CHAPTER 3

Galleries of the Gaze: The Museum in Rossellini's Viaggio in Italia *and Hitchcock's* Vertigo

Farnese Marbles

Both Roberto Rossellini's *Viaggio in Italia* (*Journey to Italy*, 1954) and Alfred Hitchcock's *Vertigo* (1958) contain key scenes that are situated in museums. In Rossellini's film, an uptight English couple, Katherine and Alexander Joyce (Ingrid Bergman and George Sanders), travel to Naples in order to dispose of property inherited from their uncle. Their confrontation with an alien Mediterranean culture makes them realise that they have become strangers to one another. Their reactions drive them to the brink of a divorce and the film's loose plot is built on a number of excursions Katherine takes in the surrounding area. While Alex prefers having 'fun' in Capri over visiting museums ('museums bore me'), Katherine's first trip is to the National Archaeological Museum in Naples, which hosts extensive collections of Greek and Roman antiquities. These are situated in an impressive building, which originally had been erected as a cavalry barracks. In the 1770s

Figure 3.1 *Katherine (Ingrid Bergman) looking at statues in the Naples Archaeological Museum in* Viaggio in Italia *(Roberto Rossellini, 1954)*

and 1780s, the premises were transformed into a royal art gallery by the Bourbons, the Spanish rulers of Naples. On their return to the city after the fall of Napoleon, the Bourbons made it quite clear that the collection was theirs by naming it Museo Borbonico in 1816. In 1860, it became the Museo Nazionale.

During her visit, Katherine is accompanied by a museum guide who kills her with all sorts of obligatory pieces of information on the masterpieces of the collection such as the famous Farnese marbles that had been excavated in the Baths of Caracalla in Rome in the sixteenth century. The most renowned piece of this collection, no doubt, is the giant marble statue of a muscular *Farnese Hercules*, which is probably an enlarged third-century copy made by Glycon for the Baths of Caracalla of a bronze statue of the same hero produced by Lysippos or his school in the fourth century BC. One of the most famous and frequently copied statues of antiquity, it has been discussed by Addison, Bernini, Goethe, Hogarth, Montesquieu, Napoleon, Schiller and Winckelmann among many other of its illustrious admirers.[1] The famous statue depicts a weary Hercules leaning on his club, which has his lion-skin draped over it. He is performing one of the last of The Twelve Labours, which is suggested by the apples of the Hesperides he holds behind his back. The guide also brings Katherine to the famous and just as frequently reproduced *Farnese Bull*, a massive Roman copy of an equally giant Hellenistic sculpture attributed to the Rhodian artists Apollonius and Tauriskos of Tralles, which was described by Pliny the Elder.[2] Carved from just one whole block of marble, the grandiose pyramid of figures represents the myth of Dirce. She was tied to a wild bull by the sons of Antiope, Amphion and Zethus, who wanted to punish her for the ill-treatment inflicted on their mother, who was the first wife of Lykos, King of Thebes.

Also included in Katherine's guided tour are the busts of Roman emperors Caracalla, Nero and Tiberius as well as a statue of Venus and a series of famous bronze statues from the *Villa of the Papyri* at Herculaneum, such as a satyr, a group of dancers, a young athlete and a life-size drunken faun, which was especially admired in the eighteenth century.[3] By visiting the museum and admiring the classical sculptures, Katherine situates herself in a long tradition of the *Grand Tour* – the educational rite of passage undertaken by mainly upper-class British travellers, which flourished from the late seventeenth century until the 1840s, when the advent of large-scale rail transit made travel possible for the middle classes.[4] Especially since the start of the excavations at Herculaneum and Pompeii in the middle of the eighteenth century, Naples had become an obligatory stop on the Grand Tour.

For Rossellini, the entire film was almost a pretext for making this museum scene. In an interview, Ingrid Bergman stated that Rossellini

> was only looking for a story into which he could put Pompeii and the museums and Naples and all that Naples stands for, which he always was fascinated with. [. . .] He wanted to show all those grottoes with the relics and the bones and the museums and the laziness of all the statues.[5]

When the film eventually went into production, Rossellini started with the museum scene – the first two weeks of shooting consisted of Bergman 'staring at ancient statues in the Naples Museum while an equally ancient guide bumbled on about the glories of Greece and Rome'.[6] Several commentators have drawn attention to this scene. Peter Bondanella calls it 'one of the most important sequences in the film' because it made apparent the 'deficiencies' of Rossellini's work when compared with conventional film practices.[7] For actor George Sanders, for instance, the scene was simply boring because it did not exploit the emotional potential of a Hollywood star and it did not seem to fit into the larger, dramatic construction that a traditional script would entail. Other commentators, notably *Cahiers* critics Rohmer and Rivette, praised the film precisely because of its seemingly aleatory plot.[8] The museum scene emphasises these issues because it suggests a dramatic tension (it is the first scene that is accompanied by music and characterised by a highly mobile camera), which is immediately suppressed.

Portrait of Carlotta

In Hitchcock's *Vertigo*, retired police detective Scottie (James Stewart) follows Madeleine (Kim Novak) through the streets and surroundings of San Francisco. Madeleine appears to be haunted by the ghost of Carlotta Valdes, a local nineteenth-century beauty who danced and sang in a cabaret where she was found by a rich and powerful man. She bore him a child, after which he abandoned her, keeping the child to raise himself. As a result, she became insane and, eventually, she took her own life. While shadowing Madeleine, Scottie ends up at Carlotta's painted portrait, which is put on display in the galleries of the San Francisco Palace of the Legion of Honor. Opened as a museum in 1924, this building is a permanent reconstruction of the French pavilion at the 1915 Panama–Pacific International Exposition – in its turn a replica of the Palais de la Légion d'Honneur in Paris. According to Dan Auiler, the museum scene was shot on location in October 1957.[9] During the shooting, the museum was turned topsy-turvy as Hitchcock waited for the right light. The museum was not closed and people watched the moviemaking more than the paintings. A 'real' senior guard played the role of the guard who identifies the painting and hands Scottie the museum's catalogue.

