ABSTRACT

LARSON, STEPHEN LARRY. The Birth, Death, and Re-Birth of an *Auteur*: the Analog to Digital Conversion of Carl Theodor Dreyer's Films. (Under the direction of Hans Kellner.)

This dissertation explores how DVD and digital media can deviate from an original filmmaker's intent by being used as a tool for re-mediation. It addresses an important issue about what happens to an author's work of art from the pre-electronic age to the present when it is re-mediated or repurposed via a new platform. The Scandinavian filmmaker Carl Theodor Dreyer (1889–1968) is an ideal prototype for studying the phenomenon of re-mediation. Dreyer began directing movies at the peak of the silent years and made his first talkie at the beginning of the sound era. Thirteen out of the fourteen feature films that Dreyer directed are available on LaserDisc, DVD, Blu-ray, and digital streaming platforms.

Dreyer deserves a renewed appraisal and fresh investigation into his life and work. Why Dreyer and why in this postmodern era of digital cinema? Dreyer's *oeuvre* has always been in a state of re-mediation through continuous, changing circumstances. Some rather infamous instances illustrate how the original aesthetic intentions of his films were either compromised or altered. For example, in 1951 the Italian-born film historian Joseph-Marie Lo Duca acquired an original negative of *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (The Passion of Joan of Arc, 1928) and cropped the left side of the picture in order to accommodate a sound track of preexisting music. He also marred the image by superimposing some intertitles over the shots. This sonorized print was recently transferred to Blu-ray. *Vampyr* (1932) also suffered an ominous fate when Image Entertainment's technical authors added large Gothic subtitles that covered nearly half the picture to Dreyer's personal print on the distributor's LD and DVD releases. While Dreyer is a prominent example of this trend, these kinds of re-

mediations have become common and need to be studied. Dreyer's films are representative of how re-mediation is crucial and unavoidable in cinema work. Film history is being re-mediated and this challenges any notion of the *auteur* in a digital domain. In fact, these practices call for a complete reconsideration of the notion of *auteur*.

This dissertation employs a mixed-methods, integrated theoretical approach to chart the genesis of Dreyer the *auteur*, his death as an author (especially in the case of *The Passion of Joan of Arc*), and ultimately the re-birth of his work rather than the re-birth of him as author. This study of an *auteur* also interweaves media theories of re-mediation and critical methodologies of film and digital restoration. It also examines key transformations of Dreyer's films through the practices of archiving, conservation, and restoration. As we navigate the historical watershed of digitization, my work examines the cultural and historical implications of converting older, analog media formats to digital ones. This "case history" of an *auteur*'s work—mainly Dreyer's silent movies—acts as an illustrative example for the assessment of how film as a medium gets pushed out of existence after it undergoes a digital makeover.

I cover nine of Dreyer's works starting with their inception and stretching from their original theatrical runs to their release(s) on home video. I account for competing versions that feature different distributors, different extra features, and different subtitle translations. Through archival research, critical questions I seek to answer include: who is the "producer" of the DVD/digital copy? Who is heading up those projects? Who emerges as the alternative *auteurs* for the films and do they supplant the role of the director? Do they assume control of new material in some way and exhibit authorship? What ethical imperatives do modifying

Dreyer’s images pose for a viewer? This detailed study strives to set standards for future work on authorship and re-mediation.

© Copyright 2015 by Stephen Larry Larson

All Rights Reserved

The Birth, Death, and Re-Birth of an *Auteur*: the Analog to Digital Conversion of Carl Theodor Dreyer's Films

by
Stephen Larry Larson

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Communication, Rhetoric, and Digital Media

Raleigh, North Carolina

2015

APPROVED BY:

_____	_____
Hans Kellner, Ph.D. Committee Chair	Ora Gelley, Ph.D.
_____	_____
Melissa Johnson, Ph.D.	Sarah Stein, Ph.D.
_____	
Xiaoyong Zheng, Ph.D.	

DEDICATION

Dedicated to the enduring legacy of Carl Dreyer whose films hopefully will connect with future generations.

BIOGRAPHY

Stephen Larson is a media studies scholar with diverse research interests that include film authorship, film genres, cinema as a critical reflection of social and political history, the hermeneutics of the book-to-script-to-screen translation process, and phenomenological theory related to cinematic spectatorship. He grew up in a suburb near Minneapolis and earned his B.A. in 2003 at the University of Minnesota in Studies in Cinema and Media Culture. He later focused on the intersection of rhetoric and film in the Communication M.A. program at Villanova University. In 2009, he matriculated in the interdisciplinary doctoral program of Communication, Rhetoric, and Digital Media at North Carolina State University. His work examines the narratological similarities and differences between books and films as well as the aesthetic representations of literary sources. Stephen's work has appeared in *Senses of Cinema* and the *Journal of Adaptation in Film & Performance*. He has also presented work at the National Communication Association Conference.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First to the members of my committee:

I would like to express my gratitude to Hans Kellner for agreeing to serve as chair of my committee. He provided me with many helpful directives over the course of my project. Our phone conversations and office meetings yielded sharp insights into my exam and dissertation's topical areas.

To Ora Gelley who gave me astute observations on directions that I could go with certain subtopics and content points.

To Sarah Stein for agreeing to serve as a reader. I have enjoyed the working relationship we have had on our various projects.

To Melissa Johnson who agreed to come on board the committee at a later stage. She is one of the finest proofreaders and editors that I know.

To Maria Pramaggiore for serving on my exam committee and for supplying editorial comments on my prospectus.

And also:

To Peter Schepelern who generously devoted a great deal of his time to translate newspaper and journal articles, sections of books, and letters between Dreyer and his studio bosses for me to include in my dissertation.

To Birgit Granhøj who also kindly set aside time to translate letters between Dreyer and his business associates during the making of *Leaves from Satan's Book.*

To Lisbeth Richter Larsen at the Danish Film Institute for delving into the archives and obtaining valuable information from primary sources.

To Lesley-Ann Brown for translating an important section from *Hvorledes skriver man en Film?*

To Nyima Sabally, Clitha Mason, and Kailey Miller for scanning and digitizing numerous book chapters for me.

To my former CRDM colleague and friend Shayne Pepper for reading early drafts and providing ongoing suggestions to the shape of the overall work.

To my good friend Nick Engan for sharing his thoughts on Dreyer's work over dinner conversations and for encouraging me to explore the connection between *Voices of Light* and the Greek Dramatic Chorus.

I would like to thank my parents (especially my mother), family members, and friends for their continual love, support, and encouragement throughout my college and graduate school years. I could not have gotten this far without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: Dreyer's Work in a World of Digital Media 1

INTRODUCTION 1

THEORIES OF AUTHORSHIP AND *AUTEURISM* 8

TOWARDS A NEW THEORY OF RE-MEDIATION 15

THE COLORIZATION CONTROVERSY OF THE 1980S 16

CRITICAL METHODOLOGIES OF FILM AND DIGITAL RESTORATION ..19

IS RESURRECTING THE "ORIGINAL FILM" AN URBAN LEGEND? 24

CHAPTER SUMMARIES 25

Notes to CHAPTER 1 28

CHAPTER 2: Transitioning from Analog to Digital for Cinematic Presentations: Re-mediations of Dreyer's Early Apprentice and *Auteurist* Work 34

INTRODUCTION 34

EARLY BEGINNINGS AT NORDISK 36

FIRST FILM: AN APPRENTICESHIP 37

NORDIC MELODRAMA 39

RE-MEDIATING *THE PRESIDENT* 42

THE BIRTH OF AN *AUTEUR* 44

SORTING OUT ISSUES OF AUTHORSHIP 47

STUDIO POLITICS AND STUDIO POLICIES 49

RECEPTION AND RE-MEDIATION OF *LEAVES* 64

CONNECTION TO *INTOLERANCE*? 69

THREE DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF *LEAVES* ON HOME VIDEO 74

FOUCAULTIAN REDISCOVERIES 78

CHAPTER SUMMARY.....81
Notes to CHAPTER 2.....82

CHAPTER 3: Reconstruction and Its Implications for Authorship and Genre in Four Dreyer Silents..... 96
INTRODUCTION 96
***MICHAEL* AND THE *KAMMERSPIEL*-FILM 99**
***ONCE UPON A TIME*'S MISSING FRAMES: FILLING IN THE GAPS.....106**
***THE PARSON'S WIDOW*.....118**
***THE BRIDE OF GLOMDAL*.....123**
CHAPTER SUMMARY.....126
Notes to CHAPTER 3.....128

CHAPTER 4: *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1928)—The Changing Roles of Authors..... 135
INTRODUCTION 135
GENESIS OF A CLASSIC.....137
A HISTORY OF *PASSION*'S PRINTS.....139
THE DEATH OF AN *AUTEUR*: I 146
THE DEATH OF AN *AUTEUR*: II.....150
RECEPTION OF THE LO DUCA VERSION 159
THE RE-BIRTH OF DREYER'S *AUTEUR* STATUS 160
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINTS 167
MUSICAL RE-MEDIATION: *PASSION*'S MANY SCORES 169
THE COMPOSER AS CO-AUTHOR OF THE FILM 171
***PASSION* AND SOCIAL MEDIA 177**
CHAPTER SUMMARY.....180

Notes to CHAPTER 4 182

CHAPTER 5: *Vampyr* (1932)—Aura, *Sfumato*, and Decay 199

INTRODUCTION 199

PRODUCTION HISTORY AND SYNOPSIS OF *VAMPYR* 205

THE ORIGINS OF *SFUMATO* 209

AURATIC MOMENTS IN DISCOVERING *SFUMATO* 210

***VAMPYR*'S THEATRICAL RECEPTION AND VERSION HISTORY 215**

THREE DIFFERENT VERSIONS AND VISIONS OF *VAMPYR* ON DVD 222

REFLECTIONS ON CHAPTER'S ANALYSIS OF *VAMPYR* 228

FINAL CONCLUSIONS 229

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF TEACHING DREYER'S FILMS 231

LIMITATIONS 234

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS 235

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS 236

Notes to CHAPTER 5 238

REFERENCES 251

APPENDIX: Transcriptions of Handwritten Letters from Carl Th. Dreyer's *Præsidenten* (*The President*) 296

CHAPTER 1

Dreyer's Work in a World of Digital Media

INTRODUCTION

Toward the end of the last millennium, the international film world officially entered the digital gateway with the industry's widespread adoption of the Digital Versatile Disc (DVD). This optical disc format arrived with the capacity to store seven times the amount of data on a single layer than that of a CD.[1] By late 1999, DVDs saturated the mainstream market to become what an independent DVD title developer called "the fastest growing consumer format of all time."[2] The DVD caused a radical shift in audience behavior. For decades, the only way to see a film again after its theatrical window expired was at art theaters or through membership in a cinéclub. This became the recurring pattern for many years leading up to at least the late seventies when the videocassette and the LaserDisc (LD) were still in their nascent stages. The DVD, however, gave movie devotees the chance to watch their favorite films at their own leisure and afforded them unlimited replay value without loss of quality, a major difference compared to VHS and even LD.

In a 2001 press conference to promote *Apocalypse Now Redux* (1979/2001) at the Cannes Film Festival, Francis Ford Coppola stated that DVD can serve "as a filmmaker's friend."[3] On the one hand, Coppola meant that the then-new home video format could be useful and beneficial as an alternative viewing mode outside of commercial cinema venues. DVD can also aid directors like Coppola store extended cuts or different versions of films on a large-capacity physical disc that can reach the masses. But on the other hand, the unspoken

discourse of Coppola's comment is even more significant if one counters with a divergent path that the format may take. More specifically, DVD can also deviate from the filmmaker's intent by being used as a tool for re-mediation. In the context of film laboratories, archivist Giovanna Fossati defines re-mediation as a practice that refashions old restoration technologies by means of new ones.[4] According to Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, a "double logic" arises in re-mediation: "Our culture wants both to multiply its media to erase all traces of mediation: ideally, it wants to erase its media in the very act of multiplying them."[5]

DVD and other digital media allow for the re-mediation of older media forms in two different ways. Transparent immediacy neglects and repudiates the presence of the medium and the act of mediation. A painting, photograph, or film tries to place the viewer in the same vicinity as the objects in view.[6] Immediacy implies a unified visual space where viewers are compelled to focus on the mediated content rather than the process of mediation.[7] Conversely, hypermediacy comprises a heterogeneous space that opens up windows to other representations of the same work or other media.[8] For example, in her longitudinal study of young people's use of DVD, interdisciplinary theorist Margaret Mackey associates the format's technical capabilities with hypermediacy. In its re-mediation of both film and video, DVD's "digitally remastered" picture is so vibrantly clear that it simultaneously ingratiates the viewer into the aesthetic experience of the film and calls attention to its own pristine clarity that distracts the viewer from the story.[9] Mackey argues that the lower number of pixels on a filmstrip accents the image's granular effect, which creates more space for the

viewer to survey the frame, whereas "the glossy surface of the DVD image almost repels involvement."[10] Her point raises a crucial question about viewers' aesthetic perception: Are they "looking at" or "looking through" a photographed composition? Indeed Bolter and Grusin acknowledge that new digital media oscillates between immediacy/transparency and hypermediacy/opacity.[11] Drawing upon Richard Lanham's work, they suggest that hypermediacy conveys a bi-stable oscillation between labeling a visual space as mediated and also a "real" space that lies beyond mediation.

The Scandinavian filmmaker Carl Theodor Dreyer (1889–1968) is an ideal prototype for studying the phenomenon of re-mediation. Dreyer began directing movies at the peak of the silent years and made his first talkie at the beginning of the sound era. Thirteen out of the fourteen feature films that Dreyer directed are available on LD, DVD, Blu-ray, and digital streaming platforms. The binary tension of being sutured inside a transparent realm and then pushed out to a hypermediated world is at the forefront of Dreyer's original works and their digital counterparts. For example, Eureka's Masters of Cinema DVD of *Vampyr* (1932) permits viewers to stay inside a transparent domain because the visual presentation does not call attention to any digital manipulation of the image. By contrast, Criterion's high-definition transfer of the film's same print leads viewers into a hypermediated world because the DVD's technical authors removed film grain and boosted the contrast levels.

