its tensions between subject and object, monochromaticity and color shifts, and temporal fluidity and fixity.

It is thus perhaps unsurprising that Brinkema’s book is itself so formally tasteful. Alternating chapters establish a rhythm between curated philosophical debates and close readings of specific films, expounding each of her formally revelatory analyses by way of aesthetic history. The book is organized such that Brinkema’s own virtuoso formal interpretations appear only after she elaborates a philosophical context. The effect is powerful, owing as much to the originality of her historical juxtapositions as to her formal command. The *Forms of the Affects* presents theoretical histories of tears, illumination, vomiting, shark attacks, and joy to motivate attentiveness to form as the rightful subject of aesthetics. Her chapters on the undialectical potentiality of cinema to express the “peculiar pain” of grief stand out as an especially stunning example of the masterful theoretical grounding of her radical formalism. From light and darkness as symbols of grief and melancholia in the work of St. Augustine and Sigmund Freud, Brinkema launches an argument that the inchoate “intensity” of grief is structured and can be formally located. She critiques contemporary memory studies for the convenient preservation of productivity inside of loss. This romance has been applied to transformative politics; in a bold corrective, Brinkema rejects the notion that “erasing the painfulness of pain [re-theorizes it]” (69).

(Despite this implied commitment to the authenticity or irreducibility of negativity, the book notably avoids portraying trauma as the privileged wellspring of thinking about affect.) The subsequent chapter capitalizes on the history of grief as a formal question of light in a subtle reading of Roland Barthes’s *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (1981) and a brilliant reassessment of Michael Haneke’s film *Funny Games* (1997), in which “reading grief as a matter of form, composition, and structure requires leaving behind narrative thematics and critical treatments that claim mourning for meaning” (99). Brinkema’s selection of works that have already attracted significant academic attention is part of the polemical wager of *The Forms of the Affects*, and one that casts the originality of her theoretical alternatives in high relief.

Preserving the multiplicity of affective potential offered by form and yet tethering her philosophy to a faith in legibility culminates in a distinctly Deleuzian quest for liberated signifying practices for film theory. Overall, Brinkema presents an overdeterminacy of icons that leaves form as the only true raw material of analysis, and yet also as the most powerful cause for symbolic recourse. Reading for form entails for Brinkema a radically disembodied theory of the “ecoaffect” (that is, formal affect: affect from without/outside), one that enlivens speculation about the interpenetrations of form and corporeality. While Brinkema’s “unzeitgemässe” (untimely) move away from the embodied spectator is bound to provoke generative disagreement, her first book restores affect as a theoretical site of limitless possibility rather than the term of interpretive foreclosure it has largely become. *The Forms of the Affects* is a tantalizingly ambitious contribution to affect theory that may even prove *sui generis* as affective film studies turns over a new leaf of close reading.
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