

Surrealism Revisited:

Leonor Fini and Federico Fellini's *Satyricon*

LAURA ARESI
University of Firenze

1. *Premise*

A photograph once kept in Leonor Fini's family album captures Federico Fellini during a visit to the artist's Paris apartment.¹ Seated beside her, he leafs through a book; other photographs from the same occasion show that Fellini's wife, Giulietta Masina, was also present. The visit was filmed and later broadcast on the French television programme *L'invité du dimanche* on 30 November 1969,² at a moment when *Fellini Satyricon* was being screened in Italian cinemas following its 'première' at the Venice Film Festival that September.

The episode acquires particular significance when viewed alongside subsequent developments. In 1970, the Paris publishing house Ariane Lancel released a French edition of the *Satyricon*, illustrated by Fini with eleven colour and fourteen sepia lithographs.³ The friendship between Fellini and Fini, openly documented by French television, was sustained by shared artistic interests, among them their engagement with Petronius' text. In France, this connection left tangible traces; in Italy, by contrast, it went largely unnoticed, reflecting the disparity in visibility between the celebrated Federico Fellini and the almost unknown Leonor Fini.

¹ The image is currently accessible in the photo gallery on the artist's official website, accompanied by the caption "Federico Fellini et Leonor Fini, rue de La Vrillière, Paris, circa 1970": <https://www.leonor-fini.com/fr/bio/photographies/> © Richard Overstreet. Its presence in the family photo album can be inferred from the YouTube video *Pittrici del Novecento* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=llHzXHTVivw&t=151s>), at minute 2:05, a film shot when Leonor Fini's Paris apartment had not yet been dismantled, in May 2025 (cf. Fantasia 2025).

² Cf. Overstreet 2021b, 1588.

³ Petronius, *Le Satyricon*. Trad. François Nodot. Paris: Ariane Lancel, 1970.

Only in recent years has the painter begun to attract renewed attention, and her name has increasingly been brought into relation with the Surrealist movement, from which she nonetheless distances herself both through stylistic autonomy and through the unconventional way she addresses questions of gender. Fini's pictorial work, marked by visionary atmospheres, explores themes of femininity, eroticism, and disguise, often inverting traditional gender dynamics.⁴ Her female figures, endowed with virile features, are powerful and enigmatic, frequently witches or priestesses, warriors or shadowy queens, in sharp contrast to the passive, muse-like image of woman prevalent in male Surrealism. Such an early sensitivity to themes that have come to occupy a central place in contemporary socio-cultural debate may help to explain the recent flourishing of major exhibitions devoted to the artist. I myself first encountered her work at the exhibition *Io sono Leonor Fini*, held in the spring of 2025 at the Palazzo Reale in Milan, where I came across a copy of the *Satyricon* she had illustrated.⁵ That chance discovery provided the starting point for the present study.

The aim of this article is to examine the triangular relationship between Federico Fellini, Leonor Fini, and Petronius' *Satyricon*, by tracing the shared imaginative horizon that connects their respective engagements with the ancient text. The opening section offers a brief biographical sketch of Fini, while also establishing the background needed to identify her subtle yet significant presence in Fellini's film production up to *Fellini Satyricon*. I then turn to Fellini's own statements concerning his reinterpretation of Petronius, situating them within the broader sociocultural context in which the director of *La dolce vita* was preparing to release another film that promised to provoke comparable scandal. This context helps to account for Fellini's conspicuous silence regarding the painter, an artist with whom he shared, as I argue, a dreamlike vision of art akin to Surrealism. The final section returns to Fini and to her work on the *Satyricon*, showing how it enters into dialogue with Fellini's film, without yielding to a linear model of influence.

⁴ On the relationship between Fini and feminism, cf. Watz 2025.

⁵ Cf. <https://www.palazzorealemilano.it/-/io-sono-leonor-fini>; *Io sono Leonor Fini: intervista al curatore Carlos Martín* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ehEeWnSXXW4>). The exhibition catalogue is published in Arcq – Martín 2025. Unfortunately, the *Satyricon* lithographs are not included.

2. *Leonor Fini and Federico Fellini: a long and hidden story*

2.1. *Leonor Fini and the Italian cultural scene*

Leonor Fini was born in Buenos Aires to Italian parents in 1907 and returned to Italy a few years later with her mother, settling Trieste.⁶ From an early age she was embedded in a cultural ‘milieu’ that included figures such as Gillo Dorfles, Italo Svevo, Umberto Saba. After a brief stay in Milan, she moved to Paris in the 1930s, where she soon gained access to the circle of leading artists of the time, including Giorgio De Chirico, Salvador Dalí, and Pablo Picasso. After the outbreak of the war, Fini formed a relationship with the Italian consul Stanislao Lepri and followed him to Rome, where she remained until 1946, forging close friendships with Anna Magnani, Elsa Morante, Alberto Moravia,⁷ and others.⁸ It may have been during this period that she first met Federico Fellini, who in 1945 worked as a screenwriter for *Roma città aperta*,⁹ a film in which Magnani played the leading role.¹⁰

The Roman public, however, proved largely unreceptive to Fini’s work,¹¹ and she eventually returned to Paris, where she reached full artistic maturity, not only as a painter and portraitist, but also as a highly sought-after designer of sets and costumes for theatre and ballet. A familiar presence in the social life of the period, Fini, an inveterate lover of disguise, became known for her spectacular appearances in costume, which regularly featured in the society pages¹². Fini never again took up permanent residence in Italy; nonetheless, she spent long periods at Tor San Lorenzo, near Anzio. The site became a gathering place for intellectuals and

⁶ The artist’s adventurous life has been the subject of numerous biographical reconstructions. Some of the most recent and authoritative ones are provided by Overstreet 2021a, Webb 2021, Renzetti 2025. Fini herself also offered an illuminating autobiographical account, now available in Fini 2021 (in English) and Fini 2025 (in Italian).

⁷ Cf. Webb 2021, 544–545, on Fini’s meeting with Moravia, Morante, and Anna Magnani in Rome in 1944, and on her costume designs for Mérimée’s *Carmen*, in which Magnani appeared.

⁸ Cf. Forlenza 1993, 68 e Natalini 19–20, on a villa in Via Po frequented in the immediate post-war years by politicians and writers, including Trilussa, Moravia, Fini, Masino, and Flaiano; the latter later collaborated with Fellini on *8½*. In 1945, the first book devoted to Fini was published in Rome (Moravia *et al.* 1945), with contributions by Moravia, Praz, Ford, Jaloux, Hugnet, Éluard, and Savinio (cf. Vacca 2015, 80).

⁹ Natalini 2015, 19.

¹⁰ Fellini himself recounts his work with the actress in Fellini 1980, 60. Cf. also Overstreet 2021a, 77: Leonor was invited to watch the shooting of a scene of the film.

¹¹ On this, and on the broader issue of Fini’s reception in Italy, cf. Strukelj 2009.

¹² The most celebrated of these took place at the ball held at Palazzo Labia in Venice in 1951, where she appeared dressed as a black angel. Cf. Fini’s own recollection in Fini 2021, 49 (= Fini 2025, 111).

friends, but also a space of freedom and transgression, marked by intertwined polymorous relationships. In the early 1950s, Fini met the literary critic Konstanty Jelenski, who joined her and Lepri in what was then a scandalous ‘ménage à trois’.