Dreyer is a famous director and celebrated *auteur* of world cinema. He began his career in the cinema in 1912 writing title cards for the Danish production house Nordisk Film Kompagni (Nordisk). By the time he made his last film in 1964, he was regarded as

Denmark's most important director. Although his output was sporadic—he only averaged one film per decade in the sound years—Dreyer is one amongst a small group of major filmmakers to have produced canonical works in both the silent and sound eras that have endured through director-centered retrospectives and specially curated video editions. Like the versatile Howard Hawks, Dreyer was a cinematic chameleon who worked in a variety of different genres throughout his long career. For instance, David Bordwell notes that Dreyer experimented with genres as varied as the formula melodrama, historical allegory, historical narrative, fairy tale, lyrical romance, and chamber drama.[12] Moreover, Dreyer exemplifies the uncompromising artist who could work both inside and outside a studio system without sacrificing either personal vision or individual creativity. Between 1918 and 1928, Dreyer made nine films of estimably high merit in five different countries. In spite of having his films re-mediated, Dreyer has posthumously enjoyed a renaissance on home video, DVD, and Blu-ray that also include fellow European silent film luminaries F. W. Murnau and Fritz Lang.

Regardless of the wide acclaim heaped on his films, Dreyer deserves a renewed appraisal and fresh investigation into his life and work. Why Dreyer and why in this postmodern era of digital cinema? Dreyer's *oeuvre* has always been in a state of re-mediation through continuous, changing circumstances. This dissertation addresses an important issue about what happens to an author's work of art from the pre-electronic age when it is repurposed or re-mediated via a new platform. While Dreyer is a prominent example of this trend, these kinds of re-mediations have become common and need to be studied. Some

rather infamous instances illustrate how the original aesthetic intentions of Dreyer's films were either compromised or altered. For example, in 1951 the Italian-born film historian Joseph-Marie Lo Duca acquired an original negative of *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (The Passion of Joan of Arc, 1928) and cropped the left side of the picture in order to accommodate a sound track of preexisting music. He also marred the image by superimposing some intertitles over the shots.[13] This sonorized print was recently transferred to a high-definition Blu-ray. *Vampyr* also suffered an ominous fate when the company Film Preservation Associates added large Gothic subtitles that covered nearly half the picture to Dreyer's personal print on Image Entertainment's LD and DVD releases. These are only a few of the numerous ways in which Dreyer's films have been re-mediated and "mutilated." As Bordwell observed in the early eighties, no filmmaker's work has been more mutilated for English-language audiences than Dreyer's.[14] "Mutilation" is a euphemism for the literal or figurative incision into a film negative by an editor's scissors. For instance, in his monograph on Dreyer's *Vampyr*, David Rudkin applies the noun mutilation to describe a snippet from an important scene that has been cut and re-spliced in one of the film's several versions. These examples from Dreyer are representative of how re-mediation is crucial and unavoidable in cinema work. Film history is being re-mediated and this challenges any notion of the *auteur* in a digital domain. In fact, these practices call for a complete reconsideration of the notion of *auteur*. This detailed study strives to set standards for future work on authorship and re-mediation.

The dissertation also examines key transformations of Dreyer's films through the practices of archiving, conservation, and restoration. As we navigate the historical watershed of digitization, my work examines the cultural and historical implications of converting older, analog media formats to digital ones. This "case history" of an *auteur*'s work—mainly Dreyer's silent movies—acts as an illustrative example for the assessment of how film as a medium gets pushed out of existence after it undergoes a digital makeover. I exclude Dreyer's *Masters of the House* (1925) because it is the one silent film of his to receive the least amount of re-mediated treatment. Last year, Criterion released a Blu-ray of the film with the original Danish score.[15] I cover nine of Dreyer's works starting with their inception and stretching from their original theatrical runs to their release(s) on home video. I account for competing versions that feature different distributors, different extra features, and different subtitle translations. Through archival research, the critical question I seek to answer is, how does an author/creator's *objets d'art* hold up through time? How do they hold up through cultural memory?

This project divides into two parts. The first part delivers a close and critical study of Dreyer in order to help reinvigorate the *auteur* theory for the digital age. The *auteur* theory was a popular fixture in both critical circles and scholarly discourses from the 1950s through the 1970s. Since that period, however, its prominence in cinema studies and the arts/humanities has waned, accompanying "the death of film." This section also explores different dimensions of filmmakers and their relationships to collaborative practices involving studio and production executives, actors, etc. In the first part, I will demonstrate

that while Dreyer worked for several production houses in the silent era and in the sound years such as Nordisk and Société Générale des Films, he had substantial involvement in other capacities (i.e., as scriptwriter, set decorator, editor). I will attempt to reclaim his "authorial" role.

The second part juxtaposes Dreyer's *oeuvre* with the appropriations and transmutations his films have undergone in a digital context. I already have briefly addressed the aesthetic changes his films undergo when transferred from celluloid onto DVD and Blu-ray. Furthermore, I probe these questions: Who is the "producer" of the DVD/digital copy? Who is heading up those projects? Who emerges as the alternative *auteurs* for the films and do they supplant the role of the director? Do they assume control of new material in some way and exhibit authorship? What ethical imperatives do modifying Dreyer's images pose for a viewer?

This dissertation employs a mixed-methods, integrated theoretical approach to chart the genesis of Dreyer the *auteur,* his death as an author (especially in the case of *The Passion of Joan of Arc*), and ultimately the re-birth of his work rather than the re-birth of him as author. This study of an *auteur* also interweaves media theories of re-mediation and critical methodologies of film and digital restoration. Before unpacking those two areas, I offer a brief overview of the *auteur* concept. While a comprehensive analysis of the progeny and historical development of authorship is beyond the scope of this project, I limit my focus to cultural and industrial conditions that surround authors and in their work. I then turn to two milestone works by Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault that on one hand, pronounced the

death of the author, and on the other, sought to revivify the author through the formation of discourses. In the literature review, I explain how each commentator's ideas apply and contribute to my study of Dreyer.

THEORIES OF AUTHORSHIP AND *AUTEURISM*

During the Romantic period (1780–1848), the idea of the artist as an author perhaps first surfaced when literary critics debated the dramaturgical qualities by great playwrights from the European Renaissance such as Shakespeare and Molière. This concept of evaluating artists and their work later blossomed with music critics judging the merits of Beethoven's symphonies, in comparison to Mozart's operas, for example. For nearly a half century since its birth in the 1890s, the cinema was primarily considered entertainment for the masses rather than a pure art form. Beginning in the late 1940s, however, film criticism helped change the notion that cinema was exclusively a financial enterprise of industry collaborators. The transformation of the idea of a film's director as its author or *auteur* spread regionally from France (*Cahiers du Cinéma*) to North America (*Film Culture*, *Film Quarterly*) and into the United Kingdom (*Movie*, *Screen*).

This dissertation applies primarily Andrew Sarris's ideas about the *auteur* theory to the authorial tendencies Dreyer exhibits in his films. In his famous essay, "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962," Sarris argues that *auteurs* bring creative vision and personal expression to their films. Two premises of Sarris's theory pertain particularly to Dreyer. (1) To be part of the pantheon of distinguished filmmakers, a director must demonstrate technical competence. "A great director has to be at least a good director."[16] Dreyer

consistently demonstrated this ability throughout his career. (2) Stylistic consistency or the distinguishable personality of the director: "Over a group of films, a director must exhibit certain recurring characteristics of style which serve as his signature. The way a film looks and moves should have some relationship to the way a director thinks and feels."[17] Shot composition, framing, camera angles, and editing became part of Dreyer's signature style. Sarris outlines the *auteur* theory along three concentric circles: the outer circle as technique, the middle circle personal style, and the inner circle. By technique, he means the ability to assemble a film with some clarity and coherence.[18] While Dreyer often experimented with form, his technique was usually in service to a film's narrative demands. By inner circle, Sarris implies the "directorial attitude" toward material that helps define a filmmaker's worldview.[19] Many topical issues and thematic tropes formed Dreyer's worldview that he expressed in his films: perpetual intolerance across civilizations, celebration of the proletariat, the Christ figure and its various incarnations, persecution of heretics, a fascination with female martyrdom, characters who pray in solitude as means of spiritual catharsis, and metaphysical rebirth *vis-à-vis* the salvation of the soul.

André Bazin, *Cahiers'* founder and Sarris's hero, wrote an important essay in 1957 about the external forces that shape and mold an author's work. Specifically, Bazin postulates that in the literary and performing arts, this individual filmmaker may transcend society but more importantly, society is above all *within* him.[20] In order to establish a criterion of "genius" or talent that defines true authorship, one must account for social factors, work environment, historical circumstances, and the technical background that

determines each author.[21] Furthermore, Bazin evinces that a work of art be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The branch of art, its style, and the sociological context are key variables. Bazin's argument states that the popular and industrial conditions of cinema are essential to its existence. For example, he attributes Hollywood's tradition of excellence to its classical studio system. Consequently, "flash in the pan" successes sometimes result from mediocre directors who do not reveal particularly creative qualities. (By this slang phrase, Bazin means a delicate balancing act between talent and milieu produced through a fortuitous set of circumstances.) The sociological factors and industrial circumstances that Bazin broaches will play a formative role in situating Dreyer's status as an *auteur*, especially early in his career. This dissertation offers production and industry-based studies. It focuses on the early Danish film industry, particularly Dreyer's employment at Nordisk.

Bazin's prescription for a more well-rounded treatment of the author provided the inspiration for film scholar Thomas Schatz's 1988 book, *The Genius of the System*, which anoints studio heads such as Louis B. Mayer, David O. Selznick, and Irving Thalberg as the primary authors of the films that they produced. I particularly want to evaluate assertions Schatz makes of the functions of classical Hollywood and its studios during the Golden Age (thirties, forties, and fifties), and how they differ from the European film companies within which Dreyer worked. In his study of Hollywood's original studios (i.e., Universal, MGM, Warner Bros., and Paramount), Schatz conducts a qualitative analysis of the moviemaking process to ascertain who the real power players were in the industry's hierarchy of relations.[22] He claims that studio executives had more creative input and control over script

development, casting, editing, etc. than directors did. Schatz contends rather controversially that John Ford's collaboration with Daryl Zanuck at 20th Century-Fox—where they made *Young Mr. Lincoln*, *Drums Along the Mohawk*, and *The Grapes of Wrath*—"were no more distinctive than other star-genre formulations turned out by routine contract directors."[23] Schatz's methodological rigor for uncovering valuable historical materials is one aspect this study of Dreyer will replicate. Prior scholarship on authors and their collaborators in the performing arts, particularly reception studies in the analog and digital eras, has not applied qualitative research methods sufficiently. This project attempts to reverse that trend through perusal of primary and secondary sources at the firms Dreyer worked under. As John Caughie notes, the function of criticism on authorship is "not to discover, or construct, the author, but to discover the history and the discursive organization which is foundational for the text, and which negotiates its relationship with its historical audience."[24]

One of the recent works to head in the direction Caughie suggests is C. Paul Sellors's *Film Authorship: Auteurs and Other Myths* (2010). Sellors defines *auteur* as "an author who produces art through her or his acts of authorship."[25] His consideration of authors as "causes" of film designates a methodological shift in *auteur* criticism compared to the traditional approach which often elevates the director to the rank of author based purely on a critical assessment of a film. To qualify as an *auteur*, one must conceive, develop, and realize the coherent narrative, visual, and thematic unity of a film.[26] Like Bazin and Schatz, Sellors favors a historicized approach which accounts for tangible production conditions and informed research into the filmmaking process. Sellors's work aids my project because his

selection criteria for identifying an authorial member is more pliable than a Post-Structuralist approach which seeks predetermined codes and conventions that will recur consistently throughout a director's work. By contrast, Sellors's recipe considers film authorship according to context. Each film critique should engage in an empirical exercise based on the best available evidence, thoughtful interpretation of this evidence, and coherent reasoning and argumentation.[27]

In addition to holistic approaches that embrace the industrial and production phases of authorship, two major philosophers from outside film studies will inform my critique of the death and re-birth of the author. In his important essay on "The Death of the Author" (1968, *uppercase original*), Roland Barthes proclaims that it is language which speaks and not the actual author of a text.[28] He observes that in a linguistic sense, language knows a "subject" and not a "person."[29] When a novel is written, for instance, the printed word becomes a subject or ephemeral entity for whoever receives it (i.e., an audience of readers): "As soon as a fact is *narrated* no longer with a view to acting directly on reality but intransitively, that is to say, finally outside of any function other than that of the very practice of the symbol itself, this disconnection occurs, the voice loses its origin, the author enters into his own death, writing begins."[30] Barthes contests the notion that the individual who produced the work should always provide an explanation through biological or biographical roots. A text is much more complex than its Author's roots because it hosts a multidimensional space in which various writings blend and clash. The text becomes "a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture."[31] Barthes indicates that the corpus of writings that go

into a single text emanate from rich and varied social histories that converge in dialogue, parody, and contestation. The Author vanishes from this scenario only to be replaced by the reader who occupies and preserves the words that are engraved on the page. However, after the removal of the Author, any attempt to decipher a text may prove to be futile. Barthes implies that, because the text has so many signifiers, it is difficult to get a clean grasp of all its meanings. From the standpoint of a hermeneutist (one who is well-versed in the art and theory of interpretation), the text decenters from its central node, the main point where it is decoded and analyzed. Given that this essay was written during Barthes's period of structural semiotics, it is not surprising that he has misgivings about the Author imposing a last limit or as he puts it, a "final signified," on the text. In a polysemic sense, Barthes holds that a text is semiotically open to its community of readers and receivers. Indeed, "a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination."[32] Barthes makes it clear, though, in his closing epigram, that an Author cannot control how his/her work is received: "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author."[33] In addition to his work on Eisenstein and cinematic spectatorship, this piece by Barthes maintains an important place in reader/reception criticism and the Structuralist phase of examining films. Barthes's landmark piece on the Author's demise will help guide my reading of *The Passion of Joan of Arc*.

