is somewhat undermined by its stylistic opacity. At times, the very language of the study reproduces the complexity of the issues examined and the reader loses sight of the connections made. The text also exhibits some slight translation issues, particularly in the excerpts drawn from the work's primary sources, which may hinder comprehension on the part of its English speaking readers. Despite these limitations, Lucamante's investigation offers an invaluable resource for those working on memory studies, women's autobiographies, and representations of the Holocaust.

BEATRICE MABREY

The University of Texas at Austin

Hava Aldouby. *Federico Fellini. Painting in Film, Painting on Film*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2013. Pp. 186. ISBN: 9781442613270. \$29.95.

Hava Aldouby's *Federico Fellini: Painting in Film, Painting on Film* is an intriguing attempt to identify and valorize the presence of art-historical references in Fellini's cinema, especially in films made between 1965 and 1980. It is a study which engages in its own way in the debate on whether the Fellini of the mid-60s and beyond was more of an ironic postmodernist nihilist or a committed purveyor of a creative cinema of metaphysical immediacy. Aldouby's overall position is that Fellini was very aware of poststructuralist currents and of the crisis of subjectivity and expressivity in contemporary art, but that he nevertheless "plays the postmodern trope of intertextuality against the grain, employing contemporary form in the service of an essentially romantic project" (13). Painting, for Aldouby, is the primary vehicle Fellini uses for engaging in this project.

Aldouby begins her essay by noting the paucity of serious attention that has been paid to the presence of painting in Fellini's works. This is attributable to Fellini's own tendency to posture himself as substantially resistant to or ignorant of highbrow culture and intellectual theorizing and inspired instead by popular art forms such as comic strips, variety theater, and the circus. More important for the critical neglect, however, is what Aldouby sees as Fellini's substantially different approach to the pictorial intertext vis-à-vis directors such as Godard, Pasolini or Greenaway. These filmmakers operate a meta-discursive and alienating

operation in which they deliberately foreground the alterity of painting in film through a series of marking devices (arrest of motion and abrupt cutting between filmic and painterly image, for example). Fellini instead tends to privilege a much more holistic and seamless insertion of the pictorial image in which “cinema is nourished by painting” and painting functions as a “conduit to film’s foundational origins,” thereby enriching its “instinctual level of communication with the spectator” (7).

To provide theoretical heft to this unique use of the painterly text on Fellini’s part, Aldouby recurs to a series of critical reference points in her introductory chapter which reappear throughout her analyses of the individual films. Fellini’s unbracketed weaving of painting and cinema into a complex textual fabric bears resemblances to Bakhtinian notions of heteroglossia and dialogism. Painting is Fellini’s primary means of access to Julia Kristeva’s *semiotique*, the chaotic, non-verbal and presymbolic stratum of communication. As such, Fellini creates in the film spectator the same primal and phenomenological “embodied experience” (à la Merleau-Ponty) that the viewer of a painting undergoes. And this is what makes his films a particularly powerful vehicle for Vivian Sobchack’s notion of filmmaking that creates its own sensorially engaged “cinesthetic subject.” For Aldouby, it is precisely the holistic use of painting by Fellini in his middle films that allows him to reinstate and convey a powerful creative and aesthetic sense of the primordial and the real in these ostensibly postmodern cinematic texts. It is an operation that was nourished, Aldouby documents well, by Fellini’s increasing interest in Jungian psychoanalysis and in its rich visual imagery, thanks to the director’s friendship with Jungian disciple Ernst Bernhard in the early to mid-sixties (which also helps to explain the periodization of Fellini’s pictorial turn as beginning with *Giulietta degli spiriti*).

Aldouby’s methodological practice throughout the volume is to focus on individual, pictorially-inspired frames or shots as special signifying units within the overall filmic text. These she likens to Roland Barthes’ notion of *lexiae*, atomic and autonomous signifying units within a text that occasion an explosive scattering of meaning and undermine any single definitive message. In Fellini, these highly intertextual pictorial *lexiae* constitute the individual hyperlinks of a grander hypertext which, for Aldouby, counter tendencies toward post-structuralist nihilism in the director’s films during this period.

On the basis of this methodology and theoretical framework, Aldouby examines pictorial intertextuality in four of Fellini’s films. In each she focuses

on references to specific paintings of different artists and schools whose presence and effects she traces and interprets. Symbolist, Pre-Raphaelites and Art Nouveau sources in *Giulietta degli spiriti*; Rembrandt, Soutine, Bacon, Velasquez and Picasso in *Toby Dammit*; Breugel the Elder, Klimt, De Chirico, Picasso and Fabrizio Clerici in *Fellini Satyricon*; the Golem figure, De Chirico, Savinio, Böcklin, Clerici, Whistler in *Fellini's Casanova*. She supports her argument for the conscious use of these intertexts by noting the presence and dates of entry of relevant books on art in Fellini's private library as well as his interaction with artist friends. For Aldouby, Fellini's art-historical intertexts gravitate toward Symbolist painting, harking back to the Pre-Raphaelites and forward to Metaphysical painting. Although the specificities vary for each pictorial lexia, a tendency to privilege symbolist-metaphysical painting on Fellini's part feeds into Aldouby's general thesis that pictorial intertextuality in the director's work contributes to his reinstatement of the creative subject engaged in a romantic quest for transcendence and primordial intensity as an antidote to the threat of postmodernist vacuity. Of course, the establishment of this particular painterly genealogy as predominant in Fellini can only be accomplished through the setting aside of other, often more consistently present, pictorial intertexts in his films, as when Aldouby, in reference to *Casanova*, dismisses both Venetian genre painting and Hogarth's grotesque realism as mere "costume" sources. This may even be, but it also reflects Aldouby's goals of redeeming Fellini's pictorial imaginary to 'highbrow' cultural sources and away from that other 'lowbrow' comic and grotesque streak that runs throughout Fellini's films and is more consonant with the director's deflation of transcendent signification. All the same, Hava Aldouby's *Federico Fellini: Painting in Film, Painting on Film* is by far the most serious and successful attempt to date to document and interpret pictorial intertexts in Fellini's work and it convincingly argues for a much vaster, varied and complex art-historical presence in Fellini than has hitherto been acknowledged.

ALBERT SBRAGIA
University of Washington