Tor San Lorenzo itself served as the setting for a 1952 newsreel produced by *La Settimana Incom*, tellingly entitled *La torre del surreale*, now accessible online through the Istituto Luce.¹³ In the version that was broadcast, the original footage was edited so as to construct a grotesque caricature of Fini. The national press, for its part, had long seized every opportunity to disparage the painter, ignoring her stature as an artist and ridiculing her unconventional way of life. In a letter to Elsa Morante dated 16 July 1954, Fini complained about an interview by Marcello Venturoli, published in *Il Mondo* on 13 July 1954, in which, she claimed, everything was “false and distorted”¹⁴. She went on to declare that she no longer wished to return to Italy, “such a cowardly and filthy country”;¹⁵ in another letter, written a few weeks later on 7 August 1954, she lamented that none of her intellectual friends “would write an honest and friendly text” about her, since she was “a scandal”. Although Morante promised to write an article “for the most important newspaper in Italy” that would do justice to her friend’s artistic stature,¹⁶ the article never materialized. In a letter dated 20 March 1956, Lepri reproached Morante for having devoted her efforts to praising Guttuso while failing to honour her promise to speak publicly on behalf of Fini’s rehabilitation in Italy.¹⁷ The artist’s disappointment, which gradually estranged her from Morante, is symptomatic of her definitive farewell to Italy. Forgotten in her homeland, Fini continued to receive recognition and acclaim almost exclusively abroad, while still maintaining close ties with many of the most prominent figures of the Italian cultural scene.

Fellini, as the photographs discussed at the outset suggest, was among them, and never abandoned the habit of visiting the old friend. Fini herself attests to this in a letter to Felicita Frai, dated 4 September 1984: praising Giovanni Grazzini’s *Intervista sul cinema*, a long interview to Fellini in which he was invited to retrace his entire career,¹⁸ she announces a possible visit from him:

¹³ <https://patrimonio.archivioluca.com/luce-web/detail/IL5000023198/2/torre-san-lorenzo-nei-pressi-anzio-nel-laboratorio-della-pittrice-leonor-fini.html&jsonVal=>.

¹⁴ Morante 2012, 206.

¹⁵ Morante 2012, 206.

¹⁶ Morante 2012, 218.

¹⁷ Morante 2012, 227.

¹⁸ Grazzini 2004². Among the many names that emerge in the conversation, Leonor Fini is never mentioned. Fini’s absence, moreover, is not confined to the director’s own statements, but extends to works reconstructing the pictorial influences on Fellini’s cinema. The only study in which I have found her name included among the artists from whom Fellini drew eclectically is Zaggaro 2020, 286: “Among his pictorial references, in addition to his friend Rinaldo Geleng, we can include Pablo Picasso, Giorgio De Chirico, Balbus, Scipione, and Mario Sironi. Creative affinity, inclined as he was to the visionary,

*Forse, dico forse, perché con la gente del cinema tutto è vago e mutevole, vedrò Fellini a Parigi verso il 17-18 sett, me l'ha proposto lui, vedremo. ài letto il suo libro (intervista con Grazzini)? È da benedirlo, l'ho letto in francese, è piuttosto mal tradotto, ma lo stesso fa piacere.*¹⁹

Perhaps, though I stress perhaps, because with cinema people everything is vague and changeable, I shall see Fellini in Paris around 17–18 September; he himself suggested it, so we shall see. Have you read his book (the interview with Grazzini)? It is something to be blessed. I read it in French; it is rather poorly translated, but still a pleasure.

As the years passed and the indignation of youth subsided, Fini seems to have accepted her relegation to the private sphere of Italy's great cultural figures. She died in Paris in 1996, a few years after Fellini, who in 1993 was still writing to her, addressing her as “*Maestra, amicissima, allegria*” (“Master, dearest friend, joy”).²⁰ In sum, all the available evidence suggests that the relationship between Fellini and Fini was not a fleeting episode but a lasting friendship, one that found expression in an artistic cooperation whose surviving traces I now set out to re-trace.

2.2. *Leonor Fini in Federico Fellini's films*

Several scholars²¹ have noted that the screenplay of *La dolce vita* (1960) originally included an encounter between the protagonist, Marcello, and a mature woman named Dolores. According to Mario Longardi, Fellini told him that the role was “vaguely inspired by the painter Leonor Fini” and that he imagined “a mature writer shut away in a tower at Tor San Lorenzo, near Ostia”.²² The scene was ultimately cut because of difficulties with the actress cast in the role, Luise

surrealist, and metaphysical, also bound him to De Chirico, Alberto Savinio, Paul Delvaux, Ren. Magritte, Salvador Dalì, Marc Chagall, Carlo Carr., Giorgio Morandi, Filippo De Pisis, Fabrizio Clerici, Leonor Fini, Jean-Michel Folon, and Carlo Guarienti”.

¹⁹ Vacca 2015, 67 e 352.

²⁰ Premuda 2015.

²¹ The earliest and most detailed testimony is provided by Kezich 1960; cf. also Longardi 2003 and Natalini 2015.

²² Longardi 2003, 21. Natalini 2015 suggests that Fellini may have derived the idea for the setting from the *Settimana Incom* newsreel on Fini. There is, however, no need to treat this as the sole ‘source’. Fellini and Fini shared many friends, some of whom frequented her summer residence: Elsa Morante was also among the guests (Webb 2021, 548), as attested by a letter she wrote to Fini from Tor San Lorenzo in July 1952, enclosing a poem dedicated to her (Morante 2012, 199–200). It is therefore reasonable to assume that Fellini had first-hand information about Fini's residence in Lazio.

Rainer. It is worth recalling, however, that the passage had been written by Pier Paolo Pasolini, whose relationship with Fellini soon became strained after he expressed rather unflattering opinions about the film, calling it “decadent” and “reactionary”.²³ It cannot be ruled out that Fellini’s decision to remove the scene, which might have jeopardised the film’s success, may have contributed to Pasolini’s harsh judgment.²⁴

The allusion to Fini, moreover, can hardly have been ‘vague’, since in the deleted scene, still extant in a collection of Pasolini’s writings,²⁵ Dolores describes herself as a painter and offers to paint a portrait of Marcello. In any case, with her disappearance from *La dolce vita*, Pasolini too vanishes: despite his contribution to the screenplay, his name does not appear in the film’s closing credits.²⁶ The same fate befell Fini: in 1963 she designed the costumes for a scene in *8½*, which I myself saw at the Palazzo Reale.²⁷ Yet her work, once again, went uncredited.²⁸

We thus reach 1968, the year filming began on *Fellini Satyricon*. It has been claimed that the director insisted on having Fini appear among the extras;²⁹ yet amid the crowd of anonymous actors who populate the film, no one has ever managed to identify her. Fabiana Giacomotti’s proposed identification—according to which Fini would be the woman dancing around the comic actor Fanfulla in one of the film’s opening scenes³⁰—has proved mistaken, however compelling at first glance. The resemblance is striking, but the woman in question is not Fini; she is Maria Mascarello, who worked as actress in the troupe of Vernacchio, alias Fan-

²³ Cf. Pascoletti 2013 for the difficulty of reconstructing the relationship between the two artists. On Pasolini’s harsh judgments of *La dolce vita*, cf. Pasolini 1999, 2276.

²⁴ In an interview cited in Premuda (2015), Natalini suggests that Fini may not have been informed of the Dolores sequence (a view also expressed in Natalini 2015, 219), or, conversely, that, having known about it and spoken of it too freely, she may have prompted Fellini to remove the scene.

²⁵ The original text is preserved at the Gabinetto Vieusseux in Florence; a transcription is provided in Vacca 2015, 356–361. Some of these writings had already been published in Pasolini 2001, 2303–2315.

²⁶ Cf. Pascoletti 2013, 113, n.11, who argues that it was Fellini himself who did not wish Pasolini to be credited in the film’s opening titles (I have not been able to identify the sources on which Pascoletti bases this claim).

²⁷ Cf. Arcq – Martín 2025, 242–245.