Like his French colleague, Michel Foucault also valued highly the role of culture in the production of texts. Barthes and Foucault are both concerned with the reception of an author's text and the site(s) of its destination. Unlike Barthes, though, Foucault argues for a reinvestigation of the functions of authors and the modes of discourse in which they operate,

alive or dead. While Foucault identifies the theme of a kinship between writing and death, in which writers become victims of their own making (an inversion of the Greek narrative or epic where writers would forestall their heroes' death or send them into immortality), he is considerably less pessimistic than Barthes about the fate of an author. In "What Is an Author?" (1969), Foucault observes that even when an author perishes (in a physical sense), the "ownership" of his/her work is not really relinquished. In his example of Nietzsche, Foucault states that unpublished drafts, margins and notations, and a notebook of aphorisms from the German philosopher's personal collection "can be extracted from the millions of traces left by an individual after his death."[34] Foucault's anecdote about finding Nietzsche's lost artifacts implies that despite demise in flesh and blood, an author "reappears" through the creation of new discourses. Likewise, a discursive revival of Dreyer occurs when a nearly pristine print of *The Passion of Joan of Arc* is discovered in an Oslo mental institution, or when an original nitrate print of *Die Gezeichneten* (Love One Another, 1922) is rediscovered in the French National film archives.

Reestablishing the existence of an author is an intriguing notion that Foucault shares with Jacques Derrida. Specifically, Derrida's idea of *écriture* (a double meaning for the act of writing and writing as its own entity) pertains most to Foucault when he is seeking a presence in an author's absence: "we should reexamine the empty space left by the author's disappearance; we should attentively observe, along its gaps and fault lines, its new demarcations, and the reapportionment of this void."[35] In other words, Foucault is saying that however many fissures left the author's space blank, there are nonetheless ways to

reconstitute and reclassify an author's discourse. In contrast to Barthes, Foucault asserts that an author preserves the unity of his/her work and is able to "neutralize the contradictions that are found in a series of texts."[36] (For Barthes, this would be left up to the reader.) Ultimately, Foucault goes in a different direction than Barthes by arguing for the resurrection of authors through the recovery of their work. For example, he asserts that authors of certain discourses must "return to the origin."[37] Indeed this was a task that faced Danish Film Institute (DFI) curator Thomas Christensen and Scandinavian film historian Casper Tybjerg when they attempted to rehabilitate Dryer's partially lost film, *Der var engang* (Once Upon a Time, 1922), through the assemblage of an incomplete print, film fragments, production stills, and other printed materials.[38] As Olbricht notes, what Foucault's author function achieves that Barthes's Death of the Author does not "is a description of ways of talking about the type of authorial discourse that has currency in textual criticism."[39] What is important is "what the discourse of the 'author' accomplishes within the discipline, within the scope of its meaning. So the author is no longer dead—but is discursified: the author is given a certain function, a certain reason to exist in discourse."[40] Although I declare that individual Dreyer works suffer a temporal death when they fall into public domain and reach the hands of new producers, I ultimately proclaim that they are recoverable in the Foucaultian sense that they carve out new discourses for audiences to digest.

TOWARDS A NEW THEORY OF RE-MEDIATION

Scholarship on re-mediation in the last decade and a half is amorphous and scattered across spaces and mediums as diverse as virtual reality, digital video games, digital

photography, digital art, the World Wide Web, and comic books.[41] Only a modicum of attention has been given to how films remediate a traditional storytelling medium or appropriate newer technologies in the cinematic apparatus.[42] For instance, Bolter and Grusin devote a small section in their book to Hollywood's incorporation of digital graphics, which refashion classically linear films during the mid to late 1990s. They primarily focus on full-length Disney animated films which undergo retrograde re-mediation, "in which a newer medium is imitated and even absorbed by an older one."[43] This study attempts to fill a large void in the knowledge base on the re-mediation of older films by examining a variety of different works that have undergone a metamorphosis through myriad of digital techniques.

THE COLORIZATION CONTROVERSY OF THE 1980S

Several of Dreyer's silent films have been tinted and toned from their original state when converted from an original nitrate negative or duplicate negative to a digital format. Tinting refers to "a method of applying color to the surface of the film without altering the physical structure of the emulsion."[44] Cherchi Usai observes that when a nitrate print is tinted, the whole picture is colored unvaryingly, and the region around the perforations is also colored. Conversely, the perforated edges of a toned print are not colored and the light parts of the image are white.[45] Henceforth, it is useful to discuss the computer-assisted process of colorization during the eighties as a corollary and historical analog to re-mediation. In 1986, Ted Turner purchased nearly 3,700 MGM titles for over $1.2 billion and subsequently began color-tinting several black-and-white classics for broadcast on his Turner Broadcasting Systems (TBS) television network and release on videocassette.[46] Color-

recoding, or colorization, entails a four-step process. The colorist is responsible for carrying out each step. Also known as the telecine artist and the datacine operator, the colorist operates the telecine machine, grades or corrects the color balance in an electronic or digital image, and often (but not always) works with the director or cinematographer.[47] First, the colorist transfers the black-and-white film to videotape. Then a computer electronically scans the first frame of a given scene and partitions the frame into 525,000 "pixels." In the penultimate step, the colorist decides on the appropriate colors along the greyscale and generates an electronic palette using signals from the colored pixels. Finally, the colorist reviews the scene to determine if any colors should be changed or new ones added.[48] Colorization caused a furor amongst classical and contemporary Hollywood directors for many reasons. For instance, Arthur Asa Berger asserts that colorization ruins the realism of a black-and-white film because specific alterations are made to suit the new producer's agenda. The film transforms into a Crayola coloring book that extracts its original content.[49] Another important reason is that a majority of films are shot in black and white to express particular moods, textures, and contrasts.[50] Dorothy Nelkin cites *film noir* of the 1940s as a genre that could only accommodate black and white via its common setting of gleaming damp streets and ominous atmosphere.[51] In a similar vein, Flo Leibowitz argues that a film's mood is equally dependent on its pictorial narrative as it is by its plot and story. A narrative sequence of events may help set the film's tone but its aesthetic strategies determine its mode of expression.[52]

Colorization also involves weighty legal, ethical, and moral concerns that supersede technical matters. Proponents of colorization such as Michael Schudson and James O. Young argue that colorizing a film will not hamper the original integrity of the work if there are extant 35mm prints. Young claims that only when a single print in existence is altered can one raise an objection "because it is no longer able to express what its creator or creators intended."[53] The problem with this concession is that if a film's copyright expires (typically seventy years after its original registration), it falls into public domain and anyone can license it as a *derivative work,* or one in which the original work is "'recast, transformed, or adapted' into a new work that stands on its own."[54] What happens if a trusted and reputable video distributor, who owns the rights to an authentic, original version of a Dreyer film, loses the rights, the film goes out of print, and then a subpar company acquires them for distribution but crops the image or changes the picture's tinting and toning? Suzanne Ilene Schiller came to a similar conclusion when assessing the 1976 case, *Gilliam v. American Broadcasting Co.* Writer Terry Gilliam sued ABC for airing a truncated version of the miniseries, "Monty Python's Flying Circus," on the grounds that the edited broadcast constituted a violation of the *moral rights* of the filmmakers. The United States Court of Appeals ruled that although US copyright statutory laws only protect artists in cases of pecuniary incentive, an infringement of the appellant's creative talents occurred. Schiller argues that the *Gilliam* case applies to Section 43(a) liability of the Lanham Act when three criteria are met: (1) the presentation and exhibition of a film or program reveals substantial distortions; (2) because of the distortions, crediting the filmmaker signifies a

misrepresentation of origin; and (3) the filmmaker/artist's name is secondary or inconsequential in meaning.[55] The court also recognized that the Monty Python group had suffered the consequences of mutilation because excessive editing of the half-hour programs altered the group's "original intended creation."[56]

The value of reexamining these legal, ethical, and moral issues using the corpus of Dreyer's films on a digital format is that I will attempt to make some policy recommendations about protecting the integrity of work of authors posthumously. I would argue that if a mutilated version distorts the meaning and intent of the original film, any living principal filmmakers such as the director, cinematographer, editor, and screenwriter (if deceased, then surviving immediate family members or chief executors of the individual's estate) should have the right to remove his/her name from the credits. Specifically, I will provide a revised proposal that amends the unsuccessful Film Integrity Act (FIA) of 1987, which granted approval to the principal director and principal screenwriter for any changes made to the original film. The failed bill was claimed to have created problems for the marketing and distribution of television and videocassette releases of a film.[57] One remedial practice that has often served as a counterpoint to colorization is the process of digitizing and restoring older films, the focus of the next section.

CRITICAL METHODOLOGIES OF FILM AND DIGITAL RESTORATION

In his article on colorization, Arthur Asa Berger brings up the important concept of the technological imperative to buttress his point that a process that alters the shape of a film without the original decision makers' input should be seen as an exemplar for the misuse and

abuse of a technology. A technological imperative signifies the qualification and worthiness technology has to living up to its potential. In a utopian sense, I want to suggest that a movement like digital restoration, which germinated in the early 1980s, can fulfill the technological imperative in the best kind of ways.

The restoration of feature films in the current era coincides with the centenary of narrative filmmaking when full-length motion pictures got their start. The first part of the twenty-first century represents a crucial juncture in honoring the heritage of movies because thousands of silent films have been considered lost, especially in the US. One of the reasons that films either disappeared or perished stems from a general industry rule enforced by early Hollywood which stipulated that distributors and exhibitors should circulate no more than 300 prints of one film across the US film market.[58] In order to conserve space for storage, almost all the release prints were destroyed along with the negative once the film's theatrical run ended.[59] According to The American Film Institute Catalog of Feature Films database, 10,919 silent feature films of American origin were released through 1930.[60] David Pierce's September 2013 study, *The Survival of American Silent Feature Films: 1912–1929,* found that a mere 2,749 (25 percent) of US silent full-length pictures survive in complete form.[61] Another 562 titles (5 percent) are incomplete, which indicates that they are missing at least one reel or more.[62] A remarkable 70 percent of the remaining titles are considered to be completely lost.[63] By contrast, Dreyer's home country of Denmark took much better care of its films during the silent era. According to former Danish Film Museum curator Ib Monty, just 15–20 percent of Danish silent films are believed to be lost.[64] (Nearly all of Denmark's

sound feature films have survived.[65]) Notwithstanding the proportional differences between each nation's output of missing films, there remains thousands of films that still exist on the flammable cellulose nitrate stock which await conversion to digital intermediate (DI). This predicament presents a great exigency to save these films before decay and decomposition render them unrestorable. Meticulously restoring as many titles as possible realizes the technological imperative when the best available digital tools are utilized scrupulously and to their fullest capacity.

Since the virtual life of Dreyer's films (to paraphrase David Rodowick) is this study's focus, it is necessary to orient the reader to the critical lexicon of restoration's techniques and procedures. To "digitize" means to take analog photographic material and convert it into digital files for the means of public access.[66] Digital restoration refers to the overall set of technical and curatorial procedures designed to bring the image and sound quality back to what it was at its original premiere, or according to the intentions of its creator.[67] As Nathan Carroll puts it, digital restoration is important because of the physical transformation cinematic content undergoes in reshaping film history. He argues that the real work of historical restoration is to attempt to "recover and cage obsolescent human memories along with the associated affect of aesthetic perception."[68] In other words, restoration attempts to convince viewers *this* is the way a film was *intended* to look and this is *how* it *should* be placed within historical context.[69] This view is antithetical to the effect colorizing a black-and-white film has on the original filmmakers and audience members who first saw the picture in unfettered form. I concur with Robert N. Wilson that viewers of a certain age

bracket may feel their past betrayed because a remembered movie is part of their own personal chronology and endearing to them.[70] Digital preservation involves using current laboratory techniques to create a technological infrastructure equipped to make the "digitized" and "digitally restored" moving image permanently available for viewing.[71] Conservation consists of any activity that precludes or minimizes the decay of archived moving image material.[72]

Now that I have provided some working definitions of the basic capacities involved in digital restoration, I turn my attention to the most vital aspect facing archivists and restorers: ethics. Lindsay Kistler Mattock advocates that organizations like the Society of American Archivists (SAA) should institute an "archival code of ethics" to buttress a sense of professional identity in the field.[73] Mattock also espouses Ray Edmondson's notion that audiovisual archivists in general who work with digital records should adopt a code of ethics toward the preservation and restoration of films. Mattock believes that film archivists should ascribe to the ethical guidelines laid out by the Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) and the International Federation of Film Archives (IFFA), who highlight the veracity of the materials, their endurance and durability, restoration possibilities, and decay. Significantly, one of FIAF's sections states that "archives will seek to achieve the closest possible approximation to the original viewing experience, paying particular attention (for example) to the appropriate speed and the correct aspect ratio."[74] The notion that film restorers should maintain a code of ethics for keeping a filmmaker's original aesthetic intentions is noble and well-meaning but there are better terms to express Mattock's

sentiments. Julia Wallmüller proposes a superior model that is more specific and less cumbersome than the AMIA and IFFA guidelines.[75] According to Wallmüller, archivists should adhere to classical fine arts restoration theory. This defines a work's authenticity according to its material, structure, and all aspects of its production. An *objet d'art* also has its own individual history, function, and context as part of a social and economic sphere. Archivists should also account for big picture issues such as art-historical, film-historical, aesthetic, and artistic meanings. Over the course of time, an object inevitably shows signs of age and use and may lose some of its original characteristics. However, the ultimate goal remains to keep its authenticity intact.[76]

I agree with Wallmüller that a prerequisite for any archivist is to maintain a semblance of authenticity through compiling "predocumentation" consisting of all of the artwork's primary materials. This helps establish the project's context and restoration plan. The former elucidates the purposes for the restoration and its goals, including the project's timetable, the recruitment of appropriate personnel, and a planned outcome. The restoration team should also be well-versed in the technical and aesthetic standards of a work's time period, which includes image and sound recording technologies as well as data on postproduction and original presentation. Accumulated knowledge on these facets will behoove restorers in distinguishing between damage, errors, and defects on a print and their possible sources of origination.[77]

An archivist faces these ethical decisions on most restoration jobs. For example, Michael Pogorzelski of the Academy Film Archive grappled with a plethora of logistical

choices when restoring Akira Kurosawa's *Rashomon* (1950). Pogorzelski worked on a 1962 release print taken from the original negative and discovered that every frame had either a damage mark or artifact. When he restored the image with digital tools, the major challenge he encountered is that ultramodern algorithms have difficulty differentiating some image properties from actual damage. *Rashomon* is replete with rain scenes, scenes that feature smoke as well as trees and brush blowing, so Pogorzelski had to be careful that he did not remove any of those elements. Since algorithms designed to inspect damage can misconstrue certain pictorial features, such as mistaking raindrops for dirt, Lowry's only solution was to clean the frames manually.[78] The larger point here is that digital restoration is not an exact science and can do more harm than good to a film. Overall, both Wallmüller's theoretical model of classical restoration and Pogorzelski's experience of restoring *Rashomon* will benefit my Dreyer study by acting as templates in the assessment of digital tools used to restore Dreyer's films.

