

Curiosity and enthusiasm are certainly required for a research, and a teacher is always happy to discover this features is a student's writing.

With no doubt, Noera shoes to possess both of these qualities and undertakes her work on the base of a strong and effective idea (the city as a mind), supporting her main thesis with the help of a large grasp of concepts coming from several authors belonging to different disciplines and cultures.

Still, the argumentation is not always clear and the reader finds sometimes hard to understand the underlying link between the concepts and authors mentioned.

Which kind of connection is supposed to exist between Canevacci's idea of "interstice" (based on a post-post-modern image of the metropolitan landscape), and Marc Augé's popular concept of "non-lieux" (rather grounded on a vision of the urban space as the inheritor of historical cities: a "non-lieu" can only exist among a network of "lieux", related to a geometrical space and a linear, historical time). And - even most important - what is the use that Noera intends to do of those difference references in order to support her idea of a possible application of Bateson's idea of an "ecological" approach to mind for a reading of contemporary life in urban contexts?

The first parts ends on a *petitio principii* that deceives a little the reader, turning the ambitious and interesting use of the 'I' and the support taken on personal experiences through the opening section of her work into a personal judgment poor in argumentation.

Dealing in the second part of her thesis (chapter I) with the concept of identity in relation with the evolving urban landscapes, Noera develops the idea of an increasing fragmentation of the self and his sensorial functions in the framework of the experience of the contemporary metropolis. On the other hand, her purpose being to attempt to demonstrate a possible application of Bateson's idea of an ecology of mind to the object of the city, she stress out the importance of an organic approach both to the self and to his contemporary habitat: the urban *milieu*. Once more the articulation between this two opposite poles is not very clear for the reader, who is asked to move from a reference to the other, lacking a little of some critical distance from the sources provided from the author.

On page 40, she speaks about "metropolis as the spacial metaphor" for modernity, but we wonder if in the kind of approach proposed by the author, the object of reading and interpretation - the contemporary urban landscape - can be understood as a simple "metaphor" and in which sense this concept is used by Noera.

Moreover, especially in Chapter II, the different authors quoted are rarely used referring to the context in which they have been writing, nor in consideration of the

different kind of cities they could experience from the 1920's Brazil to the 1990's Paris or 2010's Prague and so on, and no comparative approach is held of the different ideas of "media", "city" or "visual communication" that can be involved in texts belonging to such different ages.

From Benjamin's passage to contemporary malls, from Simmel's image of town to Marc Augé's definition of "non-lieux", history changed the shape of our lives and cultures, our experiences, our ways to perceive, and as well the label "contemporary" and the idea of "metropolis" can be applied by scholars and philosophers to a grasp of different objects.

Turning to the idea of visual communication (2.2-2.2.1-2.3 in her own articulation of the parts), that seems to be the part of the work in which Noera is better interested in, the argumentation becomes clearer, the use of the authors more grounded on their contexts and historical situations, the coming back to personal experience makes more sense and the writing gets more effective.

Although very difficult to support scientifically, the description of the experience in Prague's yellow line metro on the base of the six terms of Bateson's definition of the mind, is cleverly dealt and shows a noble attempt to use books and concepts to better understand our life and times, which is or should be for sure the most genuine purpose of all kind of studies.

Moreover, Noera makes a good use of her position of "expatriate" in order to better observe the dynamic of everyday's life in the cultural context taken as the object of her analysis.

Again we go back, in the last part dedicated to methodology, to a puzzle of different authors, to whom Noera refers here with precision and in a more sensible way. Still, it the links between those theoretical approaches and the method used for the following interview seems to be loose, and one could wonder why in the context of a metropolitan living analysis the subjects interviewed are only classified on the base of their culture or nationality.

Still, in the conclusion, Noera shows to have a sufficient critical distance to understand the complexity and contradictions involved in the huge object given for her research.

Once more, she gives proofs of her interest for the large grasp of authors that she is able to read, and passion for the urban context that she tries to describe using both concepts and experiences on the field.

The grade proposed is 3.

Benedetta Zaccarello