Figure 3.2 *Charles-André Van Loo,* Architecture *(1753). Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco*

Figure 3.3 *Madeleine (Kim Novak) looking at the Portrait of Carlotta at the Palace of the Legion of Honor in* Vertigo *(Alfred Hitchcock, 1958)*

In the film, Scottie enters a room in which a remarkable mixture of paintings is on display. Some of them can easily be identified, such as a *Portrait of a Gentleman* (1710) by Nicolas de Laviglière and *Flowers before a Window* (1789) by Jan-Frans van Dael, paintings that still are exhibited in the very same room of the museum today. In particular, just for a moment, Scottie's attention is drawn to an allegorical representation of architecture painted in 1753 by Charles-André Van Loo. It shows three children presenting to the beholder a drawing of the façade of Madame de Pompadour's *Château de Bellevue* – a strikingly emblematic image in a film dealing entirely with the illusions of

appearances, staged realities and mistaken identities. The painting, which associates architecture with a kind of childlike innocence, appears at odds in a film in which people mysteriously fall from rooftops or church towers.

The nineteenth-century painted portrait of Carlotta Valdes dominates the opposite wall. When Scottie enters the room, he finds Madeleine sitting in front of it as is she is mesmerised by the painting. The life-size portrait shows a young woman with tightly pinned-up blonde hair with a chignon, which is clearly visible on the left side of her neck. Looking straight at the spectator with dark eyes, she wears an impressive light blue crinoline which is trimmed with gold-coloured brocade on top and a band of lace at knee level. She also wears a gold necklace, which holds an impressive ruby at her chest. She holds her hands together but they are obscured by a bouquet of flowers including pink roses, the colours of which are in perfect harmony with the rest of the painting. Standing on a portico of a Colonial mansion, a fluted column of which is clearly visible on the right, Carlotta's image is confronted with a landscape on the left, which consists of a water surface and a spectacular clouded sky at sunset – the lavender-coloured clouds, so typical for the Bay area, throw a gloss on the dress and the column. The painting unmistakably refers to the tradition of the English aristocratic portrait inspired by Gainsborough, which, in its turn, reaches back to Van Dyck's seventeenth-century portraits of Genoese noblemen. As in Gainsborough, Carlotta's portrait is painted with thin oil colour to achieve the shimmering effect of an eye-catching costume and includes an elaborate background setting for its subject. A note in the film's production files demanded that the portrait's frame should be 'matched to the frames already hanging', which were 'dull gold'.

The portrait of Carlotta Valdes was especially made for the film by modernist painter John Ferren, who had worked with Hitchcock on *The Trouble with Harry* (1955) and *Vertigo*'s dream sequence. On the audio commentary of the 1999 DVD release of the film, Ferren's authorship is confirmed by associate producer Herbert Coleman, who stated that 'this portrait caused us more trouble than any other prop in the whole picture.'[10] Anyhow, production files in the Margaret Herrick Library indicate that the filmmakers first commissioned Manlio Sarra, an Italian painter, to make a 'portrait of Pauline' (as Madeleine's character was originally called). Luigi Zaccardi, who worked at the Paramount office in Rome, spotted this artist whom he described as

> a well-known typical and real Italian artist. In keeping with the authentic tradition of his profession, he is also a poor man. He started out in his career as a copy artist and a restorer and that is the main reason why I got him to do

> the job. He is quite a creative artist too, however, and specialises in very picturesque paintings depicting scenes from the region of Italy where he comes from and which have always received good reviews from the critics.[11]

Zaccardi further noted that 'this copy job is more difficult than normal ones wherein a painting is used as a model, because in the case of the "Portrait of Pauline," Mr. Sarra has to paint the portrait from a transparency.'[12] Moreover, Coleman stipulated that the painting should look old (as if painted in 1854) and be done in the style of the 'Italian school', and that the background 'should be straight' and in 'a deep burgundy colour'.[13] Tellingly, the correspondence between Coleman and Zaccardi is accompanied by little cards mentioning the names of both European and American painters, which were probably used as references for the style of the portrait: Wilkie, Phillip, Winterhalter, Magnus, Kroger, Ingres, Corot, Courbet, Couture, Stieler, Imnan, Sully, Neagle, Elliott, Hicks, Harding and Healy.[14] Sarra's painting, which was shipped to Hollywood in February 1957, as well as another version executed in England were never used in the film because they were considered to be inadequate. Subsequently, another version was made by an unidentified Hollywood painter, who, according to Coleman 'was in his late sixties' and, almost echoing a film plot, 'fell in love with the model'.[15] However, this version was never used either because eventually actress Vera Miles became pregnant and was replaced by Kim Novak. The whereabouts of the final painting are unknown and it may no longer exist but the version with Vera Miles's features hangs in the office of film restorers Harris and Katz.

Mental Landscapes for *Flâneurs* and Tourists

Although made by two directors using an almost incompatible style in diverging production contexts, both museum scenes show striking similarities. Apart from the fact that Rossellini's film features Ingrid Bergman, who was Hitchcock's fetish actress in the previous decade, both films have in common a structure that is marked by long, contemplative car drives through an uncanny urban landscape. In both films, the city is largely constructed through the gaze of the protagonists. In Rossellini's film, Katherine Joyce is confronted with the city of Naples and its surroundings. On the one hand, the confrontation with this exotic environment enables her to realise that her previous Romantic and spiritualist preconceptions of Italy and classical antiquity were incorrect. It also makes her aware of her own situation, in particular of her unhappy marriage. On the other hand, she cannot fail to see the environment as something that resonates with her own thoughts and feelings. Several commentators have noted, for instance, that when confronted with

her own sterile and childless marriage, Katherine drives through the Naples streets populated by pregnant women or young mothers. According to Bazin, the urban surroundings in *Viaggio in Italia* evoke

> a Naples as 'filtered' through the consciousness of the heroine. If the landscape is bare and confined, it is because the consciousness of an ordinary bourgeoise itself suffers from great spiritual poverty. Nevertheless, the Naples of the film is not false. [. . .] It is rather a mental landscape at once as objective as a straight photograph and as subjective as pure personal consciousness.[16]

In *Vertigo*, too, the city of San Francisco is transformed into a mental landscape at once objective and subjective. Scottie wanders through the city, which is transformed into a dizzy maze. It turns out, however, that his itinerary through this landscape, which encompasses many of San Francisco's landmarks, is staged and constructed by others – in particular by his old friend Gavin Elster (Tom Helmore), who is hiring actress Judy to pose as Madeleine, his wife committing suicide.