IS RESURRECTING THE "ORIGINAL FILM" AN URBAN LEGEND?

When archivists begin the process of restoring a film, they accumulate as much information as possible so they can try to replicate its original appearance. But the idea of recreating the "original film" in its purest form is just an urban legend. Archivists use the notion of an original as a mythical construct when they consolidate all the best extant elements into a simulation of what the film may have appeared like in the eyes of the first audience. The original film is actually a powerful re-mediation of thousands of original feet of film brought into the editing room after the completion of filming. Walter Benjamin

provides a classic re-mediated example with Chaplin's *A Woman of Paris: A Drama of Fate* (1923). Chaplin originally shot 410,105 feet (125,000 meters) of film but reduced the final release version to a length of 9,842 feet (nearly 3,000 meters).[79] Benjamin argues that the finished film represents the antithesis of a work crafted at a single stroke.[80] Film is an art form capable of either improvement or regression on the cutting room table. Benjamin's notion that editing can cause a drastic renunciation of a film's eternal value correlates with re-mediation's power to forever alter the original composition, makeup, and character of a film's totality.[81] When this dissertation uses "original film" to refer to a work by Dreyer, it implies a set of informed inferences surmising what the film looked like at its premiere.

CHAPTER SUMMARIES

Each chapter of the dissertation is structured around a specific topic and theme. Chapter Two, "Transitioning from Analog to Digital for Cinematic Presentations: Re-mediations of Dreyer's Early Apprentice and *Auteurist* Work," chronicles three of Dreyer's early films and his transformation from an apprentice into an *auteur*. The chapter applies the historicized notion of authorship espoused by Bazin, Schatz, and Sellors to *The President*, *Leaves from Satan's Book*, and *Love One Another*. It first argues that the near-consensus by the film public of *The President* as an apprentice work has contributed to its erratic treatment on DVD. Next, it is argued that the plethora of ways in which *Leaves* has been re-mediated undermines its place in Dreyer's *oeuvre*. Finally, Foucault's discursified author provides a key lens for reading *Love One Another*. The rediscovery of this "buried treasure" unlocks previously unrecognized aspects of Dreyer the *auteur* and other discourses in silent cinema.

Chapter Three, "Reconstruction and Its Implications for Authorship and Genre in Four Dreyer Silents," focuses on a quartet of films that required reconstructing at least one aspect of their original narratives. When put together as a complete narrative, these films transform into a recoverable text (in the Foucaultian sense) and garner discursified status alongside the *Kammerspiel*-film and the *lyrical films* of Sjöström and Stiller. The central argument is that the films' mass-produced DVDs and Blu-ray, online promotion of Dreyer retrospectives at museums and retrospectives, online video catalogs, and viral marketing all contribute to a media cultural shift in the reception of the films compared to their original releases. Although this chapter is an extension of the last section in the second chapter, the foci is on reconstruction and genre.

Chapter Four, "*The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1928)—The Changing Roles of Authors," builds on areas covered in prior chapters but sheds new light on the various roles alternative *auteurs* play in changing the form and content of *Passion*. It scrutinizes the history of versions Dreyer's experimental film has undergone in the pre-electronic and digital eras. It argues that Dreyer's death as an author occurred at the hands of commercial entrepreneur restorers and artist-restorers. It also asserts that the DVD and Blu-ray releases by the Criterion Collection and Masters of Cinema Series give the film a new life and contribute to the re-birth of Dreyer's work, but not the re-birth of him as an *auteur*.

Chapter Five, "*Vampyr* (1931)—Aura, *Sfumato,* and Decay," traces the fractured existence and resurrection of Dreyer's first sound film. While a talkie with a mono sound mix, *Vampyr* relies heavily on its *sfumato,* a painting style from the Renaissance Dreyer

borrows from to suffuse the film with a misty and smoke-filled atmosphere. The film's redolent power resides in the primacy of the image; Image's LD/DVD releases re-mediate the film by placing a black band with large white subtitles over the lower portion of the picture so the dialogue is accentuated. In applying Benjamin's theories about art and media, this chapter argues that re-mediation practices denigrate the film's visuals, rob the narrative of its alluring mystery, and desecrate its aura of atmosphere. These effects cause a genuinely authentic representation of the film to be lost on the viewer.

The last section of this final chapter presents the conclusion in several parts. It first recaps each chapter and considers the ramifications of teaching Dreyer's films in the classroom. Further, it offers policy recommendations for film studios and video distributors. Finally, it addresses the study's limitations and prescribes directions for future research in re-mediation and authorship.

Notes to CHAPTER 1

1 Jim Taylor et al., *Blu-Ray Disc Demystified* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009), 5–14.

2 Ralph LaBarge, former Managing Partner of Alpha DVD, quoted :36 seconds into John Barrett, *DVD: Disc of All Trades*, DVD to Accompany *DVD Demystified, Third Edition* (Washington, D.C.: Television Production Services, 2000).

3 Francis Ford Coppola, "2001 *Apocalypse Now Redux* Cannes Press Conference," DVD (Region 2 PAL) (Paris: Fox Pathé Europa, 2002).

4 Giovanna Fossati, *From Grain to Pixel: The Archival Life of Film in Transition*, Framing Film (Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 192.

5 Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, 1999), 5.

6 Ibid., 11.

7 Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 33; Bolter et al., "New Media and the Permanent Crisis of Aura," *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 12 (February 2006): 32, doi:10.1177/1354856506061550.

8 Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 33–34.

9 Margaret Mackey, *Literacies Across Media: Playing the Text*, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 103.

10 Ibid.

11 Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 19.

12 David Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, vol. 1, Indiana University Press Filmguide Series 1 (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1973), 7.

13 Tony Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC: Textual Variations in the Key Prints of Carl Dreyer's Film," *Film History: An International Journal* 2 (November-December 1988): 307.

14 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981), xi.

15 “Master of the House,” *The Criterion Collection*, 2014, https://www.criterion.com/films/27804-master-of-the-house.

16 Andrew Sarris, “Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962,” *Film Culture*, no. 27 (Winter 1962–63): 7.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

19 Sarris quoted in Marion Wolberg Weiss, “A Film By...,” *The Independent* 21 (March 1998): 31.

20 André Bazin, “La Politique des Auteurs,” in *The New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, ed. Peter John Graham (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968), 142.

21 Ibid.

22 Schatz draws from primary sources like interoffice memos, budgets, schedules, daily production reports, story conference notes, censorship files, corporate correspondence, and other materials to build his case that producers were the true *auteurs*, not directors. He argues that filmmakers with a high degree of authority and a specific style (e.g., Ford, Hawks, Capra, and Hitchcock) only exerted control over script development, casting, and editing in their (often uncredited) capacity as producers, not as directors. See Schatz, *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988), 3–4.

23 Ibid., 6.

24 John Caughie, ed., “Preface,” in *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*, BFI Readers in Film Studies (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 1.

25 C. Paul Sellors, *Film Authorship: Auteurs and Other Myths*, Short Cuts 47 (London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2010), 5.

26 Ibid., 75.

27 Ibid., 126.

28 Roland Barthes, *Image, Music, Text*, trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1977), 143.

29 Ibid., 145.

30 Ibid., 142.

31 Ibid., 146.

32 Ibid., 148.

33 Ibid.

34 Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?," in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard, trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977), 118–19.

35 Ibid., 121.

36 Ibid., 128.

37 Ibid., 134.

38 Casper Tybjerg and Thomas C. Christensen, "The Restoration of Dreyer's *Der var engang*," *Journal of Film Preservation* 67 (June 2004): 31–36.

39 Erika Mae Olbricht, "Constructing the Dead Author: Postmodernism's Rhetoric of Death," in *Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 146 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 73.

40 Ibid., 76.

41 For example, see Apperley, 2006; Kirchoff, 2012; Mallapragada, 2010; and Poremba, 2007.

42 See Merolla's (2009) analysis of two African "epic" films that retell creation myths from oral traditions and re-mediate different genres such as the youth tale and the cosmic father-son struggle.

43 Bolter and Grusin, *Remediation*, 147.

44 Paolo Cherchi Usai, "The Color of Nitrate: Some Factual Observations on Tinting and Toning Manuals for Silent Films," *Image* 34 (Spring/Summer 1991): 33.

45 Ibid., 36.

46 Timothy W. Luke, "Reel Rehab: The Political Economy of Colorization," *Art Papers* 11 (April 1987): 70.

47 Jim Taylor, Mark R. Johnson, and Charles G. Crawford, *DVD Demystified*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006), G–33, 16–5; Leo Douglas Graham Enticknap, *Film Restoration: The Culture and Science of Audiovisual Heritage* (England and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 167.

48 Elise K. Bader, "A Film of a Different Color: Copyright and the Colorization of Black and White Films," *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 5 (1986): 503–04.

49 Arthur Asa Berger, "Film Technology's Latest Frankenstein," *Society* 24 (June 1987): 13.

50 Luke, "Reel Rehab," 71.

51 Dorothy Nelkin, "Show and Sell," *Society* 24 (June 1987): 16.

52 Flo Leibowitz, "Movie Colorization and the Expression of Mood," *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 49 (Fall 1991): 363–65, doi:10.2307/431036.

53 James O. Young, "In Defence of Colourization," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 28 (Autumn 1988): 369, doi:10.1093/bjaesthetics/28.4.368.

54 Copyright law statute cited in William S. Strong, "Legal Shadings," *Society* 24 (June 1987): 20.

55 Suzanne Ilene Schiller, "Black and White and Brilliant: Protecting Black-and-White Films from Color-Recoding," *Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal* 9 (Spring 1987): 535.

56 Lewis Segal, "A Once-Silent Joan of Arc Now Hears 'Voices,'" *Los Angeles Times*, August 19, 1995, sec. Entertainment, 535, http://articles.latimes.com/1995-08-19/entertainment/ca-36863_1_silent-film.

57 See David A. Honicky, "Film Labelling as a Cure for Colorization [and Other Alterations]: A Band-Aid for a Hatchet Job," *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 12, no. 2 (1994): 409–30.

58 Vinzenz Hediger, "The Original Is Always Lost: Film History, Copyright Industries and the Problem of Reconstruction," in *Cinephilia: Movies, Love, and Memory*, ed. Marijke de Valck and Malte Hagener, Film Culture in Transition (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 141, Available at https://www.academia.edu/1260985/The_Original_Is_Always_Lost_Film_History_Copyright_Industries_and_the_Problem_of_Reconstruction.

59 Ibid.

60 Cited in David Pierce, *The Survival of American Silent Feature Films: 1912–1929*, CLIR Publication 158 (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources and The Library of Congress, 2013), 1, Available at http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub158/pub158.pdf.

61 Ibid., 2.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid., 1

64 Ib Monty, "Life with Nitrate," in *This Film Is Dangerous: A Celebration of Nitrate Film*, ed. Roger Smither and Catherine A. Surowiec (Brussels, Belgium: International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF), 2002), 7.

65 Ibid.

66 Paolo Cherchi Usai, "The Conservation of Moving Images," *Studies in Conservation* 55 (December 2010): 252.

67 Cinetech founder Sean Coughlin quoted in Russell Shaw, "Returning Quality to Classic Film," *World & I*, May 1994, 184+; Usai, "The Conservation of Moving Images," 252.

68 Nathan Carroll, "Unwrapping Archives: DVD Restoration Demonstrations and the Marketing of Authenticity," *The Velvet Light Trap: A Critical Journal of Film & Television* (Fall 2005): 18.

69 Ibid, 23 (italics in the original).

70 Robert N. Wilson, "Green and Other Colors," *Society* 24 (June 1987): 22.

71 Coughlin cited in Shaw, "Returning Quality to Classic Film," 184+; Usai, "The Conservation of Moving Images," 252.

72 Julia Wallmüller, "Criteria for the Use of Digital Technology in Moving Image Restoration," *The Moving Image* 7 (Spring 2007): 79, doi:10.1353/mov.2007.0032.

73 Lindsay Kistler Mattock, "From Film Restoration to Digital Emulation: The Archival Code of Ethics in the Age of Digital Reproduction," *Journal of Information Ethics* 19 (Spring 2010): 74–85, doi:10.3172/JIE.19.1.74.