²⁸ Cf. Webb 2021, 553: the request to participate in the film as costume designer would have come from the director himself.

²⁹ Premuda 2015. Premuda further states that, on the occasion of the award of the San Giusto d’Oro by the municipality of Trieste in 1969 (on which see Webb 2021, 555), Fini, having returned to Trieste, insisted on attending a private screening of Fellini’s *Satyricon*. Unfortunately, I have not been able to verify this claim.

³⁰ <https://www.teatroallascala.org/it/media/la-scala-rivista-del-teatro/le-metamorfosi-di-leonor-fini.html>.

fulla. Liliana Betti, Fellini's assistant, provides a detailed account of the difficulties encountered in shooting the scene and explicitly records the extra's name.³¹ At present, therefore, the attempt to locate Fini in the film appears futile. The screenplay offers no help: as is well known, it underwent multiple revisions, and Fellini never followed it slavishly.³² In the absence of documentary evidence, one may plausibly hypothesize that Fellini decided on the spur of the moment both the part he wished Fini to play and the precise timing of her brief appearance. On this reading, the painter must have been so thoroughly disguised (perhaps even masked) that any chance of recognizing her was eliminated. Whether this effect of self-effacement was deliberate on Fini's part, however, cannot be established and remains an open question.

3. *Fragments of antiquity: Federico Fellini, Surrealism, and the Satyricon*

In the previous section, I traced the presence of a subtle play of allusions to Leonor Fini's figure running through Fellini's films of the 1960s.³³ I now turn to showing how this concealed presence within Fellini's production of those years goes hand in hand with the development of a sensibility closely akin to the one the painter was exploring in her own work. Beginning with *La dolce vita*, Fellini moves towards themes that align him with the dreamlike and fantastic world of the Surrealists, and away from the neo-realist narratives of post-war cinema. This tendency becomes an explicit programme in *Fellini Satyricon*, where Fellini declares his intention to dismantle the *continuum* of a logically sequential order of events, expanding instead the space given to pure images, understood as true domains of the unconscious.³⁴

³¹ Cf. Betti 1970, 33–36.

³² Cf. Bondanella 1988, 181–186, on Fellini's working method, which developed from sketches and drawings to a linear screenplay by trusted collaborators, later freely departed from in production in order to re-fragment the narrative and align it more closely with the dreamlike quality of Petronius' text that Fellini had in mind.

³³ The game likely extended even further, if we consider that some fragments from *Casanova* (1976), discarded as a "gift for initiates", were later given by the director to Fini (cf. Natalini 2015; Premuda 2015).

³⁴ The bibliography on this issue is vast and will be partially recalled in the following pages; no claim is made, however, to exhaustiveness. I therefore refer here to Perruccio 2024, the most recent contribution on the relationship between Petronius and Fellini, which emphasizes its reworking in a dreamlike and visual key. According to Perruccio, the dissolution of narrative continuity is further reinforced by the fact that Encolpius in the film loses his status as narrator of the story, through whose perspective the reader of the *Satyricon* originally accessed the narrated reality.

From this perspective, Petronius' *Satyricon* offered a fertile opportunity. What fascinated Fellini was the novel's fragmentary nature, which lets mysterious textual islands to emerge from the void of a plot no longer recoverable. Petronius' work thus became a perfect manifesto not only of the unknowability of antiquity—an idea Fellini reiterated in numerous interviews—but also of human reality itself: a realm whose essence can be apprehended only through “scattered fragments”,³⁵ isolated manifestations of feeling that rise from the magma of an unfathomable interiority.

If critics have devoted much effort to cataloguing the Petronian elements that Fellini alternately reproduced, altered, or omitted, while also identifying precise archaeological and documentary sources³⁶ that make the director's enterprise far less improvised than he himself claimed,³⁷ the aspect that brought Fellini closest to Petronius was his impulse not to close the text's fissures but to widen them: to dissolve narrative into a dust of autonomous scenes. Petronius offered the director the possibility of resolving the film into a gallery of paintings, as though the *Satyricon* as a whole contained the key to its interpretation within the episode of the picture gallery, which, not by chance, occupies a central place in Fellini's reworking.

This primacy of image over narrative did not escape Pasolini, who was angered by the immense commercial operation that had favoured *Fellini Satyricon* and crowned it the winner of the Venice Film Festival even before the event began.³⁸ In an article published in *Il Tempo* on 13 September 1969, and tellingly titled *Umiliare*,³⁹ Pasolini described Fellini's work as an immense trap, one into which even Moravia had fallen, having reviewed and discussed the film before it was dubbed.⁴⁰ Every film, Pasolini observed, must, by definition, express itself through the audio-visual medium; yet *Fellini Satyricon* had induced critics into

³⁵ Cf. Grazzini 2004², 136, when Fellini speaks of “*sparsi frammenti, brandelli riaffioranti di quello che poteva anche essere considerato un sogno, in gran parte rimosso e dimenticato*” (“scattered fragments, resurfacing shreds of what could itself be seen as a dream, for the most part repressed and forgotten”).

³⁶ Cf. e. g. Sullivan 1991, Brunet 2006, Slavazzi 2009, and Pesando 2010.

³⁷ Cf. e. g. Pace 2009b, who, in dialogue with Luca Canali, the Latinist consulted on the film set, argues for a precise and historically accurate reconstruction of the film's settings, despite Fellini's ‘misleading’ statements. Canali, however, makes clear that his role was limited to preventing gross errors, while Fellini sought above all to give form to the “phantoms” (*sic*) of his imagination.

³⁸ Pasolini's hostility may also be explained by the fact that he was competing at the Festival with *Porcile*. He referred to Fellini's film as the “winning horse” of a prize that did not, in fact, exist, since that year only the Silver Lion was awarded, and it went to Fellini (cf. Pascoletti 2013, 118).

³⁹ Now included in Pasolini 1992.

⁴⁰ Cf. Zanella 1969, 67–72, which partially reproduces Moravia's interview with Fellini, later published in the June issue of *Vogue*, shortly after the end of filming.

the error that a film could consist of image alone.⁴¹ For him, this constituted a betrayal of the genre to which the work belongs, and a deception of its spectators. It is well known that, during filming, the actors were not reciting a script but uttering random words, each in their own language.⁴² The only one irritated by this practice was the innkeeper Mario Romagnoli, who played Trimalchio and was allowed—an idea truly worthy of the character—to ‘perform’ the day’s menu from his own restaurant.⁴³ The soundtrack was added later:⁴⁴ the result is a film built upon a deliberate disjunction between lip movements and voice, between “words and things”.

After all, the film speaks through the bodies and faces of its characters. They often pause to look at the viewer, as if leaning out from the frame of a painting. “The Word made flesh”, a principle that plays such a central role in Petronius’ poetics, becomes, in Fellini, what we might call “flesh made word”. This is not to suggest that the representation of the body is realistic or true to life. Fellini, who vigorously opposed the aesthetics of Neorealism,⁴⁵ achieved the paradox of evoking the body rather than describing as it is or what it does in time and space. The more explicit the scenes of sex, pleasure, or physical pain, the more they seem to lose substance. By abandoning narrative continuity, the individual shots have no logical or causal sequence and do not cooperate in the creation of shared meaning. The acts in which bodies are momentarily seized and then abandoned become, as it were, ‘de-responsibilized’.