Both *Vertigo* and *Viaggio in Italia* deal first and foremost with the perception and experience of surroundings – something which is perfectly visualised in the emphatic close-ups of the protagonists' faces while they are driving through the streets of San Francisco and Naples, respectively. Both melancholy protagonists move through uncanny cities. Hitchcock's dreamy San Francisco is presented as a labyrinth governed by the past and death, whereas Katherine Joyce, in *Viaggio in Italia*, sees Naples as a sediment of an alien, semi-pagan and semi-Catholic culture with an incomprehensible attitude vis-à-vis bodily existence and death. Accompanied by the slow rhythm of Bernard Herrmann's music (in *Vertigo*) or the humming sound of the car and muffled street sounds (in *Viaggio in Italia*), cars have become the viewing devices through which the characters perceive the city. Both directors unmistakably present the car drive as a form of cinematic self-reflection. Identifying the windscreen with the movie screen, these scenes illustrate the optic evaporation of the city by the cinematic act of driving. By privileging mobile perception and changing viewpoints, the urban experience is reduced to a visual spectacle. As a result, the cinematic representation of car driving can be interpreted as an intensification of *flânerie*, which has been identified with a scopophilic operation from the very first. The car, furthermore, enlarges the necessary distance between the *flâneur* and the urban environment. The *flâneur* has become a *chauffeur*.[17]

Not coincidentally, in both films, a car drive dissolves almost seamlessly into a scene situated in a museum, an institution specially built for the gaze. Obviously, both the Naples and San Francisco museums are presented as

tourist sites. In *Vertigo*, the museum is part of a collection of landmarks also comprising the Golden Gate Bridge, the Palace of Fine Arts, the redwood forest, the Mission Dolores and the Mission of San Juan Bauttista. In *Viaggio in Italia*, the museum is part of a travelogue that also includes the cave of the Sybil in Cumae, the Phlegraean Fields, the Church of the Fontanelle with its skulls and skeletons, and the excavations in Pompeii. In so doing, both films simply follow a conventional formula that was particularly popular in films of the 1950s that used a museum as a token to emphasise the exotic or adventurous character of a certain environment. In films such as *On the Town* (Kelly and Donen, 1949), *Three Coins in the Fountain* (Negulesco, 1954), *Born Yesterday* (Cukor, 1951) or *Funny Face* (Donen, 1957), main characters visit museums as part of a sightseeing tour including the monuments of New York, Rome, Washington DC or Paris, respectively. In such a cinematic narrative, museums contribute to the construction of a visually glorious but topographically nonsensical sequence.[18] As famous tourist attractions, museums are often part of establishing shots as well as montage sequences, which situate the story in a particular city. Museums therefore contribute to the construction of a cinematic space, answering to what John Urry has called the 'tourist gaze', which reduces the city to a series of postcard images.[19] This postcard-like succession of urban monuments and museums, which mimics the superficiality of the tourist visit, is precisely what modernist directors of the 1950s and 1960s have ridiculed or criticised. Godard, who prefigured the age of mass tourism and the appropriation of the world through industrially produced images in the famous postcard sequence in *Les Carabiniers* (1963), created the ultimate cinematic museum visit in his *Bande à part* (1964).[20] In this film, three protagonists kill some time by breaking the record, as a voice-over indicates, of tourist Jimmy Johnson from San Francisco who visited the entire Louvre in nine minutes and forty-five seconds. The scene opens with a panning shot of the museum's exterior followed by shots showing the trio running through the museum rooms – the entire sequence was reshot and intercut with images from Godard's original version in Bertolucci's *The Dreamers* (2003).

Sinister Visitors

Famous tourist attractions, the museums in *Viaggio in Italia* and *Vertigo* also resonate with other conventional associations that cinema connects to art galleries.[21] In feature films, museums are not visited by art lovers but seem rather to be favourite places of other categories of sinister characters. First of all, cinema seems to endorse Bourdieu's critique of the modern art gallery as an instrument of social distinction.[22] Since art and museums seem to be

created as means of social prestige in the first place, cinema loves to present museums as perfect places to strike a sophisticated pose. In films such as *On the Town* (Kelly and Donen, 1949), *Born to Be Bad* (Ray, 1950), *The Dark Corner* (Hathaway, 1946), *Three Coins in the Fountain* (Negulesco, 1954), *Play It Again, Sam* (Allen, 1972), *Manhattan* (Allen, 1979) or *LA Story* (Jackson, 1991) among others, the museum is frequented by unworldly, snotty, neurotic or decadent dandies who turn it into a stage for artificial poses and idle talk. Both temples of high culture and posh party venues, museums consequently are also perfect victims of mayhem and blasphemy. Particularly popular comedies such as *The Return of the Pink Panther* (Edwards, 1975), *LA Story* (Jackson, 1991) or *Bean* (Smith, 1997) have their main characters wreaking havoc on the exhibits in art galleries.

In addition, treasure chambers stuffed with strange and precious objects, cinematic museums are not only favourite attractions for tourists, snobs, dandies and iconoclasts but also for thieves. Sceptical of the ethical and edifying ambitions of museums, philosopher Nelson Goodman once stated that 'the only moral effect a museum has on [him] is a temptation to rob the place.'[23] In films, too, museums represent big money and one of their main functions is to serve as targets for burglary. Pearls (*The Pearl of Death*, Neil, 1944), diamonds (*The Hot Rock*, Yates, 1972), Amazon figurines (*L'Homme de Rio*, de Broca, 1964), Rembrandt portraits (*Stealing Rembrandt*, Johansen, 2003) and El Greco triptychs (*L'Incorrigible*, de Broca, 1975) have been stolen from cinematic museums. The sensational 1911 theft of the *Mona Lisa* from the Louvre immediately unleashed a swarm of comic silent films such as *Gribouille a volé la Joconde* (Capellani, 1911) and it also inspired filmmakers later to produce *Der Raub der Mona Lisa* (von Bolvary, 1931) and *On a volé la Joconde* (Deville, 1966). Self-evidently, in films, museum robberies are invariably spectacular, such as in Dassin's classic caper movie *Topkapi* (1964) or McTiernan's remake of *The Thomas Crown Affair* (1999). In particular, the motif of intruding museums as thieves in the night proved a very powerful cinematic formula that transcends the genre of caper films. Sneaking into the strange territory of uncannily empty, silent and unlit museum rooms can be found in a wide variety of films ranging from a French *auteur* film such as *Les Amants du Pont-Neuf* (Carax, 1991), a Hollywood blockbuster such as *The Da Vinci Code* (Howard, 2006), a poetic documentary such as *La Ville Louvre* (Philibert, 1990) and an arthouse experiment such as Sokurov's *Elegy of a Voyage* (2002). In all these titles, the filmmakers were clearly fascinated by the play of flashlights in nocturnal museum spaces – a phenomenon that unmistakably evokes the nocturnal visits to museums and archaeological excavations so popular in the nineteenth century. Furthermore, the play of flashlights transforms the appearance of the masterpieces in the darkness.