74 FIAF quoted in Ibid., 77.

75 Wallmüller, “Criteria for...”

76 Ibid., 80.

77 Ibid., 83.

78 Rachael K. Bosley, “The State of the Art: An Update,” *American Cinematographer*, December 2008, 78.

79 Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version,” in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Harry Zohn, vol. 3, 1935–38, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 109.

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid.

CHAPTER 2

Transitioning from Analog to Digital for Cinematic Presentations: Re-mediations of Dreyer's Early Apprentice and *Auteurist* Work

INTRODUCTION

In his watershed essay, "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962," the late film critic Andrew Sarris identifies the interior meaning (i.e., fêting the cinema as an art form) that is manifested from the tension between a director's personality and his/her material as one of three premises of the *auteur* theory. He maintains Truffaut's notion that interior meaning measures "the temperature of the director on the set."[1] Sarris argues that great directors are capable of overcoming business regulations and financial limitations imposed on them by their employers.

Those barriers are more difficult to overcome in today's oversaturated market of digital media. DVD and Blu-ray production companies, particularly specialty labels, are the decision-makers who take into account matters of art and commerce when deciding which films to release to the public. Based on profits and consumer interest, they determine whether the disc they remaster is by an *auteur* whose movie will sell to a niche market. These comprise films by celebrated directors whose place in the canon is already established. However, films directed by folks that I call the *no-teurs*, relegated directors whose pictures are rarely shown, may not receive the same deluxe restoration as their counterparts. Curators of art museums and film institutes endorse the same inclusionary/exclusionary process as video distributors do. They also use a selection criteria that fêtes works that are part of an

auteurist enterprise. It makes it easier for curators to show them because an *auteur* has a recognizable name and a built-in fan base. Galleries and museums also house films by the *no-teurs*. These titles are buried in a storeroom somewhere or consigned to a film vault. This is not to suggest that the films or their makers are unimportant. Rather curators prioritize their screenings based on audiences' cinematic tastes or their preference for certain *auteurs*.

The late archivist Sam Kula explains this dilemma in more detail:

> Moving image archivists collecting film as art rather than record face similar problems in freeing themselves from the accepted canon of great works now the subject of study in the universities. These films, more often than not, are simply the works that have been accessible for academic research in the past quarter century. Because they are acknowledged by scholars as important works, and are by established *auteurs*, copies of these titles, even inferior copies, tend to receive priority for preservation, exhibition, and restoration if necessary. They represent a fraction of the films that are now held in archives, and an even smaller fraction of the films that are still held in private hands.[2]

Carl Dreyer's films from his early silent years fall somewhere between the *auteur* and *no-teur* spectrum. Although Dreyer has long been acclaimed as a genuine *auteur*, several of his early works have been rarely screened, seen at all, or treated mediocrely. This chapter applies the structural model of authorship discussed in the prospectus to three of Dreyer's early films: *The President*, *Leaves from Satan's Book*, and *Love One Another*. I first argue

that the near-consensus by the film public of *The President* as an apprentice work has contributed to its erratic treatment on DVD.

Few film projects better illustrate the tenet from Sarris's *auteur* theory that opened this chapter than *Leaves*. The next section undertakes a qualitative analysis of *Leaves*, exploring how and why it is such a misunderstood film. I argue that the myriad of ways in which the film has been redone undermines its place in Dreyer's *oeuvre*. Additionally, reader-reception criticism reveals that D. W. Griffith and his film *Intolerance* has usurped authorship from Dreyer's film. Finally, I examine *Love One Another* which I argue is a "buried treasure" that unlocks previously unrecognized aspects of Dreyer the *auteur* and other discourses in silent cinema. In this chapter, I probe a key question: what transpires to film when it is transferred to analog, optical, and digital media platforms?

EARLY BEGINNINGS AT NORDISK

Dreyer's entry into filmmaking during the early 1910s coincided with the rise of the studio (e.g., Biograph, Gaumont, et. al) and the transition from multi-reel to feature-length films (i.e., sixty minutes or longer). In 1912, Dreyer began writing scripts for the film studio, Det Skandinavisk-Russiske Handelshus (The Scandinavian-Russian Company). His script, *Bryggerens Datter* (The Brewer's Daughter), won acclaim and caught the attention of Nordisk's managing director, Frede Skaarup (1881–1942), who hired Dreyer to write titles for its studio's films.[3] Launched in the fall of 1906 by amusement park owner Ole Olsen (1863–1943),[4] Nordisk Films Kompagni emerged as one of the largest film firms in the world, trailing only the French companies Pathé Frères and Gaumont in production output.[5]

Dreyer blossomed into a prolific scenarist at Nordisk, writing no less than thirty-one scripts, twenty of which got made.[6] In addition to assisting some of the company's contract directors with cutting their films, Dreyer assumed several other responsibilities at Nordisk. He became a literary adviser, a talent scout, and a procurer of literary authors' material for use in films.[7] Despite his productivity in various capacities, Dreyer grew restless and yearned for a directing job.

FIRST FILM: AN APPRENTICESHIP

In a letter dated October 31, 1917, Dreyer writes to Harald Frost (1884–1942), the manager at Nordisk's head office in Copenhagen, declaring that he deserves a promotion for his accumulation of work at the studio: "I'm willing to stand aside my position to one more talented. One says that when a man has been 5 years in his job, either one must let him be promoted or else get rid of him. I wonder if my 5 years have expired?"[8] As a reward for his diligence, Nordisk let Dreyer make his own film. For his debut as director, Dreyer chose Karl-Emil Franzos's (1848–1904) novel, *Der Präsident* (The Chief Justice, first published 1890), which he had purchased the rights to as a literary consultant.[9] He adapted a work that either literary critics in the late nineteenth century or the present would consider mediocre, second- or third-tier literature.[10] Principal photography commenced on May 4, 1918 and finished on July 9. Dreyer presented a final, tinted cut to Nordisk's management on August 11.[11] While the film enjoyed a world premiere in Sweden in February 1919, it did not receive a domestic premiere until a year later at the Panoptikon Cinema in Copenhagen.[12] No one, including Dreyer, seemed to know why Nordisk or Danish exhibitors delayed the film.[13]

The President (produced 1918, Danish premiere 1920) tells the multigenerational story of bourgeois patriarchs named the von Sendlingen's and their association with women in nineteen-century Austria. The film's title character Karl Victor von Sendlingen (Halvard Hoff), President of the Court, learns that he will preside over a case involving his illegitimate daughter, Victorine Lippert (Olga Raphael-Linden), who stands trial for infanticide. Dreyer explores Karl's family ties and the repercussions they have on his case through a series of flashbacks.

In making a faithful adaptation of Franzos's novel, Dreyer searches for his identity as an *auteur*. However, he does break new ground in some areas such as editing and casting against type. For instance, Dreyer was one of the few directors in the silent years to radically shift a narrative's space-time relationship around through flashbacks. He also atypically chose actors from outside Nordisk and did not require them to wear makeup. Despite these encouraging signs, Dreyer struggles to find his personality as a director. In a 1966 interview with *Cahiers du Cinéma*, Dreyer admits to Michel Delahaye that he made *The President* "as a study and for the experience….[it] was also a film of apprenticeship."[14] Dreyer's formative years at Nordisk are comparable to Charlie Chaplin's years at Keystone Studios. In his recent book, *Early Charlie Chaplin: The Artist as Apprentice at Keystone Studios*, James L. Neibaur defines Chaplin's apprenticeship as the period where the Tramp learned how to translate his stage act to the screen and came to understand the techniques of film direction.[15]

Although they regarded Dreyer as an *auteur*, the *Cahiers du Cinema* critics François Truffaut and André Bazin would probably brand the Dane an apprentice based on *The*

President. Using the criteria presented in *Cahiers*, one could easily label Dreyer a *metteur en scène*, or filmmaker who exhibits the technical competence to uphold a particular film studio or industry's "Tradition of Quality" but fails to demonstrate his/her own authorial signature. As Edward Buscombe gleans from Bazin's review of the film adaptation of Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*, John Huston is a director who has "no truly personal style." In other words, not a true *auteur*.[16] Likewise, Truffaut asserts that scriptwriters and directors associated with the French film industry's "Tradition of Quality" fail to exhibit any unique talents or personal expression to the works that they bring to the screen.[17] Dreyer's first time directing a film was an on-the-job learning experience and he was obligated to continue Nordisk's production line of formula melodramas.

NORDIC MELODRAMA

Dreyer worked in an era of silent cinema in which Danish pictures fell under the category of Nordic melodrama, often containing romantic moments and erotic elements. Peter Urban Gad's *Afgrunden* (The Abyss) introduced the Danish erotic melodrama in 1910 and the following year, Nordisk chose to produce almost exclusive feature-length films in this genre.[18] The genre features a melodramatic story, strong love scenes with long drawn-out kisses and social barriers which the young protagonists have to fight against (the male belongs to the upper middle classes, the female to the lower middle classes).[19] One of the last films of the genre,[20] *The President* shares these attributes. Karl, his father Franz (Elith Pio), and Karl's grandfather (Carl Meyer) all come through an upper middle-class family. By contrast, Franz's wife is the daughter of a gamekeeper. Victorine is reduced from a governess

to the lower class after she is thrown off the land owned by a countess. Moreover, Dreyer's camera accents romantic encounters between interclass couples. For example, he films a high-angle tight shot of Karl kissing the governess of his uncle's daughter on a bridge. Dreyer biographers Dale Drum and Jean Drum encapsulate these aspects well: "*The President* is the most visually erotic [Dreyer] made, dealing as it does with illicit love and children borne out of wedlock in three generations. It also contains the only live nudity found in any of his films."[21]

Dreyer's film also fulfills Heide Schlüpmann's edict that a melodrama will subordinate everything to the requirements of dramatic structure.[22] Dreyer's screen version of *The Chief Justice* is self-reflexive of a literary text because the film begins and ends with images of a book being opened and closed. *The President* may even be described as "filmed literature." As Bordwell observes in his book on Dreyer, "the book" *is* the film and ensures teleology of closure.[23] Karl uses his power as a judge to have Victorine released from her cell. He lies to Victorine that her attorney's appeal for a commuted sentence was granted. Karl flees and while traveling abroad in secrecy, he returns to the same town three years later to confess his "crime" to the new President. When he discovers there will be no reprimand, Karl returns to his forefathers' castle (where he walked with his father at the beginning of the film) and plunges to his death from atop a high wall.

Despite *The President*'s melodramatic tendencies, Dreyer shows promise in his choice of casting. Dreyer broke with tradition when he cast old people to play old parts. (It was common currency to make up young actors to appear old.) For example, Hallander

Hellemann and Fanny Petersen (wife of a theatre manager) were of age to play the roles.[24] According to Elith Pio, who played Franz Victor, Dreyer's directing methods were atypical in that he informed the actors beforehand of his observations and opinions of specific scenes.[25] He also was the first director at Nordisk to read entire scenes aloud to his actors.[26] Strong rehearsals, however, do not always translate well in front of the camera. The acting in *The President* is very stylized and commonly demonstrates highfalutin performances. As the late British film critic Tom Milne points out, "...the net result is barely distinguishable from all the other tearful melodramas being manufactured in Denmark as elsewhere at the time."[27] Milne also argues that "the acting is mainly a matter of rolling eyes and wild gesticulation, not helped by Dreyer's clumsy attempts to imitate [D. W.] Griffith's more skittish moments."[28] Not until the film was completed did Dreyer realize "with a certain cold horror" that the acting was in the conventional melodramatic style spurned by journalist Frejlif Olsen and other Danish art critics of the time.[29] In a 1947 interview with French film critic Judith Podselver, Dreyer concedes that he focused more on aesthetics than monitoring performances: "I was too busy with material problems to think of directing. I let the actors do what they liked. Later I saw my mistakes on the screen and learned my lesson. That's how one learns to direct."[30] He later added, "I was more interested in the composition of the image."[31]

One area, however, that Dreyer separates himself from his Danish contemporaries and even Griffith is the use of an innovative flashback structure. The decision to employ this narrative strategy was probably dictated by the extensive interior monologues and soliloquies

in Franzos's novel, which Dreyer visualizes through intertitles of characters' letters. Dreyer integrates flashbacks within flashbacks (preceding Luis Buñuel by several decades) to unify the ancestral lineage of the Viktor family, who are the story's centerpiece. It is true that Dreyer employs the conventional device of characters reading letters from the other characters via close-ups or intertitles, but he does it in a fresh way. I disagree with Milne that Dreyer deliberately attempts to persuade the audience to manufacture emotions by building the story up through elaborate flashbacks that he borrowed from Griffith. Through his experience of working as a scriptwriter and designer of title cards from 1912–1917, Dreyer had a solid understanding of the film medium. Former Museum of Modern Art curator Eileen Bowser argues that Dreyer demonstrates complete control of the language of film in *The President*.[32] She praises the excitement Dreyer generates from the *fakkeltog* (torchlight parade), his use of crosscutting between the town's titular character and incarcerated daughter, and his choices of décor to fit characters in profile for interior scenes.[33] In sum, Dreyer worked in the established genre of Danish melodrama and was limited by his source material but showed budding signs of an *auteur* by ushering in some dynamic narrative devices that helped him get the opportunity to direct a second film.

RE-MEDIATING *THE PRESIDENT*

The Danish Film Institute's (DFI) 2005 DVD of *The President* remains the only video copy of Dreyer's debut available either in the commercial marketplace or outside the public domain. The disc uses Marguerite Engberg's 1999 restoration of the film as the basis for its digital transfer. When casual fans of silent cinema read about Engberg's methods for

restoring the picture,[34] they may have a positive inkling that she correctly implemented Nordisk's "naturalistic" colors for tinting images: light amber for daylight exteriors, amber for interiors, blue for nighttime exteriors and red for fire and neon signs.[35] However, the image only superficially preserves the original color palette due to a low image resolution. Engberg's print is encoded at 720x576 pixels and the interlaced transfer resembles the quality of a worn videocassette.