Fellini Satyricon is, in this sense, an ‘amoral’ film in the etymological sense of the term: it has no moral, and it would be absurd to look for one, just as it would be absurd to seek a unifying meaning that could link, into a coherent narrative, the paintings in the picture gallery through which Encolpius wanders, or the micro-episodes that jostle together in our dreams. From this perspective, the director skillfully exploited the potential offered by the fragmentary nature of Petronius’ *Satyricon*:⁴⁶ the dismantling of diegesis allowed for the dismantling of morality, transposing reality into a dreamlike dimension that makes Fellini, in this respect, an exponent of Surrealism before he ever drew on Freudian or Jungian psychoanalysis.⁴⁷

⁴¹ Pasolini 1992, 287.

⁴² Cf. Danese 2024, 48.

⁴³ Cf. Falaschi 2003, 136.

⁴⁴ Cf. Paul 2009, 212 and Perruccio 2024, 16, n. 34: “just eleven Italian actors dub all major and minor characters of the film”.

⁴⁵ Cf. Grazzini 2004², 86: Fellini explicitly distanced himself from Neorealism, which he described as a kind of “aesthetic of non-aesthetics”.

⁴⁶ On the fragmentation and refragmentation operated by Fellini, cf. Bondanella 1988 and Armstrong 2011.

⁴⁷ Cf. Reinhardt 2013, who, through a comparison of *La dolce vita* and *Fellini Satyricon*, shows that elements later attributed to psychoanalysis predate Fellini’s formal engagement

In this regard, the statement that Fellini made in 1968 to Dario Zanelli is revealing, when he explained the kind of operation he intended to carry out in the film, one that can be called a reconstruction of antiquity only in the sense that the reassembling of broken pieces lays bare the cracks of an amphora whose intact form would never hold the same fascination.⁴⁸

Le rovine di un tempio non sono forse più affascinanti del tempio stesso? Un'anfora ricomposta pazientemente pezzo per pezzo racchiude in sé significati e risonanze che non poteva certo avere allorché nacque: è una cosa passata attraverso il fiume del tempo, e perciò immersa in un'atmosfera metafisica che la rende più misteriosa, più ineffabile. I surrealisti, del resto, lo sanno bene: la corruzione, la lebbra del tempo rendono tutto più arcano, ambiguo, indecifrabile, e perciò pieno di magia.

Are not the ruins of a temple more fascinating than the temple itself? An amphora patiently reassembled, piece by piece, holds within it meanings and resonances it could never have possessed when it was first made. It is something that has passed through the river of time and is thus immersed in a metaphysical atmosphere that renders it more mysterious, more ineffable. The Surrealists, after all, know this well: decay, the leprosy of time, makes everything more arcane, ambiguous, indecipherable, and therefore full of enchantment.

Fellini explicitly refers to the Surrealists.⁴⁹ As Zanelli himself recounts,⁵⁰ the idea of adapting the *Satyricon* for the screen came to him after he discovered the complete text at the home of Fabrizio Clerici, another prominent Surrealist and a close friend of Leonor Fini, who had been commissioned to illustrate the work for the

with it, and that his primary debt was to contemporary figurative art. According to the statements Fellini makes in Grazzini 2004², 129, his reading of Jung, whom he began to explore during the years of 8½, provided a theoretical justification for the dreamlike element that characterizes his films, freeing him from what he had always believed to be his greatest limitation: namely, “of having no general ideas about anything”.

⁴⁸ Zanelli 1969, 21. These statements are consistent with those expressed by Fellini himself in the preface to Zanelli 1969 (Fellini 1969, 107), where he describes the film as “a fresco in a fantastic key” and as a series of “obscene adventures so total and grandiose as to become innocent”. Fellini reiterates this view in Grazzini 2004², 129, 135–138.

⁴⁹ An interesting testimony is provided by Falaschi 2003, 130–131: for *Mastorna*, the film Fellini was working on before *Satyricon*, and which would remain his quintessential ‘non-existent’ film, the director had sought the collaboration of Dino Buzzati, a writer close to Surrealism; Buzzati’s death, however, brought any further development of the project to a halt.

⁵⁰ Zanelli 1969, 17. On Fellini’s earlier readings of the *Satyricon*, cf. Zanelli 1969, 16–18; Fellini 1980, 100–101; Sütterlin 1996, 175–178; Stubbs 2006, 213; Copioli 2020, 139.

1963 Canesi edition.⁵¹ Clerici had been able to achieve something akin to what Fellini would later envision for his own film: “I want to make a suggestive and mysterious fable”, he declared in the same interview with Zanelli, “a film made of fixed, immobile tableaux; without tracking shots or other camera movements. A film to be contemplated entirely, like dreams, so that you remain as if hypnotized”.⁵² He was echoed by Bernardino Zapponi, the film’s screenwriter, who spoke of “a stunned, absorbed, metaphysical atmosphere, in the manner of De Chirico”, capable of rendering the embraces of Encolpius and Giton “free of scandal”: everything would become “innocent like a distant fresco, a fresco from Pompeii, which, whatever its subject, is never obscene”.⁵³

A common thread, in short, seems to link the mysterious metaphysic of Surrealist painting to the cracked frescoes of Pompeii and the characters of Petronius’ fragments. It is no coincidence, after all, that the film ends with images of the main actors frozen in the stillness of a fresco.⁵⁴ The element that binds all these artistic manifestations together is, as has already been suggested, the disappearance of narrative, and, consequently, of any moral concern. This aspect deserves closer attention before returning to Fini, for it seems to me essential to understanding what may be described as a ‘conspiracy of silence’—that is, a broader climate of reticence and indirectness, where explicit acknowledgment gives way to allusion and coded presence—, one in which Fellini himself took part, much to the detriment of the painter.

4. ‘The moral question’: Federico Fellini vs. Leonor Fini

The Fellini who set out to make *Satyricon* was the same director who, nearly a decade earlier, had been harshly attacked by Italy’s conservative establishment

⁵¹ Petronio Arbitro, *Satiricon. Introduzione e versione di G.A. Cibotto. Con 18 illustrazioni a colori, applicate su tavole fuori testo, e numerosi disegni a colori, nel testo, di Fabrizio Clerici*. Roma: Canesi 1963.

⁵² Zanelli 1969, 44: “Voglio fare un favolone suggestivo e misterioso [...] Un film di quadri fissi, immobili; senza carrellate, né altri movimenti di macchina. Un film tutto da contemplare, a simiglianza dei sogni: e tu ne resti come ipnotizzato”.

⁵³ Zanelli 1969, 42: “un clima stupefatto, assorto, metafisico, alla De Chirico [...]. Si potranno accettare [...] senza scandalo anche Encolpio e Gitone che si abbracciano. Perché tutto, allora, diventa innocente, un affresco lontano, un affresco di Pompei, che qualunque soggetto tratti non è osceno”.

⁵⁴ Nino Scordia, the painter appointed by Fellini as a “consultant for the frescoes”, was tasked with photographing archaeological material and then transposing it into wall paintings or pictorial works. In the case of the wall paintings, such as the opening and closing frescoes, this involved a creative enlargement of motifs observed at Pompeii (cf. Zanchetti 2009, 147–151).

after the release of *La dolce vita*. What had been condemned was his portrayal of a lost generation, one that seemed to have abandoned the traditional values of the past (*Patria, Famiglia, Chiesa*) and drifted into a life ruled by private and hedonistic impulses. As we have previously noted, only Pasolini discerned in this depiction the reactionary melancholy it concealed, while Moravia was the first to draw an analogy between that sense of decadent malaise and Petronius' *Satyricon*.⁵⁵

By 1968, amid political unrest and social upheaval, Fellini, though casting a sympathetic glance toward the hippie generation,⁵⁶ whom he often likened to the characters of the *Satyricon*, could scarcely afford to risk a second wave of moral outrage from the Catholic, provincial world he came from and still, in some measure, felt attached to.⁵⁷ Hence his insistence⁵⁸ on depicting a pre-Christian world, in which he could, as he provocatively put it, “forget to be a Christian”:⁵⁹

C'è fra noi e la realtà umana un filtro fatto di giudizi morali, di una morale che è cristiana, cattolica, e che naturalmente applichiamo alle immagini. Diciamo: quello è un invidioso, o un goloso, o un lussurioso, come se avessimo

⁵⁵ Cf. Reinhardt 2013, 74: on the release of *La dolce vita*, Moravia likened the society portrayed in the film to the “Alexandrian taste” of Petronius’ age, whose distinctive features he identified as “sexual promiscuity, latent mysticism, boredom, cruelty, sterility, a craving for unusual pleasures, cosmopolitanism, aestheticism, and irrationalism”.

