selective use of evidence, and presents highly suspect sources as if they were incontrovertible. In the most extreme cases, she makes blatant factual errors, distorts her sources through misleading paraphrase, or confidently makes statements that have no source at all. Even her infrequent comments on Chaplin’s films are often grossly inaccurate.

Milton’s paraphrase of Chaplin’s description of Hetty Kelly is typical. Chaplin writes, “Her figure had developed, and I noticed the contours of her breasts and thought their protuberance small and not very alluring” (116). But according to Milton, “He . . . was disappointed to notice that she had developed breasts, which he did not find attractive” (15)—a reversal of Chaplin’s meaning. Since Milton has just been discussing Chaplin’s platonic attachment to 12-year-old Mabelle Fournier, she seems to want to suggest that Chaplin preferred a pubescent figure to a fully developed one. Such convenient distortion hardly seems accidental.

Milton soon becomes even more brazen, declaring that during puberty Charlie was “subject to devastating crushes on other boys” (30). No source is cited, probably because none exists. Carrying her speculations about Chaplin’s androgyny even further, Milton suggests that Chaplin and his friend Ralph Barton, who was “clearly bisexual,” were lovers. Her evidence? Chaplin reportedly had his portrait taken with Barton in a “Greek coin pose” (288). Precisely what Milton expects us to make of this phrase is beyond conjecture, but the photographer obviously meant a double profile.

These unsubstantiated speculations about Chaplin’s sexuality point to the basic flaw of Milton’s book, which is that she has no coherent interpretation of Chaplin to offer. Occasionally she gropes toward a thesis, suggesting that Chaplin suffered from bipolar (manic-depressive) disorder, which caused him to behave erratically and sometimes self-destructively. This claim has some basis in fact, but Milton never makes a sustained case for it—nor does the suggestion originate with her. A version of this argument (unacknowledged by Milton) first appeared in the Spring 1992 issue of Film Quarterly.

*Tramp*’s sole virtue is that Milton draws on a number of sources currently unavailable in print. Unfortu-
Her approach is thematic and "the title of each chapter is meant to spell out the director's attitude toward painting" (2). For example, Antonioni's Red Desert uses "Painting as Ventriloquism and Color as Movement," while Rohmer's The Marquise of O is subtitled "Painting Thoughts, Listening to Images." Dalle Vacche states that her approach is also intertextual, but her explanation seems to conflate her method with that of her director subjects. It includes "the borrowing of images from art history to inflect the meaning of a text, the rejection of painting to stress the unique features of film, the insertion of cinema in broadly shared visual cultures and national traditions, and, finally, the power film-making has to redefine art history" (3). Dalle Vacche likens the structure of her book to "a necklace upon which eight different beads, so to speak, are strung on a thematic intertextual red thread" (3).

She focuses on the auteurs, using their statements about painting and art, and in the case of Murnau, even studying records at the University of Heidelberg to ascertain the influence of contemporary art historians on him. Far more than archival material, however, Dalle Vacche is indebted to semiotics and contemporary feminist theory. Sometimes her understanding of the use of painting in film seems elliptical and speculative, for example, the relationship between Pollock's energy and primitivism and Kelly's dancing in American in Paris, or the collusion of the human and the inorganic in Warhol and Antonioni. Other times she explores how the style of painting intersects the style of film—collage and Godard, for example. Dalle Vacche also cites specific paintings and the way they are appropriated by the film-makers—De Chirico for Antonioni, Fuseli for Rohmer, Friedrich for Murnau. In all cases, many more illustrations would have been helpful (Hollander's Moving Pictures is the model here).

While at times Dalle Vacche gives a strong historical context, especially in the chapter on Mizoguchi and his relation to his American censors in postwar Japan, she does not always give a broad enough art-historical context. In the chapter on American in Paris, Dalle Vacche does not question the idea that Paris is the place to go if you want to paint. Although she does discuss Pollock in relation to the film, she does not state the obvious: that in 1951, New York was rapidly replacing Paris as the center of the art world, and Abstract Expressionism was edging out the School of Paris.

Other times I feel Dalle Vacche does not go far enough with her art-historical allusions. She brilliantly matches Tarkovsky's technique with Malevich's suprematist composition, both of which attempt to make visible the invisible, but neglects to mention that Malevich in the late 20s occupied an analogous position to Tarkovsky in the late 60s. Both were criticized for emphasizing spiritual, not materialist, values.

Her most focused chapters are the most successful, especially dealing with Murnau and German painting, and Rohmer and Neoclassical and Romantic painting. She offers her last chapter, which focuses on Cavalier's Thérèse, as a way to revive art history through film studies, "to teach art history about itself" (7). It is subtitled "Still Life and the Close-Up as Feminine Space," and Dalle Vacche finds that the obsessive close-up technique in Thérèse "invokes a return to the mother-infant bond, a blissful state of fusion between self and other that only a mystic can parallel by becoming one with God" (223). Cavalier's close-up technique, focus on still-life objects, and lack of architectural context create a feminine sphere—the convent—outside of history and architecture, and in that way the film privileges feminine experience and the expression of feminine desire. Cavalier's technique in Thérèse is analogous to the radical nature of still life painting. Dalle Vacche's argument about still life is indebted to art historian Norman Bryson, who finds in still life allusions to women's silent work, which has been excluded from history. The relation of women's work and men's action is paralleled by the comparative reputation of still life and history painting. Still life was traditionally rated far below history painting in the hierarchy of genres since it did not depict great ideas (ideas only thought and acted out by men). Dalle Vacche finds still life potentially more radical than the female nude, since it is not a projection of male fantasy but, more subversively, an alternative order that decenters the masculine subject and is thus a way of subverting the traditional emphasis on history painting and male action. By furthering the dialogue between art history and film in such ways, Dalle Vacche enlarges their perspectives, making a valuable contribution to each.
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