory of its former by giving the audience something they can recognise and thus commit to memory. Each of these tableaus share the origins in the Scopus dinner party account and by this method of simplicity transcends an overarching summary of the tradition whereby the scope which this story was limited by in the presentation of one room with several key characters and the Ricci memory palace that returned to the same idea of a single room with limited Jiffa. The Installation was created on the premise that the differences between each instance would be located in how the audience would experience each part and also interpret how the standardised characters would interact with different environments governed by different rules of place. One of the particular problems in doing so was that each tableau had to rely on a representation of places that would enable the user to experience such place in a different context to other parts, and this not only had to be cohesive in the overall installation itself but also easy enough for the user to experience without causing confusion or complexity as they temporally progressed from one part to the next. This perhaps was the hardest challenge in creating these different places given the fact that the aesthetics of the artwork had to hold cohesiveness in order to accommodate the periodic rules of place and images where in the case of classical and medieval accounts, were conflicting. After several trial and error instances the installation was designed to be in a U shape formation of three projections – as in the classical and medieval traditions - symbolic of the three elements prescribes in a memory palace; that of place, an image and an object. A set of images were represented on the first screen that corresponded to the parallel third screen depicting inter-related objects. The second screen at the bottom of the U formation displayed the characters interacting with and defining both sets of images and objects.

## PART ONE: THE GREEK TRADITION

The Simonides account was visually represented by a filmed dinner party scene whereby each individual character was projected onto screen two, the objects representing these characters were projected onto screen one, and the dwelling which

housed these characters and objects together was projected onto screen three. An intention for this was to prompt an association between both the memory of the person and the trigger object for the user to make linkage and commit to their own memory. The user was able to participate in the installation by committing the memory of the characters seating arrangements to then identify the places where these people in the Simonides story had obviously passed. The objects representing the characters were centered around the food and drink of the dinner party – a vessel, a bowl of grapes, a roasted chicken, and a large ornate bowl of soup and the mythological elements found in Greek culture at the time – the ram’s skull, the candelabra, the lantern, and a small statue.

## PART TWO: CLASSICAL TRADITION

The second component represented the *Ad Herennium* and the Cicero accounts by considering the rule of places that prescribed that dwellings be neither big nor small, that they must be quiet, that they must be well lit, and in a place of solace or desertion. How this was realised in the video was to represent the same characters in the same costumes but situated in a different building which was more spacious than that which featured in part one and also contained more light in defining its architecture. There were an additional two characters depicted in the live action component as prescribed in the *Ad Herennium* to correlate to the ten places and images reference of being the 5<sup>th</sup> – a hand – and the 10<sup>th</sup> – a cross. To complement the places of desertion rule, a different location other than what was used in the first iteration was captured to delineate the differences of a spatial context while at the same time distinguish between the lighting of the dinner party and the more sprightly lit Roman context. From a conceptual perspective, this part plays out a more precise introduction to the notion of moving through spaces by way of a steadicam long shot with attention to the allocation of trigger objects dispersed throughout different rooms and dwellings.

## PART THREE: THE MEDIEVAL TRADITION

The third part was a combination of amendments to the mediaeval incarnations by including the places of the afterlife as embedded locales. The advantage of this enabled quite a difference from the staticness of the classical representation created by using the rule of place where locales were to be remembered at night with minimal lighting giving rise to a more theatre-based visual aesthetic. The presented characters were filmed in low light amongst a Gothic style dwelling as the camera moves slowly and thoughtfully through a series of single take performances interspersed with images and objects of the period including a crucifix, a candle, a hand written parchment, and torture devices. As the rule of place states that a dwelling must have no more than four

corners, the rooms depicted on screen were essentially large square spaces void of naves and vestibules. Places – *loci* – feature in this part as a more prominent element used in the projections whereby taking into account the importance of a place which certainly underpinned mediaeval Ars Memoria that, as we have discussed, broke away from the more closely integrated dual relationship comprised of images and places as understood as an essential duality of the classical period.

#### PART FOUR: THE RICCI TRADITION

This fourth section examines the last great advancements of the tradition by investigating the memory palace of Matteo Ricci. His simplification of classical and mediaeval methods brought his device back into the realm of the Scopus dinner party which for the user, delineates the more complicated and elaborate scenes of Parts Two and Three into a concluded and simplified approach. The first screen displayed images in the space mirrored by the third screen depicting the objects in the same place while characters mingled with each other in the second screen. Only four characters are represented in this memory palace correlating to the four images of place displayed in the four corners of the room. The way this was visualised in the installation was by the inclusion of holograms constructed in post-production, illustrating Ricci's original biblically themed pictures and the corresponding Chinese indiums. Notwithstanding, such integration of digital visual effects brought about a direct way to communicate with the user through animated elements corresponding to Ricci's suggestion that a dwelling can be real, imaginative or both.

#### CONCLUSION

In sum, the Ars Memoria tradition established an ongoing method for how we might ought to consider spatialised memory by encouraging us to move through a space in order to witness objects and pictures that would prompt us to recall what we sought to remember. Representing this history through video installation presented a challenge and a seemingly impossible task to on the one hand, depict an overview of the 2500 year tradition with a cohesive sense of authenticity and on the other, invent a system that represented the rules of places for the viewer to use and engage with and prompt their own memory using elements that revealed themselves within the experience of the videoed frame. As we have discussed, the tradition was thought to have demised through the impending relativism of the Enlightenment yet by reconnecting to these traditions in the twenty first century, the technologies by which I have employed to create a digital representation of the rules of such have given me an opportunity to contribute to the new methods of the tradition and from this, moreover, attest new knowledge that Ars Memoria is able to be revisited in a contemporary context where the

tradition itself can be continued and further developed in a way that advances its history and its future. We have seen that this new development can, in fact, be propelled through both time based and virtual technologies inasmuch as the tradition itself can continue its evolution to reflect the technologies of the time and moreover, to complement such technologies so that the ideas pioneered by Simonides are preserved and referenced in new approaches and new ways of coming to terms with spatialised memory and the memories we seek to recall.

## REFERENCES

*Ad Herrenium*. 111, xxii 36, Yates, p.10.

Agrippa, 1569, *Of the Vanitie and Uncertainties of Artes and Sciences*, Tr. James Sanford.Henry Wykes, London.

Boncompagno, *Rhetorica Novissima*, ed. A. Gaudentio 1891, Bibliotheca Iuridica Medii Aevi II, Bologna.

*Institutio Oratoria*, XI, 11, pp.17 – 22, Yates, p.3.

Lyndon, D, Moore.W.C 1994, *Chambers of a Memory Palace*, The MIT Press, Massachusetts, xi.

Malpas, J.E 2001, ‘Comparing Topographies: Across Paths/Around Place: A Reply to Casey’, in *Philosophy and Geography*, Vol.4, No.2, August, Carfax Publishing, Oxfordshire, p. 236.

Perlman, M 1998, *Imaginal Memory and the Place of Hiroshima*, State University of New York Press, New York.

Ricci, M 1964, *Jiffa*, Treatise of Mnemonic Arts, revised Zhu Dinghan, in Xiangxiang, W ed. Taipei, pp.20-21.

Spence, J.D 1984, *The Memory Palace of Matteo Ricci*, Penguin Books, New York.

Wilson, S 2017, *The Memory Palace 2017*, video installation, UHD1 video, collection of the artist.