⁵⁶ On this, cf. Armstrong 2011, 120. The casting of the leading actors was intended to make them appear “completely modern” (cf. Galletti 2009, 199–204). In Grazzini 2004², 137–138, recalling the film’s premiere at Madison Square Garden after a rock concert and before an audience partly drunk, partly asleep, partly engaged in lovemaking, Fellini notes an uninterrupted continuity between “that fantastic audience of the future” and ancient Rome as projected on the screen. Cf. also Paul 2009, 202; Perruccio 2024, 116–118.

⁵⁷ Cf. Cosulich 1969, 35, who argues that Fellini was not intimidated by comparison with Polidoro’s almost contemporaneous film adaptation of the *Satyricon*, but rather by the “two thousand years of sexophobic ethics imparted to us by Christianity”. Moreover, in Grazzini 2004², 142, Fellini states that he is not a revolutionary and that he needs the stability and recognition of established authorities to devote himself to art without disturbance.

⁵⁸ Cf. Betti 1970, 23, which clearly illustrates Fellini’s “protective anxiety” and “logomania” in explaining his cinematic project before shooting began, and underlines that it was an entirely unusual practice for the director, who typically did not begin filming with a fully articulated conception of the project.

⁵⁹ On Fellini’s relationship with Catholicism, see Grazzini 2004², 69–72, where the director calls the Catholic Church “the greatest creator of artists” and credits its grand apparatus—despite its distortions and taboos—with protecting “from the devouring magma of the unconscious” and “from the existential horror of the absence of meaning” (72). He further notes that the Church “has relentlessly fostered the artist’s sense of guilt toward work without immediate utility and toward a life outside any rule” (116).

*in testa un catalogo, una tipologia umana. Ebbene, io voglio dimenticare questo catalogo, dimenticarmi d'essere un cristiano, voglio rivivere il mondo d'allora con gli occhi d'allora.*⁶⁰

Between us and human reality there is a filter made up of moral judgments, of a morality that is Christian, Catholic, and that we naturally apply to images. We say: that one is envious, or gluttonous, or lustful, as if we had in our heads a catalogue, a typology of human types. Well then, I want to forget this catalogue, to forget that I am a Christian; I want to relive that world with the eyes of that world.

What emerges, then, is the image of a pagan world imagined as innocent precisely because it precedes the advent of Christ's message of salvation and the moral filter through which human reality would later be read.⁶¹

The homoerotic, bisexual, and polyamorous relationships that punctuate the film are thus untainted twice over: first, because they belong to a world that existed before the spread of Christianity, before the beginning of History (with a capital H);⁶² and second, because they are removed from historical time in the narrower sense, the time of narrative itself, essential to novels and films but not to painting, least of all Surrealist painting. This double shield proved entirely effective: upon the film's release, after months of debate in the mainstream press

⁶⁰ Zanella 1969, 27.

⁶¹ Despite the director's explicit statements, critics have long debated the extent to which Christian morality shaped Fellini's reinterpretation of Petronius. Canali, in the interview reported by Zanella 1969, 47–49, rejects the notion that the film is pre-Christian, describing it instead as “fundamentally existential and religious” because of its pervasive “sense of mystery and death” (48). Moravia adopts a similar stance, arguing in his *Vogue* interview (Zanella 1969, 70–71), to Fellini's evident irritation, that the director had assumed a perspective akin to that of Christians around the year 1000, for whom paganism appeared alien and obscure, and thus identifiable with sin; from this angle, the film becomes the transposition of “a hell without purgatory and without paradise, [...] of a nature at once vicious and innocent.” Segal 1971 likewise maintains that Christianity, though formally absent, weighs heavily on the film, depriving the *Satyricon* of its playfully pagan spirit. By contrast, Pace 2009b argues that the atmosphere of decay and death is already constitutive of Petronius' work and unrelated to Christian morality. Perruccio 2024 proposes a mediating position, acknowledging a form of religiosity and moralizing tension in the film while nonetheless identifying a deeper affinity between the two works, grounded in “a painful backdrop, an aura of premonition of death, an elegant ability to smile” (xvi). A different solution is advanced by Carrera 2019, 108–109, who detects in the film's final scene the emergence of a non-traditional paganism, dominated by an Orphic-Pythagorean strand.

⁶² Cf. Canali in Zanella 1969, 49: the homosexual relationships depicted in the film are, in imperial Rome, “a natural and therefore insignificant fact”, which, in Fellini's case, becomes “abstract”.

over its problematic ‘paganism’,⁶³ critics were perplexed⁶⁴ rather than scandalized, and the broader public no less so.

As in Fellini’s cinema, Fini’s works appear suspended in time, confronting the ontological mystery of an ephemeral existence, over which decay, corruption, and death always appear to hover:⁶⁵ a preoccupation shared, after all, by Trimalchio himself, both in Petronius and Fellini.⁶⁶ Yet Fini’s paintings—true to an artist who, in fact, never accepted being confined by a label such as “Surrealist”⁶⁷—stand as a revolutionary manifesto for an equally revolutionary conception of the human body, of gender identity, and of sexuality. As a woman, she lived out in reality, with two men, the very amorous triangle that Petronius had staged and that Fellini sought to purify, re-enacting it in her paintings, works that are never outside history but immersed in a time that is both fantastical and real.

In Fini’s ‘oeuvre’, the emblem of this fluidity is embodied by the countless androgynous sphinxes she loved to paint, many of which bore her own features. One may well wonder whether it is mere coincidence that the two episodes in *Fellini Satyricon* that find no correspondence in Petronius’ novel seem like the transposition of pictorial motifs dear to both Clerici and Fini: the episode of the Minotaur, against whom Encolpius-Theseus fights in a kind of amphitheatre reminiscent⁶⁸ of Clerici’s *Il Minotauro accusa pubblicamente sua madre* (1952), a painting that held special significance for Fini;⁶⁹ and that of the Hermaphrodite,

⁶³ Cf. De Berti 2009 for a comprehensive analysis of the press anticipation preceding the film’s release, which also focused on the issue of pagan morality. Particular attention should be drawn to the debate published in *L’Espresso* on 23 February 1969 (*L’erotismo dell’Italia 1970 e quello della Roma imperiale. Ma com’era il peccato pagano?*), reproduced in Zanella 1969, 57–64. Participants included, alongside Fellini, Santo Mazzarino (Professor of Roman History at the Sapienza University of Rome), Luca Canali (University of Pisa), the journalist Peter Nichols (*The Times*), and the writers Gabriele Baldini and Bernardino Zapponi.

⁶⁴ Cf. Falaschi 2003 and Reinhardt 2013, 74–78.

⁶⁵ On Leonor Fini’s interest in death and corpses, also attested by the visits she made as a young girl to the Trieste morgue, cf. Martín 2025.

⁶⁶ Cf. Lago 2002.

⁶⁷ Cf. the statements made by the painter herself in Fini 1994, 9–10, where she rejects labels such as “Surrealist” or “fantastic”, arguing that reality itself can be “strange and wonderful”.