Restless shadows create the illusion that some of the characters in the paintings come to life. As a result, the museum is presented as a strange and mysterious place filled with secrets and uncanny powers. Public institutions, museums are turned into sinister places of privacy and intimacy.

Given this perspective, museums become convenient hiding places for criminals on the run, spies and secret agents. Since they operate in secret, spies are attracted by the contemplative silence associated with museum spaces. However, in spy thrillers, the silence of museum galleries becomes strange, mysterious and sinister. In Hitchcock's *Torn Curtain* (1966), Paul Newman walks through the uncannily empty and silent rooms of the Alte Nationalgallerie in Berlin, the classicist architecture of which is mirrored by the sculptures on display. The museum functions as a labyrinth in which Newman tries to get rid of his invisible pursuer. The menacing silence in the museum is emphasised by the sound of Newman's and his pursuer's echoing footsteps. A similar uncanny silence in a context of political intrigues characterises the sequence in Francesco Rosi's *Cadaveri eccellenti* (1976), set in the Archaeological Museum in Naples, which is also the locale of the museum scene in Rossellini's *Viaggio in Italia* – some statues even feature in both films. In this climactic scene, we follow a police inspector (Lino Ventura) during his long walk through the museum's classical sculpture collection. We see him walking past busts and heads of ancient emperors, rhetoricians and statesmen – an appropriate focus since the film's narrative presents the museum as a place where the future of the corrupt state is at stake. The museum, after all, is the place where the protagonist meets a politician who has information on the mafia connections of some of his opponents. Both characters, however, are shot by an off-screen sniper. Both in *Torn Curtain* and *Cadaveri eccellenti*, the silence and emptiness of the galleries turn the museum – one of the public spaces of urban modernity – into a site of paranoia. A realm designed for the cultivation of sophisticated sensory perceptions, the museum becomes an environment of excessive anxiety. Temples of visual culture and training areas for the look, museums become suffocating labyrinths where characters are chased by invisible adversaries and unrevealed pursuers. Just as for thieves, criminals on the run and illegal intruders, for spies, too, the museum turns out to be a place of a fatal encounter.

Museum as Mausoleum

This is perfectly in line with another recurring cliché in cinematic museums – the museum as a place of death. In films, museums are often produced as treasure chambers dominated by spiritual and atavist powers. In the *Indiana Jones* series, for instance, museums are dark and musty houses of mystery,

full of strange and exotic objects. According to Andrea Witcomb, 'this association suggests that despite their role within hegemonic discourses, museums are also associated with danger, the irrational, the uncontrollable.'[24] Consequently, museums are often presented as places of witchcraft. Accommodating magical artefacts, museums become realms of occult reincarnations – an item crucial to the numerous horror films featuring waxworks and mummies, which foster the popular association of museums with death. Archaeological museums, after all, display artefacts of extinct cultures, which are represented by objects that relate to complex death rituals and life in the hereafter: tombs, mummies, death masks, funeral monuments, sarcophagi, sacrificial objects, and so on. Furthermore, in the popular imagination, museums themselves are like tombs characterised by a sepulchral silence and solemnity. Films, consequently, present museums as fatal places or as environments where characters are confined in a mysterious past. In films, museums become tombs. Popular culture and films illustrate philosopher Theodor W. Adorno's famous statement that 'museum and mausoleum are connected by more than phonetic association.' 'Museums', Adorno wrote, 'are like the family sepulchres of works of art.'[25]

The association between the museum and death is further encouraged by the fact that museums present themselves as sites where connections with the past and with death are established. Products of modernity and the Enlightenment, and even important tools in the formation of the bourgeois public sphere, museums are buildings where the past is confined.[26] Museums not only contain objects and images of the dead but are also monuments to entire nations and their histories. Storing national treasures and embodying collective memories, museums encompass entire histories. According to Louvre curator Germain Bazin, an art museum is 'a temple where Time seems suspended'.[27] Furthermore, it has been repeatedly stated that museums freeze, suffocate, sterilise or bury artworks. Both a building type and an institution of modernity (a kind of stone equivalent of the *Encyclopédie*, as it were), the museum petrifies or kills art. Although, from the very first, museums were criticised for tearing art apart from its so-called natural surroundings, the museum only originated when art's original context (that of the church and the palace) was destroyed by the process of modernisation. Of the Louvre, Paul Valéry famously said that 'neither a hedonistic nor a rationalistic civilization could have constructed a house of such disparities. Dead visions are entombed here.'[28] Rossellini called Beaubourg, to which he dedicated his last film in 1977, 'the tomb of a civilization . . . Everything is useful in Saint Peter's, whereas here at Beaubourg everything is useless.'[29] Given this perspective, all museum scenes in film relate to the mummy films since in a museum, everything gets mummified.

The funerary associations of the museum are enhanced by its architectural typology. National or civic monuments that commemorate and conserve the past, museum buildings are destined to last for eternity. In that sense, traditional museum buildings express eternity and grandeur, and both directors and film characters are simply fascinated by their spectacular aspects. Monumentality and enduring grandeur are values that were attached to the very first museum buildings. Its classical building type goes back to late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century designs by architects such as Durand, Von Klenze, Schinkel and Soane, and it remained the dominant model for a long time. It is characterised by long rows of rooms, the presence of overhead light and elements borrowed from classical temple architecture, such as a colonnade, a monumental staircase and a rotunda topped by a dome.[30] These elements refer to the presupposed sacral origins of art; they isolate the museum and its treasures from everyday life and they turn the museum visit into a ritual experience. This dimension is enhanced by the architectural references to sacral and sepulchral architecture, which are emphatically visualised in films with museums as locations. In popular culture, however, this association remained intact when classical forms were exchanged for the modernist 'white cube', which combines the solemn character and sacral silence of the Greek temple with the smooth floors, white walls and big glass surfaces of the clinic.[31] Popular culture embraces the clinical and sterile image of the museum as much as that of the museum as a tomb. Strikingly, in *Manhunter* (Michael Mann, 1986), Richard Meier's High Museum of Art in Atlanta stands for the mental ward, in which serial killer Hannibal Lecter is placed under restraint. Because of Lecter's haunting presence (or is it because of Meier's dazzling white architecture?), the detective visiting the killer feels anxious and he runs off the many ramps that turned the building into one of the paradigmatic museums of the postmodern 1980s – an era in which museums are no longer presented as temples to contemplate art but also as tourist destinations where visitors can stroll, talk, drink, eat and shop as well. An era, in short, in which frenetic attempts are made to deny that the museum is a place of death.[32]