Worse, the disc uses a small "script" font size for the dual-language (Danish and English) intertitles, which are hard to read while the film is running. Writing about Dreyer's last five works, Bordwell states: "…the problems posed by the films block any immediate consumption…All the characteristic pressures toward disunity operate not only to 'crack the film apart at the seams' but also to keep it from being assimilated to contemporary aesthetic standards." In *The President*, Dreyer presents problems for viewers watching his debut for the first time because of the constant flow of narration exchanged between various characters. The DFI DVD constitutes one of Bordwell's "unconsumable" texts, cinematic works that reach the "information overload" pole with too much visual stimuli for viewers to absorb and too little repetition for them to gain equal footing.[36] The disc's presentation multiplies difficulty for viewers on the levels of narrative comprehension and perceptual ability to read the title cards. The font's off-white is not very pronounced on the intertitles'

black background. Additionally, some of the letters are displayed in old-fashioned cursive and use a calligraphic style. The shimmer and chroma noise hinder the words' legibility.[1]

The DFI's motley treatment of transferring *The President* to DVD reveals a film institute's ecumenical and curatorial priorities. On a financial level, a frame-by-frame restoration of Dreyer's debut could prove prohibitively expensive without sufficient donor funds. In the order of importance of an *auteur*'s canon, the DFI seems to rank *The President* relatively low, with a majority judging it as an apprentice work.[37] Thus, a correlation exists between a film's critical value and the amount of technical labor a *cinematheque* puts into restoring it for public consumption. The DFI would shift its priorities for their DVD release of Dreyer's next film, *Leaves from Satan's Book*.

THE BIRTH OF AN *AUTEUR*

Blade af Satans Bog (Leaves from Satan's Book, produced 1919, Danish premiere 1921) moves in chronological order to follow Satan's temptations of humankind across four historical epochs: Jerusalem thirty years after the birth of Christ, the Spanish Inquisition, the French Revolution, and the contemporary civil war between the Russians and Finns. With the possible exception of his Swedish minimalist chamber drama, *Two People* (1945), Dreyer's *Leaves* is perhaps the most misunderstood film of his career. Since its domestic release in

---

1 As a corrective, I have created a table (**APPENDIX**) containing transcriptions of all the characters' letters that are displayed on intertitles. My purpose is to provide viewers with an accessible, handy guide so they can follow the story's progression more easily. I have noted the DVD's time codes where each letter is displayed on the screen. Barring a new digital restoration of *The President*, this should be helpful in navigating through the narrative. This **APPENDIX** has been published on the DFI's website: http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Praesidenten/Transcription-of-letters.aspx

1921, critics predominantly cite *Leaves* as a work resembling D. W. Griffith's *Intolerance* (1916). This section examines the comparisons between the two films and attempts to revise the notion that *Leaves* is a European simulacrum of *Intolerance*. In addition, Dreyer's second feature exposes a battle over creativity that includes alleged compromises between Dreyer and his superiors, contradictions in decision-making, and artistic controversies within the early Danish film industry.

When he made *Leaves from Satan's Book* (hereafter cited as *Leaves*), Dreyer chose the subject, cast nearly all parts, re-wrote portions of playwright Edgard Høyer's (1859–1942) original screenplay, and designed the sets.[38] *Leaves* is the first film in which Dreyer truly found himself. For instance, his direction of actors and choreography of scripted material improved on *The President*. Clara Pontopiddan, who portrays Siri in the film, did not like the way Dreyer framed large close-ups because it did not give her a chance to act out at someone. However, Dreyer knew exactly what he wanted to get out of his actors at the time. He wanted them to avoid the pitfalls of melodramatic overacting in favor of the best possibilities for expression.[39] In his "Selvbiografisk notat" (Autobiographical note, 1939), Dreyer writes that he devoted closer study to acting and montage/editing than his first film.[40] Dreyer also mentions that he worked for the first time with a mobile camera, both vertically and horizontally, that glides to a close-up of the cadre of Red Guards in *Leaves*' last episode.[41] Further, the experience of making the film established the preparatory process and working methods that Dreyer would apply for the rest of his career. Artistic collaborator Preben Thomsen recalls that while working with Dreyer on a screenplay inspired by

Euripides's *Medea,* the Danish director amassed a voluminous collection of materials on the project and arranged them "as if in preparation for a thesis."[42] Dreyer spent several months in libraries locating drawings and photographs apropos to *Leaves*' four periods.[43]

Dreyer composes *Leaves* in a series of tableaux and moving images reminiscent of frescos during the Renaissance. One may even argue that each is analogous to a symphonic movement. Indeed, there is a certain musicality to the images. One thinks of the two aristocrats playing cello and harp in the music room at Chambord Castle during the French Revolution section. The speed in which the film is projected was also of central importance to Dreyer. Dreyer borrows characteristics from Joseph Conrad's and Ford Madox Ford's literary device called *progression d'effet*. This narrative strategy necessitates that as the story moves forward, it must sweep along faster and faster with greater intensity.[44] *Leaves* is a work comprised of four episodes so as each develops, pacing becomes increasingly important.

The purpose of this section is not to defend Dreyer as an artist or offer a reappraisal of the film (although it may do both), but to provide scholars in media arts with a structural model of authorship that examines the contributions to an *objet d'art*. What actually transpired over the course of *Leaves*' making and its releases? This section pieces together a history—for the first time—of all known events that occurred from the project's origin to its reception in the early 1920s to the present.

SORTING OUT ISSUES OF AUTHORSHIP

While *Leaves* holds a distinction as the only title in Dreyer's filmography not adapted from a novel or a play, the author of its "text" is still disputed with several content producers vying for control of its creative center. For many years, film scholars believed Høyer and later Dreyer used Marie Corelli's (1855–1924) novel, *The Sorrows of Satan* (1895), as a basis for *Leaves*. However, recent archival research by Casper Tybjerg reveals that Corelli's work bears little resemblance to any of Høyer and Dreyer's screenplays or the finished film.[45] The only similarity between the novel and the film is Satan's portrayal as a secret agent for God.[46] In both versions, Satan drifts across earth tempting humankind to commit evil sins. If a victim succumbs to his wishes, Satan receives punishment from God. However, if one of his targets refuses, Satan is relieved of any penalty. Outside of this underlying premise, there is no connection between *The Sorrows of Satan* and *Leaves*. Tybjerg notes via Dreyer biographer Maurice Drouzy that "Dreyer crossed out the words 'based on a novel by Marie Corelli' in a handout written by Erik Ulrichsen for a [Danish] Film Museum presentation of the film."[47]

While Dreyer and Høyer share a screenwriting credit, the two men essentially wrote separate scripts at different periods.[48] Long before filming began on *The President* in May 1918,[49] Høyer started developing *Leaves* as a potential feature film as early as 1913.[50] Høyer even recorded the exact time of day that he finished the script: 9:45 o'clock on September 12, 1913.[51] However, Nordisk rejected Høyer's screenplay in late October 1913 and addressed a brief cover letter to the Danish Dramatists' Association informing the guild of its decision.[52]

Leaves sat on the shelf for nearly five years until Nordisk approved it in the spring of 1918.[53] Dreyer joined the project after making final edits to *The President* later that summer. In a letter dated November 20, 1918, Dreyer writes to Harald Frost that *Leaves* is "quite important" to him and will consume his "livelihood for a year."[54] Here Dreyer also raises concern about many unspecified objections that Høyer has to his contractual terms on the film but expresses hope that any misunderstandings can be resolved.[55] Acknowledging that he received two amicable letters from Frost, Dreyer writes back over a week later to say that he is in agreement with the shooting conditions for the film.[56] Dreyer also encloses his rough draft manuscript for the film and requests that Frost return it once he has read it.

The set of letters exchanged between Dreyer and Frost in January 1919 begins to reveal how both Høyer and Dreyer stake authorship claims to *Leaves*. In letters dated Jan. 3, 1919 and Jan. 21, 1919, Dreyer sends Frost a copy of Høyer's original script as well his own manuscript.[57] (Dreyer also informs Nordisk's managing director, Wilhelm Stæhr, of his request on Jan. 21.[58]) Dreyer tells Frost that he is open to adding items. Frost's reply on Jan. 4, 1919 is terse but upbeat: "I have with great pleasure read [your] four sections of 'Satan's Book' to-day [*sic*] and would very much like to talk to you about it."[59] Notwithstanding the cordial working relationship between Dreyer and Frost, significant tension emerges between Høyer and Dreyer's treatments of the Russian-Finnish episode. Høyer recounts in an interview published on Jan. 12, 1920 in the Copenhagen daily newspaper *B.T.* that he considers *Leaves* to be "his film."[60] Nearly a year later, an article subheading in Copenhagen's other paper *Politiken* refers to *Leaves* as "Edgard Høyer's big film."[61]

Dreyer's script, however, toned down the anticommunist aspect found in Høyer's script and remains closest to the resulting film.[62]

STUDIO POLITICS AND STUDIO POLICIES

Dreyer's desire to become a filmmaker of autonomy and clout contrasted with the more subservient role Nordisk cast on its contract directors. More specifically, Dreyer's artistic and creative impulses conflicted with the conservative and autocratic methods espoused by his studio's Board of Directors. For instance, in a December 19, 1918 letter to Frost, Dreyer chastises Stæhr for "his unrelenting hatred to everything young and new."[63] Dreyer also chides Stæhr for using a "dictator tone" that blindly persecutes him and fellow director August Sandberg: "…he tried to drive a wedge between the other directors and us and he will probably continue with this politics."[64] In the letter, Dreyer brings up two indeterminate "conflict matters" from a meeting where Stæhr claimed that he would present material to the general manager to prove that Dreyer was a liar.[65]

Dreyer's sentiments about the hierarchical authority and bureaucratic control Stæhr and other Nordisk executives/administrators exerted over their workers are echoed elsewhere. In his memoir, *Filmens Eventyr og mit eget* (The adventure of film and my own, 1940), Nordisk founder Ole Olsen describes an unidentified "Mr. F," apparently a high-ranking employee at his studio, as an *overdommer* or "Super Judge" (an individual who arrogantly thinks that he can set himself up as a judge over everybody else).[66] Olsen recounts that when Stæhr moved from the Free Port laboratory to the production studios in Valby, Mr. F likened Stæhr's behavior to a circus ringmaster: "[Stæhr] charged into a circus where he

stood in the middle with his whip while all the once so free and jolly and eager employees at the honor and fame of Nordisk Film now trotted around under his whip lashes, embittered and full of hatred to the work they used to love."[67] Mr. F's analogy is especially enlightening as it pertains to a premonition Dreyer had of Stæhr while prepping *Leaves*: "This summer I will have a job that is *many, many* times bigger than I expected it. I shudder at the thought that manager Stæhr besides that will try to pain me with his pinpricks. Well, we will see!"[68]

These revelations portray a far different relationship between Stæhr and Dreyer compared to the mentor/protégé kinship the pair enjoyed circa 1915–1917 when Stæhr was technical director in the editing department where Dreyer served as his loyal assistant. In a 1967 interview, Dreyer recalls those years fondly: "Stæhr was a wonderful man. I liked him very much. What he knew, he learned from experience, not from books, and I learned it from him."[69] Dreyer's bond with Stæhr, however, broke during filming of *The President*. When Stæhr visited the set one day, Dreyer "became enraged and flatly refused to continue any shooting until Stæhr was off his set."[70] Dreyer wanted to work on his own and refused any interference with the newfound freedom he sought as a director.

In light of his strained relationship with Stæhr and consternation to his superior's meddlesome ways, it is understandable why Dreyer's lengthy March 23, 1919 letter to Stæhr carries a sharp, defiant tone. From the outset, Dreyer asserts bluntly that *Leaves* is "the best manuscript Nordisk Films Kompagni has ever had its hands on. It is also my honest conviction that from this manuscript a unique film could arise, that would serve as a glory to Nordisk Films Kompagni and contribute to regaining the company its lost reputation."[71]

Dreyer tries to turn the tables on Stæhr. Instead of taking orders from his managing director, Dreyer dictates them through a set of demands. For example, while preparing for a trip to Stockholm where he plans to recruit actors to play parts in *Leaves*, Dreyer delineates ten items that he wants Nordisk to provide him with or else he will hand over his proposal to an unnamed Swedish studio. These items include scripts, actor contracts, set design and props drawings, a production plan, and various lists of business expenditures. [72] Dreyer closes his letter with a curt request:

> On the assumption that my proposal is met with approval by the Director General [Ole Olsen], I ask you to procure the above mentioned material so that I can have it at latest Tuesday afternoon at 4 o'clock. The material must be accompanied by a letter in which the management declares its willingness to agree to the proposed agreement within 8 days. *This commitment from N.F.K. must be absolutely binding.* I have now briefly and clearly, as I know you appreciate, explained what my proposal to the company is all about. I think the advantage in the proposal is that it satisfies both the company and me, and I thank you for your promise to recommend the proposal to the Director General.[73]

Besides demonstrating Dreyer's vigilance to have things done his way, the letter also reveals Dreyer as the consummate *auteur*. "[N]ever previously in this country has there been presented such a preliminary work to any film, and never before has a director been so well prepared for his direction of the film that I am now…I have left nothing to others, I have

done everything myself."[74] Dreyer asks Stæhr to inform Olsen that he spent months in the library doing research "to find every detail for my set design," procured animals months in advance, and scoured Copenhagen to find extras for the film's Spanish section.[75] Dreyer also reminds Stæhr that he is judicious when it comes to working within a budget: "…I have every shot I want to do printed in my memory…my manuscripts are so complete and thoroughly prepared that nothing is superfluous, unnecessary or random. The pictures create an organic entity."[76] Moreover, Dreyer attempts to set himself apart from directors who make a *useful* film (Dreyer equates this with a 3rd or 4th rank film and even a *bad* film) versus those (i.e., *auteurs*) who make a *standard* film (a work of film art). He stipulates that *Leaves* is to be filmed "with the most careful consideration to all artistic demands."[77] The tenor of this letter matches a January 1920 article Dreyer wrote for *Dagbladet* (Copenhagen *Daily-Blade*) where the 30-year-old filmmaker compared the Danish film industry to factories: "For in Denmark films have always been *manufactured*."[78] As opposed to assembly-line films, Dreyer aims for the *standard* film.