⁶⁸ Carrera 2016, 83, and Gianotti 2020, 208 argue that the Minotaur scene is an homage to Picasso, who Fellini undoubtedly admired: in Fellini 1980 he recounts a dream in which he and Picasso go to the seaside (86), as well as his encounter with a striking essay by Jung on Picasso (90). Such an interpretation, however, does not exclude others; rather, it further reinforces the Minotaur’s status as a key figure within the imaginary of Surrealist painting.

⁶⁹ Cf. Overstreet 2021a, 90: it was beneath this painting by Clerici, at the Palazzo delle Esposizioni in Rome, that Fini had arranged the first meeting with her future lover Constantin Jelenski.

an androgynous being like the many that populate Fini's canvases, the sphinx first among them. The Hermaphrodite, too, in the film, is consulted as if an oracle, and responds in the same sibylline manner.

Whether it was meant as a conscious tribute or as the unconscious reworking of a shared imaginary, there is no doubt that Fini is present in *Fellini Satyricon*: not only in the flesh, masked, nor merely as a representative of Surrealism and its dreamlike, fantastic imagery, but above all as the living embodiment of a bold and nonconformist way of life—one that the director did not have the courage to bring fully to the screen except in a defused form, through veiled allusions and disguises that perhaps only a very small cultural 'élite' could appreciate.

5. *Leonor Fini's Satyricon*

Leonor Fini's *Satyricon*, published only a few months after *Fellini Satyricon*, makes explicit a dialogue that the film itself had largely kept implicit. Any attempt to establish a strict chronology, however, would be misleading. What matters is not whether Fini's plates were conceived before or after the film, but that they crystallize a shared visual and imaginative field, in which certain motifs, atmospheres, and formal choices resonate with striking consistency. This field had been taking shape for years within the circle of intellectuals and artists to which both Fellini and Fini belonged, where the *Satyricon* functioned as a constant point of reference and artistic 'temptation', as evidenced, for instance, by Clerici's *Satyricon* of the 1960s, already mentioned above. From this perspective, the most prudent conclusion is not one of a unidirectional, linear influence from Fellini to Fini (or the reverse), but rather of an osmosis of shared artistic interests and sensibilities.

This becomes particularly evident in the treatment of the idea of the fragment. In examining the lithographs that embellish the French edition,⁷⁰ one can discern the same spellbound stillness of a Pompeian fresco eroded by time, a visual horizon to which Fellini himself explicitly referred when discussing the film. The analogy with Pompeii⁷¹ is reinforced by the fact that several of Fini's lithographs

⁷⁰ For this aspect, the reader must rely solely on my descriptions, based on direct examination of the volume at the Palazzo Reale exhibition. Attempts to obtain reproduction rights for the *Satyricon* lithographs were unsuccessful; as noted above, they are not included in the exhibition catalogue. A forthcoming *Catalogue raisonné* of Leonor Fini's illustrated books is announced in Overstreet 2021b, 601, edited by Arlette Souhami with the assistance of Sophie Godard and Richard Overstreet, and is expected to include a page-by-page description of more than 120 illustrated books. No publication date has yet been announced.

⁷¹ Cf. Webb 2021, 555, where, in discussing the *Satyricon*, lithographs inspired by Pompeian frescoes are mentioned.

are presented as wall paintings, their cracks deliberately emphasized. Here one of the film's key motifs re-emerges: the fragmentary way in which antiquity reaches us.

This convergence, however, does not establish a relation of dependence in either direction. Fini herself stated that she had been fascinated by the frescoes of Pompeii since her youth, when she imitated their technique: for example, in the 1930s decorative panels she painted for a Roman cinema. The building, as Fini recalls,⁷² was later destroyed during the war, and only a few fragments of its frescoes survived, later sold by the cinema's owner. By a curious irony of fate, the modern work thus came to share with its ancient model not only a visual language, but also the vulnerability of its own material support.

It is often assumed that great artists produce enduring masterpieces, yet it is easy to forget that the supports on which art depends are perishable and short-lived. For both Fini and Fellini, the surviving remains of ancient art functioned as a constant *memento mori*, a reminder of the constitutive fragility of both human existence and artistic creation, each consumed by death, as our own bodies are. Seen in this light, it becomes meaningless to ask whether the link between Pompeii and Petronius' novel first occurred to Fini or to Fellini. What matters instead is Fini's apparent intention to foreground the continuity between her own work and that of the great director, as a way of reaffirming her presence within a cultural 'milieu' that had long tended to overlook and marginalize her.

This continuity does not exclude moments of clear chronological dependence. This intention is most evident in several of the portraits of characters depicted in Fini's lithographs, where a distinct 'family resemblance' emerges between her figures and the faces of Fellini's actors.⁷³ In the case of Trimalchio, for instance, the prominent nose and pronounced chin, together with the fullness of the neck and the thick, arched eyebrows, unmistakably recall the features of Mario Romagnoli. Analogies can also be traced in the figures of Encolpius and Giton: the former appears fair-haired and slender, with the same alert, penetrating blue eyes as Martin Potter (Encolpius); the latter, a boy of ethereal delicacy and pale complexion, evokes both the adolescent beauty of the young Max Born (Giton) and the whiteness of Pasquale Baldassarri, the albino hermaphrodite in the film.

The most explicit connection is found in the plate depicting the *Cena Trimalchionis*. Among the guests, reclining to eat with an air of boredom, a group of women with elegant hairstyles occupies the foreground, strikingly similar to those of Fortunata and Scintilla in the film. The roast pig also appears at the centre of

⁷² Fini 2021, 52 (= Fini 2025, 111–112).

⁷³ Cf. Overstreet 2021a, 97, who, commenting on Fini's interest in cinema, notes that she integrated memories of specific film scenes into her paintings, and observes that Fellini's *Satyricon* (along with *Casanova* and *E la nave va*) surfaces in several of her works.

the scene, in an episode central both to Petronius' *Cena* and to Fellini's reinterpretation, which reproduces its essential outlines without variation. In the lithograph, the interior background is rendered in a uniform, vivid red, a choice that unmistakably recalls Fellini's visual palette.⁷⁴

It is true that red serves as the background for many Pompeian wall paintings; there, however, it remains a background, against which human figures or other decorative motifs normally stand out. In *Fellini Satyricon*, by contrast, the red of Trimalchio's dining room walls dominates unchallenged, contributing to a nightmarish atmosphere far removed from any historical realism. The dark, saturated monochromy of the walls suggests that the guests themselves have become the figures of the fresco: they appear to relinquish their immobility and momentarily 'detach' themselves from the bidimensionality of painting, to which they nonetheless remain intrinsically bound.⁷⁵ It is precisely to this bidimensionality that Fini's work returns: her lithographs seem to draw the consequences of Fellini's visual intuition, as if laying bare the device itself. In Fellini's design, Trimalchio and his guests are not flesh-and-blood characters endowed with a narrative trajectory, but fresco figures briefly granted the illusion of speech and movement: an illusion that Fini deliberately suspends by restoring them to the flatness of the image.⁷⁶

A markedly different picture emerges when we consider the drawings that Fini produced not for the standalone lithographs of the French edition, but for those reproduced on the printed page alongside the text. Here the human figures are reduced to red outlines, left unfilled. Sometimes they appear alone or in pairs; more often, however, Fini depicts them in an almost inextricable tangle of bodies, embraces, or sexual scenes. Paradoxically, although even less substantial than the coloured lithographic figures, these empty silhouettes impart movement and dynamism to the narrative they accompany, from which they seem to 'spring'⁷⁷ with striking naturalness. Unburdened—unlike Fellini—by any anxiety over the moral legitimacy of Petronius' narrative, Fini is able to represent it without the slightest embarrassment, as a living and immediate reality that needs no distancing to be

⁷⁴ Cf. Bondanella 1988, 187, who, drawing on the work of Stephen Snyder, notes that the dominant chromatic tones of the film shift according to the central characters; red predominates in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.