These associations between museum and death play an important part in films featuring art galleries. This is particularly the case in Hitchcock's museum sequences.[33] In *Blackmail* (1929), Hitchcock chose the British Museum, a prominent example of the first generation of museum buildings built by Smirke between 1823 and 1847, as one of the first employments of his typical climax at a famous or bizarre location that is entertaining itself. Because the museum did not allow a full cast and crew to occupy its premises, the famous backdrops were photographed first with half-hour exposures and made into backlighted transparencies. The actors were integrated into the museum interior by means of the famous Schüfftan process. Unmistakably,

Figure 3.4 *Scottie (James Stewart) entering the Palace of the Legion of Honor in San Francisco in* Vertigo *(Alfred Hitchcock, 1958)*

Hitchcock played on the associations between museums and death since the blackmailer tries to evade the police by sneaking into the rooms with ancient Egyptian statues, products of an extinct culture fascinated by death, tombs and life in the hereafter. In a striking shot, the fugitive climbs a rope next to the huge stone face of an Egyptian colossus. Eventually, the museum also becomes literally a tomb since the man falls through the skylight of the museum's dome. In *Strangers on a Train* (1951), a museum is used as one of the monumental places where a murderer haunts the protagonist. The sinister character of Bruno Anthony turns up from behind the columns of the monumental rotunda of the National Gallery in Washington DC, which is constructed by means of rear projections. A messenger of fate, Giambologna's sculpture of *Mercurio* is visible above the heads of the protagonist and his girlfriend.

In *Vertigo*, finally, death is connected to the museum in various ways. First of all, the museum is part of a collection of landmarks associated with death or eternal life: the Golden Gate Bridge (which is the most popular place to commit suicide in the entire world), the redwood forest with its timeless trees, the Mission Dolores and its graveyard with the burial place of Carlotta, the uncanny McKittrick Hotel, the Palace of Fine Arts that looks like a Romantic ruin, and the Mission of San Juan Bauttista. Moreover, Scottie ends up in a museum that is even literally a memorial since the Palace of the Legion of Honor was conceived as a shrine for soldiers who fell in the First World War. Furthermore, the building forms the shrine for the portrait of Carlotta Valdes, a deceased woman, who is contemplated by Madeleine, a woman possessed by the dead, who, in her turn, keeps Scottie in her grasp. Given this perspective, Hitchcock tails an entire tradition of films made throughout the 1940s in which haunted painted portraits of the dead play a significant role.

The mysterious presence of an important absentee through a painting was a key motif, for instance, in prominent examples of film noir and also in some films directed by Hitchcock himself such as *Rebecca* (1940), *Suspicion* (1941) and *The Paradine Case* (1947).[34] In each case, cinematic elements such as framing, editing, lighting, camera positions and camera movements are used to bring into being the person portrayed. Haunting the characters, the deceased Carlotta seems to look back at the beholders. Apparently, when cinema deals with paintings, such as in museum scenes, it almost always shows instances of what Kris and Kurz have called 'effigy magic', that is, the primitive belief that a person's soul resides in their image or effigy.[35] The mesmerising effect of a painting and the idea that a portrayed person is looking back is a recurring trope in cinema, which certainly marks many scenes situated in museums. In line with this, filmmakers love to create a spatial and narrative continuum between the characters and the figures depicted in artworks: Madeleine seems to belong to the same distant realm as Carlotta in Hitchcock's *Vertigo* just as Ingrid Bergman's character finds her own body amidst the sensual nudes in Rossellini's *Viaggio in Italia*.

In *Viaggio in Italia*, too, the museum is a place of mortification. As in *Vertigo*, the Archaeological Museum is part of a collection of landmarks connected with death such as the Fontanelle cemetery with its huge pile of skulls, the ruin of the Temple of Apollo and Pompeii with its buried bodies. With its recurrent allusions to Joyce's short story *The Dead*, Rossellini's film has been described as a 'journey into the realm of the dead' or as 'a story of the living and the dead in which, as in Joyce's story, the dead are more alive than the living'.[36] According to Sandro Bernardi, 'it is death that Katherine continually encounters on her path, or rather the cohabitation of life and death, by which one germinates the other and vice versa.'[37] Rossellini himself stated that he wanted to show 'Naples, this strange atmosphere in which a very real, direct and profound feeling is fused with a sentiment of eternal life.'[38] In the museum scene, which is accompanied by the first appearance of Renzo Rossellini's eerie musical theme, the guide tells gruesome stories about Roman emperors killing their own family members, while the Farnese Bull features violence and death. Moreover, through Katherine's physical confrontation with the ancient sculptures, Rossellini demonstrates that statues, with their fixity and 'strange opacity making them seem at once so ghostly and so familiar', as Kenneth Gross reminds us in his *Dream of the Moving Statue*, turn out to be 'so well fitted to our mourning'.[39] Tellingly, Rossellini concentrates on Hellenistic sculpture, which aspired to create the illusion of frozen movement. Living movement is turned into stone. The sculptures convey movement in stillness. They are images of life in inanimate stone. The sensual and hedonistic nudes make Katherine aware of her own unhappy and