The March 23rd letter set off a chain reaction between Nordisk and Dreyer concerning the film's budget. Olsen replies the next day to tell Dreyer that he seems to have misunderstood the situation and "put the card before the horse."[79] In his letter to Stæhr, Dreyer had insisted that *Leaves* be made on a budget no cheaper than 230,000 –235,000 kroner. Olsen, however, rebuffs those figures and goes through a series of contractual agreements he had with Dreyer. According to Olsen, Dreyer initially agreed to do the film for roughly 100,000 kroner, accepted a budget of 120,000 kroner in a November 23, 1918 letter,

and then confirmed that agreement in another letter five days later.[80] For a company to commit almost 240,000 kroner to a single film would run too high of a financial risk, Olsen reasons. Although Olsen is unwilling to cover Dreyer's inflated amount, he agrees to increase the original budget to 150,000 kroner. But he issues Dreyer an ultimatum: "[S]hould you deny to fulfill your obligations, according to our agreement, and refuse to budge from your demands, we of course must make you responsible for all the consequences, as we at the same time reserve the right to make other arrangements regarding the film, as we see fit with our interests."[81]

The following day, Dreyer consults with his lawyer and confirms that in November 1918, he accepted Nordisk's "economical grounds/instructions" and henceforth "*in every circumstance*" is obligated to direct *Leaves*.[82] Dreyer, however, still believes that he does not have financial leeway to experiment with an ambitious production: "In the presence of your warning remark, that you intend to make me responsible, if I still deny to shoot the film, I must face the facts, because my conditions do not allow me to take any risks by subjecting myself to a compensation claim of 70,000–100,000 kroner."[83] The letter contains a startling statement by Dreyer that seems to imply his ostensive removal from the project: "I though solemnly renounce every responsibility for the finished film."[84] Olsen writes back the next day to remind Dreyer of two December 1918 meetings in which Nordisk's directors learn that they have to adhere to a specific shooting sum based on estimates the studio allots to individual productions.[85] Inferring that Dreyer will cede control of the film to others because his budget demands have gone unmet, Olsen annuls their agreement: "[W]e, considering how

the circumstances have developed, do not dare to let you shoot such a costly film."[86] On the same day (March 26), Dreyer responds to Olsen to clarify a "regrettable misunderstanding":

> [I]f the company were to decide on a large number of changes in the present manuscript and then hand the changed manuscript to me for filming, then I could of course not take on the responsibility for the film. However[,] I have been given proof from a conversation with Mister Managing Director Stæhr, that the practice with the changes of the manuscript certainly will be made as I suggest them…in a way that I am not only consulted but furthermore will have the opportunity to approve the necessary changes. Under such conditions as a matter of course I will willingly take over the responsibility for the film as before – it's only fair.[87]

A day later, Olsen acknowledges Dreyer's renewed commitment to the project and asks him to resume work on the film.[88]

Due to Dreyer's premature renunciation of taking final responsibility on *Leaves* and his later consolation that he give up the idea of the *standard* or *great* film (as he puts it),[89] Bordwell concludes that Dreyer failed "to solve the problem which he had defined: how to make an art work in the context of mass production." [90] Bordwell insinuates that because Dreyer took on a lower budget, he had to give up any idea of *his* film and subsequently did not produce the film he wanted.[91] Bordwell's book on Dreyer, however, does not tell the whole story behind *Leaves*' pre-production. In a March 26, 1919 letter to Olsen, Dreyer says that the prospective film "dramatically most likely will seem much better and more forceful

than the great film."[92] Bordwell also misconstrues the impact that the budget concession had on Dreyer. Conversely, Drum and Drum document that Dreyer proceeded in making the film "with his enthusiasm undiminished."[93] Even Milne, who dismisses *Leaves* as meretricious, claims that "Dreyer won the battle."[94] In an article published just before *Leaves*' premiere in Copenhagen, Høyer writes that Dreyer directed the film "with living interest and huge energy."[95]

Dreyer had a change of heart. The lower budget compelled him to think more creatively about how he could get the most out of the sets and props Nordisk bequeathed him. He chose a "less is more" approach. I concur with Drum and Drum's assessment that Dreyer relinquished the idea of a large and expensive film so he could concentrate on human drama as opposed to an epic canvas.[96] Dreyer may have made an economic compromise but he did not partake in an artistic concession. However, Dreyer also faced a theoretical battle with his studio over the dramatic construction of *Leaves*.

A historical costume drama, *Leaves* stands out as a major anomaly among the many modern films and farces released by Nordisk during Dreyer's tenure there. From 1912 through 1918, only one costume film (a remake of a 1909 picture) was produced at Nordisk. During that same period, a total of 349 modern films (an average of nearly 50 per year) were made.[97] Furthermore, of 45 fiction films made in 1918, 29 were farces. Nordisk maintained a similar output the next year with 24 of 41 features classified as farces.[98] Economic and logistical factors played a pivotal role in Nordisk's decision not to accept scripts with historical themes.[99] Italian film companies released large spectacles such as Mario Caserini

and Eleuterio Rodolfi's *The Last Days of Pompeii* (1913) and Giovanni Pastrone's *Cabiria* (1914) but Nordisk could not match them in a highly competitive international film market. Even though *Leaves* fell outside of Nordisk's genre rubric, I believe that the studio green-lit the film because it wanted a long-planned ambitious project to rekindle some of the glory from Danish cinema's Golden Age (1910–1914). In a June 10, 1916 memo sent to Nordisk's directors, Ole Olsen writes: "With growing apprehension, the management has witnessed how the company's productions have become weaker than ever before. The films hitherto screened at test runs have all, and almost without exception, been average productions, or indeed, in most cases, considerably below average."[100] While Dreyer had not yet directed a film, he assumed a variety of responsibilities at the studio so if the memo did not cross his desk, he was probably at least familiar with Olsen's concern.

Nordisk's enactment of production rules for its scenarists in the early 1910s became a significant creative challenge for Dreyer as he developed *Leaves*. Specifically, Jens Locher's (1889–1952) screenwriting manual, *Hvorledes skriver man en Film?* (How does one write a film?), placed dramaturgical and aesthetic constraints on the studio's writers and directors. While officially published as a slender book in 1916, Locher's treatise was first mentioned in a company letter sent to Holger Ibsen in November 1910.[101] Formal reference to "Instructions for script writers" came in a January 29, 1912 letter addressed to Ellen Margarethe Ladegaard.[102] Nordisk published some of Locher's precepts for scriptwriters as early as 1913 when Høyer started writing the *Leaves* script and Dreyer had been a part-time

employee for about a year.[103] So presumably, both men were familiar with the following seven guidelines:

- The scripts' action must be written in short, clear images in the order in which the author intends them to be seen on the screen. There must be no more than 2 to 3 main characters around which the action takes place, and the author should always ensure that there is at least one person whose fate the audience can follow with sympathy.
- A single, simple operation without too many and too large side stories is preferable.
- Crimes such as murder, theft, counterfeiting, etc. must absolutely not be shown, but only hinted at.
- The action must take place in the present and played among "good" company. Pieces that are played among peasants and farmers, are not considered. Knight pieces, historical pieces and national pieces are also not considered.
- It is not allowed to write anything derogatory or unfavorable about the royal family, magistrates, priests or officers.
- Nihilism, anarchism and similar politics must not be used.
- There must, in all film, be something very powerful – and above all original – a "trick" or gimmick that can create the film's climax.[104]

In March 1917, Nordisk issued a slightly revised version of the instructions that devoted greater attention to issues of censorship and copyright. The update prohibited stories that reflected World War I and military milieus.[105] The showing of uniforms was also restricted: "...uniforms must be avoided if possible, and they should therefore only be used in cases of

unavoidable necessity, when the person in question appears in uniform according to his official position. This precaution is dictated not only because of censorship concerns, but mainly because it is extraordinarily difficult at present to sell films with uniforms in them."[106] The new edition added an extra item: "Everything that can be considered unaesthetic, exciting or brutalizing, must be avoided."[107] Nordisk's production rules probably remained in effect when *Leaves* went into production.

As a film, *Leaves* violates practically every guideline and most other tenets in Nordisk's handbook. For instance, its shooting length of 2,900 meters (9,514 feet) far exceeds Nordisk's stipulated length of 1,000 to 1,200 meters (3,280 to 3,937 feet) for film dramas.[108] This mandate applied to both multi-reel and later feature-length pictures.[109] With a running time of 157 minutes (projected at 17 fps), *Leaves* is one of the longest Danish silent films ever made.[110] More, Locher's edict that scenarists should compose the script's action in "short, clear images" with minimal explanatory titles is eradicated by Dreyer and Høyer.[111] For example, the dialogue list for a print of *Leaves* distributed in the UK contains a verbatim record of no less than forty-five title cards of story exposition.[112]

Due to the film's complexity, the intertitles (particularly ones that introduce each episode) contain a lot of text describing plot threads and characters. As Bordwell observes, none of Dreyer's films surpasses the density of parallelisms (including parallel subplots) as *Leaves* does.[113] I disagree, however, with Bordwell's presupposition that *Leaves*' dense weave of parallel lines of action "enables the viewer to extract an overall pattern of causation in which each character, regardless of epoch, participates."[114] Although Bordwell establishes

that the four stories enact a casual pattern in a theme-and-variations manner with Satan acting as the catalyst to propel the action,[115] he makes a brisk assumption that viewers from any era can organize and parse out the film's overabundance of screen information, which is difficult to accomplish in one viewing. *Leaves* is likely the last script Locher would use as a template to demonstrate Nordisk's preference for "a simple, straightforward plot without too many digressions."[116] Locher aimed to maintain Ole Olsen's original goal of telling stories with simplicity and easily clear situations so audiences could immediately grasp how they were constructed, even if they were unaware of a film's literary basis.[117] Dreyer, however, did not assemble his films with the same intention of reaching the masses. He could care less about box office or his work achieving widespread popularity. "The public," he once conceded, "never enters my thoughts for a moment."[118] *Leaves* proved to be no exception.

Dreyer refused to follow Nordisk's genre requirements. He sets three of the four sections of *Leaves* in the distant past: (1) Jerusalem: Thirty years after the birth of Christ; (2) 16th Century Seville: the Spanish Inquisition; and (3) Paris in autumn 1793: the French Revolution. Milne speculates that Dreyer succumbed to a "conventional literary respectability" advocated by Locher's handbook and only broke the rule on *Leaves* more so in letter than in spirit.[119] However, a clear-cut representation of good and evil across time is unequivocally not the case. Gray areas pervade each section because Satan attempts to corrode the souls of outwardly innocent characters. The film's protagonists are three-dimensional because of the *double entendre* involving Satan. They are unaware of the potential consequences he faces if they either obey or refuse his temptation. Moreover,

Dreyer supplies subtlety to *Leaves*' fourth section: the modern civil war between the Russians and Finns. Milne complains that the Finns are too genteel and high-minded but he neglects an important point regarding their social representation.[120] Dreyer abnegates Locher's requirement that Nordisk films should only show "good company" (people from upper middle-class backgrounds) by casting the primary Finnish characters as humble peasants who become the story's heroes.

Dreyer's film breaks other Nordisk rules (including the handbook's 1917 update) by showing acts of murder, brutality, and criminal behavior. For instance, toward the end of *Leaves*' second section, Satan (Helge Nissen) acts as a Grand Inquisitor for the trial of astrologer and astronomer Don Gomez de Castro (Hallander Hellemann), whose scientific ideas are heretical to the Holy Inquisition. Dreyer's cinematographer George Schnéevoigt frames an archway of the inquisition chamber where Gomez is undergoing *strappado*. Satan announces that the trial is over. His black-hooded henchman releases the rope from the steering wheel contraption, causing Gomez to plunge to the stone floor. Schnéevoigt's camera captures Gomez's instant death without cutting away. Dreyer also uses violent torture in a metaphorical way during the French Revolution episode. Two shots of a guillotine alternate with shots of maids and servants appearing petrified in an open cellar. The slashing motion of the axe head juxtaposed with the fearful faces of the onlookers emblemize the heinous executions carried out by the Revolutionary Army. Like the hanging of Don Gomez in the Spanish section, Dreyer portrays another wrongful death in the film's final episode. Posing this time as the revolutionary monk Ivan, Satan acquits a senior pro-Finnish guard at a

Red Tribunal occupied by Russian forces. Nevertheless, he orders one of his Red Guards to lodge a bullet through the old man en route to the woods. Seen through the point-of-view of the man's daughter, peasant Naima (Karina Bell), the Russian guard shoots and kills the elder Finn aboard the wagon horse. These scenes demonstrate Dreyer's unwillingness to comply with Nordisk's restrictions of concealing overt violence.