⁷⁵ Cf. Bondanella 1988, 188: characters often emerge first as shadows and only subsequently as fully formed bodies, within frames conceived as flat, sharply delimited spaces reminiscent of ancient or Renaissance frescoes.

⁷⁶ Cf. Fini 2021, 56 (= Fini 2025, 114): "All this comes from a desire to freeze-frame the effects of what paint is doing when it's 'alive' and in motion: a frequent impetus in my painting. Alberto Savinio said that paint is 'a huge paralytic' and this strikes me as being true".

⁷⁷ Cf. Fini 2021, 56 (= Fini 2025, 114): "What are the subjects of my paintings all about? Sometimes they spring from a splotch of paint".

rendered harmless, because it is harmless in itself. This contrast becomes even more striking when we examine the preparatory drawings Fellini himself produced for the film, and which he requested be published alongside the shooting diary kept by Liliana Betti.⁷⁸ These drawings clearly reveal his origins as a cartoonist:⁷⁹ they are playful vignettes of various characters from the film, whose least conventional physical traits (dark circles, baldness, obesity) are exaggerated for a caricatured effect. In the case of female figures, they are for the most part sexualized miniatures, in which the body's curves are accentuated, and the breasts are often even anthropomorphized, complete with eyes, a nose, and a mouth. Here, too, we see Fellini's need to distance himself from Petronius' world: in the film, he does so by transposing it into the timeless dimension of dream; in the drawings, by defusing its force, reducing it to a mere grotesque deformation of reality. Nothing could be further from the serious, graceful sensuality of Fini's drawings.

For the painter, no rupture separates the Petronian world from her own. This continuity enables her to craft a narrative in images, achieving what Fellini, despite the formidable resources of cinema, had deliberately refused to do. With only a few exceptions, all her figures are nude. Fellini, by contrast, filled his *Satyricon* with masks and veils, at times even in the sex scenes, where bodies do not simply undress but emerge from layers of masks, draperies, and curtains. Fini—who, in life, revelled in disguise and theatrical artifice—strips her characters of even their clothing. She renders them as unmediated bodies,⁸⁰ animated by impulses that require no screen, no filter, to appear on the page.

Fellini allowed Fini to flicker through his films as an enigmatic presence that only a restricted circle of intimates could recognize. This was not merely a game for initiates: it conformed to a broader climate of social caution that the director, like many Italian intellectuals who admired the painter in private, was unwilling to challenge openly. Fini, however, took it with the worldly grace that was hers, weaving herself back into the cultural project from which her friend had kept her at the margins. The illustrations of the *Satyricon* unfold along two complementary lines: one in continuity with Fellini's visual choices in the film, the other in divergence from them. This dual articulation testifies to the autonomy of Fini's work,

⁷⁸ Cf. Betti 1970.

⁷⁹ One of Fellini's earliest professional engagements was as a cartoonist for the Roman satirical magazine *Marc Aurelio*, where he worked from 1939 for several years (cf. Bellano 2020, 60–64). In Fellini 1980, 66–71, Fellini himself speaks of his passion for drawing and caricature, and recalls having once believed that his vocation lay in painting (69). In Grazzini 2004², 54, the director further reveals that his encounter with Rossellini was decisive, insofar as it allowed him to understand that the filmmaker's work was not unlike that of the draughtsman.

⁸⁰ Cf. Fini 2021, 58 (= Fini 2025, 115): "I think it is easy to see which of my painting are 'masked' by concealed meaning and which one are the opposite: their meaning 'naked' and obvious".

which, grounded in an artistic horizon and cultural sensibility she shared with Fellini, forges a distinctly personal path of realization. The colour lithographs reprise the stillness and fragmentary quality of Pompeian mosaics, converging with the director's experiment in suspension and distance from the Petronian world. The red outline drawings, by contrast, open onto a lighter, more fluid space, in which 'eros' circulates freely, without recourse to the moral binaries of sin and innocence.

Unfortunately, Fini's illustrated *Satyricon* remains virtually unattainable in Italy, where it never circulated.⁸¹ Fellini's *Satyricon*, by contrast, has continued to receive steady critical attention. Yet, as the curators of *Io sono Leonor Fini* have observed, the painter is now poised to emerge as a pop icon, a figure comparable to Frida Kahlo.⁸² My hope is that this long-overdue reassessment will, at last, extend to her *Satyricon* as well.⁸³

Bibliographical references

- Armstrong, R. 2011. 'Eating Eumolpus: *Fellini Satyricon* and Dreaming Tradition', in: J. Parker, T. Mathews (eds.), *Tradition, Translation, Trauma: The Classic and the Modern*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 109–128.
- Arcq, T. – Martín, C. (eds.) 2025. *Io sono Leonor Fini*, Milano: Moebius.
- Bellano, M. 2020. 'Fellini's Graphic Heritage: Drawings, Comics, Animation, and Beyond', in: F. Burke, M. Waller, M. Gubareva (eds.), *A Companion to Federico Fellini*, Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell 2020, 59–78.
- Betti, L. 1970. *Federico A.C.: Disegni per il Satyricon di Federico Fellini*, Milano: Milano Libri Edizioni.
- Bondanella, P. 1988. 'Literature as Therapy: Fellini and Petronius', *Annali d'Italianistica* 6, *Film and Literature*, 179–198.
- Brunet, E. 2006. 'Tramandare-tradire: storiografia e senso dell'antico nel *Fellini Satyricon*', *Engramma* 49, 35–50.

⁸¹ We know only that, in 1971, Fini presented her illustrations at the Galleria Il Fauno Grafica in Turin (Webb 2021, 555). Even in France, very few copies of Fini's *Satyricon* can now be located. Besides the copy displayed at the exhibition, owned by the Minsky Gallery, another extant copy is held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Site Richelieu, Paris (Overstreet 2021b, 600).

⁸² Cf. *I curatori Carlos Martín e Tere Arcq ci raccontano dell'incredibile artista Leonor Fini* (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3U-2PsmapOs>), minute 3:27.

⁸³ This research was funded by the European Union – Next Generation EU, Mission 4, Component 2, within the framework of the project *Petronius and Apuleius: New Critical Editions and Related Studies* (CUP: B53D2302235 0006). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the international conference *Edizioni in cantiere: nuovi studi su Petronio e Apuleio*, Florence, 25–26 September 2025.