cold marriage, and Rossellini compares them to the excavated and fossilised bodies of Pompeii in a scene later in the film: the bronze statues of perfect bodies in the museum are echoed by the scene in which dirt is scraped from the hardened plaster in a hollow in the ground, which archaeologists have discovered in Pompeii. Bodies buried by lava had disintegrated, leaving behind a void, which archaeologists carefully filled with liquid plaster. When hardened, the mould is uncovered, revealing the imprint of the dead. In the penultimate scene of the film, slowly and gradually, a man and a woman are revealed while Katherine and Alex are watching. The great eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79 has instantly killed them and caught them while making love or at least wrapped tightly in each other's arms. Suddenly, the museum and other sites such as the catacombs come together in one startling image: 'the physicality and rawness of the ancient world, the ubiquity of death in life, and love, however inadequate and flawed, as the only possible solution'.[40] The medium of film adds yet another dimension. For Bazin, who considered the death mask as the origin of images made from direct imprint such as photography and film, even the elusive medium of film snatches bodily appearances from the flow of time.[41] In the museum scenes in both *Viaggio in Italia* and *Vertigo*, the confrontation between cinema on the one hand and sculpture and painting on the other invokes the interconnectedness between life and death. On the one hand, the museum is presented as a place where movement has come to a standstill and where life is fossilised. In the San Francisco Palace of the Legion of Honor, Madeleine is mesmerised and paralysed by Carlotta's portrait. In the Naples Archaeological Museum, most of the statues are poised in mid-gesture. It is as though, in the words of Laura Mulvey, 'the gaze of the Medusa, or some other malign magician, has turned living movement into stone.'[42] With his restlessly moving camera, Rossellini situates the immobile statues of the Naples museum in a long tradition of fantasies in which living beings are turned into stone whether through love, grief, terror or jealousy – including such figures as Niobe, Aglauros, Echo and Atlas.[43] On the other hand, both Rossellini and Hitchcock present the art gallery as spaces where inanimate matter comes to life, where paintings and sculptures are animated. It is as though Rossellini imagined that his mobile camera would be the magic means of bringing life to those blocks of stone and shapes of bronze, whereas Hitchcock uses camera movements to animate the portrait of Carlotta, who seems to looking back at Madeleine and Scottie. Facing a painted portrait or classical sculptures, both Hitchcock and Rossellini thus reconcile two opposing myths: the dream of the moving statue or living portrait resulting from the artist's (or filmmaker's) demiurgic power to create autonomous life in what seems inanimate matter on the one hand, and the metamorphosis of a living being into an immobile image on the other.

Figure 3.5 *The Farnese Hercules in the Naples Archaeological Museum in* Viaggio in Italia *(Roberto Rossellini, 1954)*

Figure 3.6 *Hendrik Goltzius,* Farnese Hercules *(ca 1591)*

Death and Desire

Finally, both museum scenes relate death to desire. As a result, the museums become sites of necrophilia. In *Vertigo*, Scottie falls in love with Madeleine who is mesmerised by the rather sterile portrait of the dead Carlotta. In the art gallery, Madeleine appears as lifeless as Carlotta. It is as if a statue is placed in front of the painted portrait. When, later in the film, Madeleine dies, Scottie compels Judy to transform herself, as if she were a statue, into the dead Madeleine. In *Viaggio in Italia*, Katherine's encounter with the statues is turned into a series of profound, almost physical confrontations with them. Katherine is almost literally dwarfed by the Farnese marbles – Rancière speaks of their 'shameless' gigantic proportions.[44] Rossellini emphasises this by the elevated camera positions in the passage dedicated to the Farnese Hercules – its rear view evoking the famous 1591 engraving by Hendrik Goltzius, which also includes two onlookers, giving scale to the statue.

Moreover, her desire is roused by the powerful rawness of the stone and bronze statuary and she is deeply moved by this encounter with the overtly physical, sexual presence of the past – in the 1780s, when it was sent to Naples, the Farnese Hercules was already notorious for disconcerting many ladies with his 'large brawny limbs'.[45] Katherine's tourist guide loves to dilate on the sensuality of the nudes. 'This is the Venus I like most, she is not as young as the others, she is more . . . mature. Don't you agree, lady?' Clearly, the museum guide's comments help to emphasise the contrast between classical civilisation's acceptance of the nude body and Katherine' puritanical sexual repression.[46] Tellingly, the guide starts his tour by referring to the so-called secret cabinet, the collection of erotic or sexually explicit finds from

Pompeii, which were locked away, from 1819 onwards, in separate galleries in the Naples Archaeological Museum. However, Rossellini links the classical nudes to the excavated bodies of Pompeii and they make Katherine aware of her own unhappy and cold marriage. In front of the statues, she discovers her true self, as it were, like several women travellers in the eighteenth century did before her. As Brian Dolan has demonstrated, for women of the eighteenth century, the Grand Tour offered opportunities denied to them at home: freedom from a narrowly defined femininity, the chance to develop and exercise their intelligence, an escape from an abusive marriage or, occasionally, a career as a travel writer or political correspondent.[47]

Circling the statues with his mobile camera, Rossellini animates them and he also expresses Katherine's physical attraction to them. In so doing, Rossellini joins a long tradition of humans falling in love with statues. In the eighteenth century, for instance, as Haskell and Penny have demonstrated by referring to some outlandish examples, Venus sculptures, such as the 'more mature' one mentioned by the museum guide in *Viaggio in Italia*, became the object of the most impassioned statue love.[48] The act of falling in love with statues, however, harks back to the Hellenistic era, in which Greek figure sculpture first began to embody a divine beauty by means of a heightened sensuousness and evocation of tactility. Hellenistic sculptures, such as the ones admired by Katherine in *Viaggio in Italia*, represent human bodies caught in the midst of a sudden motion and they seem to be animated by a surge of life that goes well beyond the stately traditions of earlier cult-statue sculpture. As George Hersey demonstrated in his fascinating book on the topic, the love of statues in the Hellenistic era also resulted in a rich tradition of ekphrastic writing, in which the description of a work of visual art often aimed at showing that the work is so masterful that it seems truly alive.[49] According to Philostratus the Younger, for instance, a statue of a god, when it is a masterpiece, is tactile. Blood flows beneath that marble, ivory or bronze skin. As a result, physical sensations seem to fill the work of art itself but also its creator or beholder. Moreover, Hellenistic writers even wrote stories involving the act of physical love with statues. Atheneaus of Naucratis, for instance, advised philosophers in love with unresponsive women to make love to statues whereas Pseudo-Lucian tells the story of a sperm-stain on the buttocks of Praxiteles's Knidian Aphrodite left by the unfortunate Makarios of Perinthos in a failed attempt at anal intercourse with the famous sculpture.

Repressed sexuality and cool eroticism seem to be recurrent elements in film scenes situated in museums. Clearly, many filmmakers have been attracted by the telling contrast between the burning passion of secret lovers and the solemn silence of museum spaces. Passion and desire are subtly hidden under the veneer of love of high culture. The restrained coolness

of the art gallery and the repressed desire needed to perceive the desire expressed in artworks give the mind opportunities to open up to extraordinary encounters. Films such as *The Kiss* (Feyder, 1929), *The Single Standard* (Robertson, 1929), *The Clock* (Minnelli, 1945), *Le Plaisir* (Ophuls, 1952), *Dressed to Kill* (De Palma, 1980), *All the Vermeers in New York* (Jost, 1990), *The Age of Innocence* (Scorsese, 1993) or *Far from Heaven* (Haynes, 2002) show us lovers meeting in a museum. Invariably, their encounter seems always to lead to a doomed romance.