- Carrera, A. 2019. *Fellini's Eternal Rome. Paganism and Christianity in the Films of Federico Fellini*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Copioi, R. 2020. *Gli occhi di Fellini*, Firenze: Vallecchi.
- Cosulich, C. 1969. *Satyricon, ABC*, 2 maggio 1969, 33–48.
- Danese, R. 2024. 'Il *Satyricon* come ipotesto della cultura italiana del Novecento: *Fratelli d'Italia* di Alberto Arbasino', *Strumenti critici* 39, 39–55.
- De Berti, R. – Galletti, E. – Slavazzi, F. (eds.) 2009. *Fellini-Satyricon: l'immaginario dell'antico: scene di Roma antica, l'antichità interpretata dalle arti contemporanee*, Milano: Monduzzi.
- De Berti, R. 2009. 'Riflessi di *Fellini-Satyricon* nella stampa periodica illustrata contemporanea', in: De Berti – Galletti – Slavazzi 2009, 253–299.
- Falaschi, G. 2013. 'Il bambino e la farfalla: immagini reali in un mondo inautentico', in: Grassigli – Reinhardt 2013, 125–144.
- Fantasia, G. 2025. 'Leonor Fini, addio alla casa fra i tetti di Parigi', *Il sole 24 ore*, 21 maggio 2025 <https://www.ilsole24ore.com/art/leonor-fini-addio-casa-i-tetti-parigi-AHHyAEq>.
- Fellini, F. 1969. 'Premessa', in: Zanelli 1969, 107–110.
- Fellini, F. 1980. *Fare un film. Autobiografia di uno spettatore, di Italo Calvino. Con una nota di Liliana Betti e una guida filmografica e bibliografica*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Fini, L. 1994. *Peintures. Préface de Leonor Fini*, Paris: Michele Trinckvel.
- Fini, L. 2021. 'Leonor Fini in Her Own Words', in: Overstreet – Zukerman 2021, I, 23–61.
- Fini, L. 2025. 'Leonor Fini si racconta', in: Arcq – Martín 2025, 99–115.
- Forlenza, F. 1993. *Cattivi maestri, ovvero Intellettuali italiani tra fascismo, comunismo, terrorismo*, Milano: Joppolo.
- Galletti, L. 2009. 'La percezione dell'antico. I Romani di *Fellini-Satyricon* tra Musei Capitolini e Harper's Bazaar', in: De Berti – Galletti – Slavazzi 2009, 165–252.
- Gianotti, G. F. 2020. *Rileggendo Petronio e Apuleio*, Roma: Aracne.
- Grassigli, G. L. – Reinhardt, J. (eds.) 2013. *Fellini-Satyricon. Tra memoria, racconti e rovine: un sottosuolo dell'anima*, Napoli: Liguori.
- Grazzini, G. 2004² (prima ed. 1983). *Federico Fellini. Intervista sul cinema*, Bari: Laterza.
- Kezich, T. 1960. *La dolce vita di Federico Fellini*, Rocca San Casciano: Cappelli.
- Lago, P. 2002. 'Alcune osservazioni sul tempo narrativo: da Petronio a *Petrolio* attraverso il *Fellini-Satyricon*', *Aufidus* 16, 101–116.
- Longardi, M. 2003. *Più stelle che in cielo: mezzo secolo tra Hollywood e Cinecittà*, Roma: Gremese.
- Martín, C. 2025. '“Un'aroma di morte”. Leonor Fini dal corpo ai confini del mondo', in: Arcq – Martín 2025, 19–34.
- Morante, D. (ed.) 2012. *L'amata: Lettere di e a Elsa Morante*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Moravia, A. et al. (eds.) 1945. *Leonor Fini*, Roma: Sansoni.
- Natalini, F. 2015. 'Leonor Fini e la torre del Surreale', *Sinestesieonline* 4/12.
- Overstreet, R. 2021a. 'Drawn from the Past', in: Overstreet – Zukerman 2021, I, 63–135.
- Overstreet, R. 2021b. 'Leonor Fini: Exhibitions, Bibliography and General References', in: Overstreet – Zukerman 2021, II, 565–645.
- Overstreet, R. – Zukerman, N. (eds.) 2021. *Leonor Fini. Catalogue Raisonné of the Oil Paintings*, Zurich: Scheidegger Und Spiess.
- Pace, N. 2009a. 'La doppia lente: Petronio attraverso Fellini, ovvero Fellini attraverso Petronio', in: De Berti – Galletti – Slavazzi 2009, 17–42.
- Pace, N. 2009b. 'Colloquio con Luca Canali su *Fellini-Satyricon*', in: De Berti – Galletti – Slavazzi 2009, 43–58.

- Pascoletti, M. 2013. 'Dentro la "lumaca-labirinto": Fellini visto da Pasolini', in: Grassigli – Reinhardt 2013, 103–120.
- Pasolini, P. P. 1992. 'Umiliare', in: G. Falaschi (ed.), P. P. Pasolini, *I dialoghi*, Roma: Editori Riuniti, 684–685.
- Pasolini, P. P. 1999. 'La dolce vita: per me si tratta di un film cattolico', in: W. Siti, S. De Laude (eds.), P. P. Pasolini, *Saggi sulla letteratura e sull'arte*, II, Milano: I Meridiani, 2269–2279.
- Pasolini, P. P. 2001. W. Siti, F. Zabagli (eds.), *Per il cinema*, Milano: Mondadori.
- Paul, J. 2009. 'Fellini-Satyricon. Petronius and Film', in: J. Prag, I. Repath (eds.), *Petronius. A Handbook*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 198–217.
- Perruccio, A. 2024. *Show-off, unreliable, erratic. Both Narrator and Protagonist in Petronius's Satyricon and Fellini-Satyricon*, New York: Bordighera Press.
- Pesando, F. 2010. 'Suggerimenti per un archeologo: in margine a *Fellini-Satyricon*', *Lanx* 5, 194–207.
- Premuda, C. 2015. 'La quinta donna della *Dolce vita* disegnata da Fellini su Leonor Fini', *Il piccolo*, 22 agosto 2015 <https://www.ilpiccolo.it/cultura-e-spettacoli/la-quinta-donna-della-dolce-vita-disegnata-da-fellini-su-leonor-fini-fqj04b0d>.
- Reinhardt, J. 2013. 'Fellini. L'immagine, il sogno e la decadenza', in: Grassigli – Reinhardt 2013, 61–102.
- Renzetti, E. 2025. 'Leonor Fini: la vita e l'opera', in: Arcq – Martín 2025, 83–97.
- Segal, E. 1971. 'Arbitrary *Satyricon*: Petronius & Fellini', *Diacritics* 1, 54–57.
- Slavazzi, F. 2009. 'L'immagine dell'antico nel *Fellini-Satyricon*', in: De Berti – Galletti – Slavazzi 2009, 59–92.
- Sullivan, J.P. 1991. *The Social Ambience of Petronius' Satyricon and Fellini Satyricon*, in M.M. Winkler (ed.), *Classics and the Cinema*, Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 251–263.
- Sütterlin, A. 1996. *Petronius Arbiter und Federico Fellini. Ein strukturanalytischer Vergleich*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Strukelj, V. 2009. 'Leonor Fini vista dall'Italia. Ricostruzione di un dibattito', in: M. Masau Dan (ed.), *Leonor Fini. L'italienne de Paris*, Trieste: Civico Museo Revoltella, 25–37.
- Stubbs, J. C. 2006. *Federico Fellini as Auteur. Seven Aspects of His Films*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Vacca, V. 2015. *L'arte del tra(s)vestire in Leonor Fini. Un percorso nella costumistica scenica tra Roma e Parigi*. Tesi di dottorato, Università della Tuscia, Viterbo.
- Watz, A. 2025. 'Leonor Fini e il femminismo della seconda ondata', in: Arcq – Martín, 73–82.
- Webb, P. 2021. 'Leonor Fini's Life', in: Overstreet – Zukerman 2021, II, 539–562.
- Zagarrio, V. 2020. 'Egli Danza: Fellini's Contexts and Influence from Before Rossellini to Sorrentino and Beyond', in: F. Burke, M. Waller, M. Gubareva (eds.), *A Companion to Federico Fellini*, Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 279–292.
- Zanchetti, G. 2009. '...*Vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta?* *Fellini-Satyricon* e l'arte contemporanea, tra originario, fantascienza e beat', in: De Berti – Galletti – Slavazzi 2009, 133–164.
- Zanelli, D. 1969. *Dal pianeta Roma*, in: D. Zanelli (ed.), *Fellini Satyricon di Federico Fellini*, Rocca San Casciano: Licinio Cappelli, 11–80.