Galleries of the Gaze

Unmistakably, both Rossellini and Hitchcock play on the associations of the museums as uncanny places of fatal encounters, mystery, introspection, death and doomed romance. However, the motif of the museum, an environment dedicated to the sophisticated look, enables these filmmakers to reflect on the nature of images and the medium of cinema as well. In completely different but comparable ways, both Rossellini and Hitchcock investigate the mechanisms of the look and the ways these can be evoked in cinema. The contemplation of artworks and the museum experience enable Rossellini, for instance, to investigate the cinematic representation of the act of looking by means of virtuoso camera movements. Much later, he would use comparably elaborate tracks and zooms in *Beaubourg* (1977). In this documentary on the then recently opened Paris museum, the camera never pauses or slows to contemplate an individual painting while floating through the galleries. In *Viaggio in Italia*, Rossellini uses the mobile camera to scrutinise specific sculptures and the reactions on Bergman's face. Often, camera movements start at an artwork and end up, without intercutting, at Bergman's subdued facial expressions, taking in both objective and subjective viewpoints in one single, sliding whole. In so doing, these obviously foregrounded camera movements are opposed to the previous point-of-view shots that have kept her visually, and thus psychologically, dissociated from what she is seeing and experiencing.[50] By employing a single long take, Bondanella notes, 'Rossellini forces the spectator into an active, rather than a passive, role because the audience must search in the photographic image of the art work for clues to the character's reaction.'[51] Moreover, Rossellini's mobile long takes situate statues and human beings in the same spatial continuum. Pedestals are abolished, flesh and bronze occupy the same space. Whereas, in the case of the Farnese marbles, the extremely mobile camera is necessary to film in proportion to the enormous sculptures, in the case of the bronze statues, Rossellini's crane and tracking shots create a bond between sculpture and beholder. Similarly, in his 1977 documentary on the Centre Pompidou, Rossellini reduces the

high-tech, late-modernist museum building to a human scale. In his exploration of the galleries, the restless camera follows someone, then pans back to discover someone else, very casually, exactly as another spectator would see things.[52]

The museum as a motif of cinematic self-reflection has also been used in *Vertigo*. The visit to the painting collection at the Palace of the Legion of Honor is a perfect illustration of Hitchcock's concept of a 'pure cinema' firmly based on point-of-view cutting. At first sight, Hitchcock complies with the traditional Hollywood editing logic of shot–reaction shot: we see a character that is looking, then what he or she sees, and, finally, the character's reactions. In *Vertigo*'s museum scene, however, this convention is followed very emphatically, *too* emphatically. The camera switches between the real and the realm of representation: between the bouquet on the museum bench and the identical flower piece in the painting, between Madeleine's curl of hair and the identical one in the painted portrait. This curl is one of the many spiral motifs in *Vertigo*, in which the characters wander through a labyrinthine city. However, the vertiginous feeling is first and foremost the result of the confrontation and contamination of a 'real' and a 'fictitious' world. On the one hand, Madeleine turns out to be just as much an artificial construction (created by Gavin Elster) as the painted portrait of Carlotta. On the other hand, Scottie, as a modern Pygmalion, transforms Judy into a kind of Madeleine who answers to his idealised image. In the sacral and doomed space of the museum, 'real' characters are as artificial and immobile as the characters in the paintings on the wall. Next to visiting old mission churches, a graveyard, and other dreamlike settings of the city (the McKittrick Hotel, the Palace of Fine Arts and the Golden Gate Bridge), the characters end up in the museum, which, in the words of Brigitte Peucker, is 'the cultural edifice in which the exchange between "real" body and image is finalized'.[53] This conflation between reality and representation is further complicated in the famous dream sequence, in which the flower piece is recreated through a filmic cartoon and in which the figure of Carlotta comes to life by means of an impersonation by an actress filmed in the precise pose and costume of the painting. In addition, another character (Midge, hoping to become the object of Scottie's desire), impersonates the painting. Hitchcock thus evokes the impact of the portrait on the beholder-in-the-film by all possible means. Scottie, after all, is mesmerised not only by Madeleine but also by the painting she is looking at.

What is more, this cinematic self-reflection is also achieved by the conscientious confrontation between the media of cinema and painting (in the case of *Vertigo*) or sculpture (in the case of *Viaggio in Italia*). In so doing, both museum scenes show striking similarities with the innovative

art documentaries made in that era, which have been discussed in Chapter 1. Just as in the art documentaries made by Emmer, Storck, Haesaerts and Resnais, both Rossellini and Hitchcock use a highly mobile camera, a remarkable editing technique and musical effects to explore as well as to animate the artworks on display. Although the artworks in their feature films play a part in the narrative or have symbolical meanings, the spectator's attention is also focused on plastic details. Like the filmmakers who created innovative art documentaries in the 1940s and 1950s, both Rossellini and Hitchcock investigate the boundaries of film by confronting it with other media and by juxtaposing movement versus stasis, narrative versus iconic images, and cinematic space versus pictorial surface. Given this perspective, the difference between Hitchcock's and Rossellini's museum scene is not only caused by their diverging styles or aesthetic preferences but also by the fact that Katherine is confronted with life-size sculptures while Scottie's attention is directed towards a painted portrait. Some commentators have emphasised the differences between the museum scene in *Viaggio in Italia* and the conventions of art documentaries. According to Bondanella, Rossellini even 'reverses the typical documentary techniques of museum photography' by 'focusing on Katherine's shocked reactions to the nude statues of the Farnese collection rather than upon the works of art themselves'.[54] By including the classical nudes and Katherine's facial expressions in a single shot, Rossellini's extremely mobile camera not only avoids the usual Hollywood shot–reaction shot, it also differs from 'the traditional, objective documentary of conventional art films'.[55] Nonetheless, as in contemporaneous art documentaries on sculpture such as Dreyer's *Thorvaldsen* (1949) or Alekan's *L'Enfer de Rodin* (1956), Rossellini uses mobile long takes that remind us of the fact that it is easier to justify filming three-dimensional works, such as sculpture or architecture, as movement of the viewer in space is necessary to see and experience them (as opposed to two-dimensional paintings). Like Dreyer and Alekan, Rossellini uses a highly mobile camera to animate the sculptures. According to Laura Mulvey, 'the camera brings the cinema's movement to the statues and attempts to revitalise their stillness, reaching a crescendo with the gigantic Farnese bull group. Here, movement stilled finds an even more complex relation with camera mobility.'[56] The encompassing theme of the film, the relation between the living and the dead, is thus translated into the relation between movement and stillness, and between cinema and sculpture.

Hitchcock, by contrast, only uses mobile long takes at the beginning of the museum scene when Scottie's gaze is fixed on Madeleine (who can be interpreted as a static though 'living sculpture') instead of on the painting. As soon as Stewart's character looks at the portrait, Hitchcock uses a hectic combination of aggressive dolly-ins that fragment the painting. As in

Resnais's art documentaries, the film sequence breaks a canvas down into a series of details, that is, a series of compositions in time. Moreover, as Resnais attempted to break up the two-dimensionality of the painting, Hitchcock's camera seems to sink into the space of the painting thereby confusing the space of observer and painting, of representation and reality. However, as Tom Gunning noted, 'the closer we get, the more the flatness of the painting, a barrier to our penetration, asserts itself.'[57] Madeleine in the hands of Elster and Judy in the hands of Scottie, by contrast, are sculptural constructions that can be compared to 'living sculptures' or waxworks or mummies, which may evoke other distant realities beyond death but which exist in the corporeal world in which Scottie finds himself. By juxtaposing the two- and three-dimensional, stasis and movement, life and death, and human flesh and paint or stone, both *Viaggio in Italia* and *Vertigo* evoke in their museum sequences the tensions that mark tableaux vivants.

Notes

1. Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, pp. 229–32.
2. See Smith, *Hellenestic Sculpture*, p. 208; and Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, pp. 165–7.
3. Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, p. 209.
4. See Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour*; and Black, *The British Abroad.*
5. Wood, 'Ingrid Bergman on Rossellini', p. 14.
6. Bergman and Burgess, *Ingrid Bergman*, p. 307.
7. Bondanella, *The Films of Roberto Rossellini*, p. 102.
8. Rivette, 'Lettre sur Rossellini'. See also the Rossellini interview by Maurice Schérer (Eric Rohmer) and François Truffaut, 'Entretien avec Roberto Rossellini'.
9. Auiler, *Vertigo*, p. 82.
10. Feature Commentary with Associate Producer Herbert Coleman and Restoration Team Robert A. Harris and James Katz on the 1999 Universal DVD release of *Vertigo*.
11. Letter (19 December 1956) from Luigi Zaccardi to Mr Russell Holman (Paramount New York), *Vertigo* Production File #11, Paramount Files, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles, CA.
12. Ibid.
13. Letter (4 December 1956) from Herbert Coleman to Luigi Zaccardi, *Vertigo* Production File #11, Paramount Files, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles, CA.
14. 'Folder 997: *Vertigo* (Production)', Alfred Hitchcock Collection, Margaret Herrick Library, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles, CA.

15. Herbert Coleman in the Audio Feature Commentary on the 1999 Universal DVD release of *Vertigo*.
16. Bazin, *What Is Cinema?*, vol. 2, p. 98.
17. See Jacobs, 'From *flâneur* to chauffeur'.
18. See Bass, 'Insiders and outsiders'.
19. Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, pp. 138–40.
20. See Baecque, 'Godard in the museum'.
21. The topic of museums in films has been addressed previously: see Louagie, 'It belongs in a museum'; Fisher, 'Museal tropes in popular film'; and Jacobs, 'Strange exhibitions'. See also Walter Grasskamp, 'Observing the observer'. Museum locations are frequently mentioned in Reeves, *The Worldwide Guide to Movie Locations*.
22. Bourdieu and Darbel, *The Love of Art*.
23. Goodman, 'The end of the museum?'.
24. Witcomb, *Re-Imagining the Museum*, p. 24.
25. Adorno, 'Valéry Proust Museum'.
26. See Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, pp. 25–33.
27. Bazin, *The Museum Age*, p. 7.
28. Adorno, 'Valéry Proust Museum', pp. 176–7.
29. Gallagher, *The Adventures of Roberto Rossellini*, p. 679.
30. See Searing, 'The development of a museum typology'; and Pevsner, *A History of Building Types*, pp. 111–38.
31. The notion of the gallery space as a 'white cube' refers to a famous text by Brian O'Doherty originally published in *Artforum* in 1976. See O'Doherty, *Inside the White Cube*.
32. See Davis, *The Museum Transformed*.
33. Jacobs, 'Sightseeing fright'.
34. See Felleman, *Art in the Cinematic Imagination*, pp. 25–55; Peucker, *Incorporating Images*, pp. 130–7; and Walker, *Hitchcock's Motifs*, pp. 319–34.
35. Kris and Otto, *Legend, Myth, and Magic*, pp. 73–9.
36. Bernardi, 'Rossellini's landscapes', pp. 58–9. See also Liandrat-Guigues, *Cinéma et sculpture*, pp. 33–40.
37. Bernardi, 'Rossellini's landscapes', p. 58.
38. Roberto Rossellini in an interview with Maurice Scherer and François Truffaut, originally published in *Cahiers du cinéma* 37 (July 1954) and included in Bergala, *Rossellini*, p. 68.
39. Gross, *The Dream of the Moving Statue*, pp. 36–7.
40. Brunette, *Roberto Rossellini*, p. 166.
41. Bazin, 'The ontology of the photographic image', in *What Is Cinema?*, vol. 1, pp. 9–16.
42. Mulvey, 'Vesuvian topographies', p. 104. See also Mulvey, *Death 24x a Second*, pp. 104–22.
43. See Gross, *The Dream of the Moving Statue*, p. 75.
44. Rancière, *Film Fables*, p. 138.

45. See Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, p. 230.
46. Bondanella, *The Films of Roberto Rossellini*, p. 104.
47. Dolan, *Ladies of the Grand Tour*.
48. See Haskell and Penny, *Taste and the Antique*, pp. 316–33.
49. George L. Hersey, *Falling in Love with Statues*, pp. 14–15, 93–6.
50. See Brunette, *Roberto Rossellini*, p. 163.
51. Bondanella, *The Films of Roberto Rossellini*, p. 104.
52. Brunette, *Roberto Rossellini*, p. 352.
53. Brigitte Peucker, 'The cut of representation', p. 150.
54. Bondanella, *Italian Cinema*, p. 106.
55. Bondanella, *The Films of Roberto Rossellini*, p. 103.
56. Mulvey, 'Vesuvian topographies', p. 104.
57. Gunning, 'In and out of the frame', p. 33.