Dreyer also declined to alter his film in order to accommodate the 1917 revisions that forbade the depiction of military environments and people in uniforms. *Leaves*' third part shows the Army of Revolutionary France circa 1793 in full regalia. The actors wore admiral hats and greatcoats that resembled the grenadiers and fusiliers in Napoleon's infantry. The actor Emil Helsengreen dons soldier's attire and delivers a chilling performance as the People's Commissar. Helsengreen is remorseless as the Commissar of Paris. He arrests individuals suspected of treason and passes death sentences on the spot. The Commissar alleges that the Count de Chambord (Viggo Wiehe) is the ringleader of a conspiracy to help Widow Capet, the former Queen of France, to flee the country. (The Count is the patriarch of a royal family, a social group that Dreyer's film was supposed to avoid.) Satan disguises himself as a poor man with a disability and informs the Commissar of the whereabouts of the Count's wife (Emma Wiehe) and daughter, Lady Geneviève (Jeanne Tramcourt). The Army later executes them along with Queen Marie Antoinette (Tenna Kraft). Dreyer extends this disturbing portrait of the military to show the poisonous effects the Army's tactics have on Parisian youth. Dreyer stages a faux courtroom in which a small group of children participates in a mock trial to determine the fate of "Citizen Cat." Two boys dress in soldier's

garb: one poses as the judge and other a public prosecutor. The judge finds the cat guilty of contempt of the French Republic and discriminates against its white fur. Following the "trial," the children play with a guillotine but the cat escapes its execution. For a studio that banned the display of any military apparel, Nordisk must have been appalled when it saw this section of Dreyer's film.

Another concrete example in which Dreyer deviates from genre requirements is in the climax of *Leaves*. One of Locher's "instructions" specifies that a Nordisk production must incorporate an original gimmick or a "trick" to create the film's climax.[121] Neergaard renders that the trick may form the *clou*, or chief attraction, of the picture.[122] On numerous occasions, Nordisk would showcase the *clou* in stunt-stories or sensation films. This genre consisted of full-length narratives where characters were placed in perilous situations.[123] These would assume four common predicaments: actors would expose themselves to wild animals, engage in a cliffhanger, jump on or off vehicles moving at full speed, or run the risk of drowning.[124] Furthermore, flying machines could fulfill Nordisk's guideline of a novel and effective gimmick that provides the highlight for a film.[125] For the story's resolution, some means of vehicular technology would save the character from his/her plight.[126] Although Dreyer previously covered these types of stunt-stories as an aerospace reporter, he did not use them in *Leaves*. None of the story predicaments found their way into *Leaves*' climax, either. Instead, Dreyer's *clou* was three vignettes he threaded together to form the climax between the Russians and Finns.

When Dreyer screened *Leaves*' last episode for Olsen, Nordisk's employees and shareholders, all were astonished to see an immense amount of footage intercut between three locales. Dreyer's method of editing was driven mainly by his material. For the Russian-Finnish section, which was the first to be shot, Dreyer used between 500 and 600 meters (1,640 and 1,968 feet) of length, totaling nearly 500 cuts (the duration of each shot was about 3½ seconds). According to Neergaard, executives at Nordisk were horrified to learn of Dreyer's accelerated cutting. They thought that he had "ruined" the film. Olsen ordered Dreyer to halt production at once.[127] Before permitting him to shoot the other three episodes, company executives ordered Dreyer to screen the Finnish segment for them. The short cuts ended up creating a perfect rhythm for the fast-paced action and Olsen permitted Dreyer to resume work on the film.[128]

Viewers who saw the film for the first time in 1921 or shortly thereafter must have been amazed with the dexterity Dreyer demonstrates in interweaving three parallel lines of action. Dreyer cuts between Satan antagonizing Siri in her cabin, Red Guards escorting Paavo (Carlo Wieth), Siri's husband, atop a meadow to be shot, and the arrival of Finnish freedom fighters via a railcar. Although Naima rescues Paavo just in time, Danish audiences at the time must have been surprised by the ending of *Leaving*. Locher includes a rule and general wish that all should end well for the hero and/or heroine.[129] Audiences were probably shocked then when they saw Siri grab a butter knife and lodge it into her heart. At first glance, it appears that *Leaves* fulfils Nordisk's goal of a satisfactory resolution. Siri has rejected Satan's temptation of signing her soul away to the devil. However, Dreyer leaves the

film open-ended. Paradoxically, Siri has released Satan from 1,000 years of punishment "but his work must still continue."[130] The final title card reads: "But the doom pronounced by the Lord was written with the characters of eternity, and its words urge Satanas on to new goals, new fates."[131] Overall, *Leaves* represented a significant departure from the dominant codes of production culture in Denmark and abroad. Distribution and exhibition of the film proved difficult.

RECEPTION AND RE-MEDIATION OF *LEAVES*

A comprehensive history of *Leaves*' reception at screenings during its theatrical run, Dreyer retrospectives, and in film societies will help to illuminate the condition of the film's various prints and the ways it has undergone re-mediation. *Leaves* had its world premiere on November 15, 1920 in Christiania (now: Oslo) where much to Dreyer's chagrin, it experienced re-mediation immediately. In a letter dated two days after the film's first screening, Dreyer writes to Frost concerning an ad he saw in the Norwegian *Aftenposten* (Evening Post):

> …to my big astonishment I see as well that the film is advertised as consisting of 8 acts [reels], that is to be shown in 1½ hours. The film in its time [originally] counted 9 acts and it took 2¼ to 2½ Hours to show. Besides being reduced with an entire act, it [the film] must have been thoroughly reduced or it couldn't possibly be shown in 1½ Hours even with express train speed.[132]

Dreyer surmises that a local cinema owner, theater operator or clerk authorized the accelerated pace.[133] Dreyer's hunch of a movie theater owner's involvement is a good

possibility. During the silent era, studios sent exhibitors a cue sheet informing the projectionist the speed, in feet per second, at which to run the film. However, in an effort to accommodate more showings, theater owners would speed films up to the extent of trimming the running time in half.[134]

In late Nov. 1920, Dreyer acknowledges a letter he received from a friend who saw the film projected in Norway. The friend wrote, "One picture succeeded the next before one could see what it was. And Jesus jumped over the screen like a grasshopper. It was ugly. The pictures absolutely stood there too short time – it became so restless exactly in this section where there ought to be rest in everything."[135] Bordwell misses the point that it seemed "extraordinarily fruitless, for a Nordisk filmmaker to seek to control how his film was projected in another country."[136] Dreyer brings up a valid and legitimate point to Frost; a movie company should exercise the authority to protect an artist's work.[137] When a studio licenses one of its films to a firm in an overseas market, the two parties usually engage in a legally bound agreement to have the film shown as its director and producers intend. Dreyer's plea demonstrates the ethical obligation distributors and exhibitors ought to embrace in the handling, treatment, and care of an *objet d'art*.

Danish cinemas postponed a domestic release of *Leaves* perhaps due to the fiasco in Norway but also, as Dreyer recalls, because it "was difficult to sell" and "was long and complicated."[138] When the film finally premiered in Copenhagen on January 24, 1921, it was greeted with critical praise for Dreyer and his actors. For example, noted Danish film critic Laurids Skands wrote of Siri's death scene: "Foremost, perhaps, stood Clara Pontopiddan,

who, in a close-up cried out in dumb anguish all her suffering and pain, as the cold steel of a knife slid into her heart. It was done so beautifully that one instantly loved her for it."[139] Running the film at its proper speed between 17 fps to 18 fps also may have contributed to the film's warm reception. The projectionist likely ran the film at a slower speed due to Dreyer's insistence to Frost that *Leaves* "will appear in a decent shape and that no important changes are made without consultation with me."[140]

Leaves received distribution from fourteen countries, including a tentative contract in the United States.[141] However, there are no extant records to indicate that the film was ever shown in North America during its international theatrical run. According to an account ledger from the Nordisk Collection, two separate prints of *Leaves* shipped to New York: one in December 1920 and the other in June 1921.[142] The recipient of the second print was distributor Chester Beecroft, a future employee of William Randolph Hearst's Cosmopolitan Productions, who at the time ran his own film company on 501 Fifth Avenue.[143] Silent film historian George Pratt reports that *Leaves* screened privately in New York for domestic exhibitors in January 1922 but failed to secure any distribution deals.[144] Curiously, Beecroft's office did not return the negative of *Leaves* to Nordisk until more than a year later on September 12, 1922.[145]

Did the film screen for critics in New York or have any preview screenings around the country? It is unlikely that the film was ever shown publicly. Search queries for Dreyer's second film in the ProQuest Historical Newspapers and the Library of Congress' Chronicling America databases yielded zero results. One possible reason for the lack of public screenings

is that Beecroft may have retained the same policies on censorship previously enforced by the Great Northern Film Company, Nordisk's branch office in New York until 1917.[146] Ingvald Oes, Great Northern's director, often griped to Nordisk in Copenhagen about actual or potential censorship obstacles and the Danish studio took his complaints seriously.[147] Censorship boards sometimes prohibited Nordisk films from being shown so Oes was pressured to make specific changes that made them more suitable and palatable for an American audience.[148] Changes arrived in the form of "alternate endings" which Nordisk produced at least fifty-six of based on surviving films, letters, and scripts.[149] Dreyer shot three different endings for *Leaves*: a bittersweet ending he ultimately used in which the young peasant Siri stabs herself to death in order to save her husband and children; a "happy ending" for export (included on the DFI DVD), in which Siri and her Finnish compatriots survive the Reds' onslaught; and the "Russian ending," in which everyone dies in the most tragic fashion.[150] It is unclear if Beecroft inserted the happy ending for the test screening with American exhibitors but since *Leaves* broke just about every rule in Nordisk's handbook, it was probably deemed un-releasable (at least initially) in the States. It also did not help that other foreign distributors butchered *Leaves*. According to Høyer, the Swedish distributor removed the entire last section of the film, while England's distributor excised the first three parts and only kept the last part.[151]

In his book, *On the History of Film Style*, Bordwell erroneously states that as early as the late 1930s, US cinéphiles knew Dreyer primarily through *Leaves* and *The Passion of Joan of Arc*.[152] Bordwell bases this assumption on the Museum of Modern Art's (MoMA)

Film Library created by Iris Barry in 1935. However, *Leaves* was not shown at the Film Library until a one-week run in September 1952 and again in January 1957 over three days.[153] Additionally, MoMA exhibited the film in late Sept. 1964 for an exhibition titled "The Films of Carl Dreyer" but oddly, without English titles.[154] Also, Bordwell's mentor and colleague Arthur Lennig notes that as of 1960, *Leaves* was "the least known of the films of Dreyer which can be rented in the United States."[155] Lennig brought *Leaves* to the Wisconsin Film Society that year for a series on silent cinema. Membership amassed five hundred, the largest in the Society's thirteen-year history. Many members had never seen a silent film and did not walk out on any, Lennig reports.[156] Members got a chance to see the MoMA print of *Leaves*, which Lennig describes as "a particularly fine one" and likely sourced from the original negative.[157] Audience reaction to *Leaves* seems to have been mixed with only the "purists" finding Dreyer's film worthwhile.[158] It is unknown what speed the projectionist ran the film.[159] Nearly three decades later, MoMA brought *Leaves* back to New York for the start of a nation-wide Dreyer retrospective across eight major cities.[160] However, audiences who saw the film in 1989 experienced a sped-up, re-mediated version running at a sound speed of 114 minutes.[161] Indeed the Pacific Film Archive confirms that the University Art Museum in Berkeley, CA ran a 35mm print of *Leaves* at the same length (i.e., at 20 fps).[162]

Earlier in the 1970s, other film archives clarified *Leaves*' presentation options. For example, the archive Glenn Photo Supply in California obtained a Super 8mm print of *Leaves* containing eight reels.[163] It recommends to potential exhibitors that they project the film at 18 fps (147 minutes), which is closer to Dreyer's preferred speed. Kit Parker Films, a

16mm and 35mm film library of studio classics and specialty films, provides greater specification in its 1979 distribution materials: 166 minutes at silent speed of 16 fps and 111 minutes at sound speed.[164] Prints, however, are on the "contrasty side" which suggests that the film was not in the best condition.[165] It is surprising that MoMA did not evaluate data on available prints and opt for a slower frame rate.

In recent years, major film institutes and film societies have more accurately projected *Leaves* at slower speeds. For a special Dreyer series in the fall of 2010, the Pacific Film Archive seemed to rectify its earlier gaffe with the frame rate by showing a 35mm print courtesy of the DFI running at 150 minutes.[166] A year later, the Austrian Film Museum hosted a Dreyer retrospective and appeared to have shown the same DFI print of *Leaves*.[167] In the winter of 2011, the Gallery of Modern Art in Queensland projected a restored 35mm print at 171 minutes.[168] So the last several years has seen increased devotion to presenting a more leisurely-paced film. Despite improvements in the theatrical projection of *Leaves*, art museums have followed a popular trend since the film was first shown by associating its authorship not with Dreyer, but with a certain 1916 American film.

CONNECTION TO *INTOLERANCE*?

One evening in the summer of 1918, Frede Skaarup, a prominent film and theatre manager, invited all Nordisk Film directors (including Dreyer) to view a feature from North America called *Intolerance* (1916) because he thought they could learn something about new modes for narrative storytelling. The group of filmmakers gathered in a special screening room at the studio. After the film ended at 4 a.m., Dreyer sauntered home through the quiet

street, contemplating the possibilities a more creative and arty (i.e., artistically fertile) brand of Danish cinema could achieve for a local industry that had floundered during the war years.[169] Olsen says in his memoir that he had a growing awareness of the influx of American films such as *Intolerance* and Griffith's earlier *The Birth of a Nation* (1915) that filled Danish cinemas. [170] So Nordisk felt it had to put out tent-pole projects by its leading directors in order to compete.

When *Leaves* had its Danish premiere nearly three years later on January 24, 1921, the film critic of the Norwegian newspaper, *Aftenbladet* (Evening Post), wrote:

> A couple of years ago, an American film, 'Intolerance', played at Paladsteatret [Palads Cinema in Copenhagen)]; in brief sections from all ages, it showed how horribly intolerance had everywhere intervened in the destinies of men and nations.
>
> Tonight, again at Paladsteatret, will be played a film developed according to the same principles, but this one has been written by a Danish author and is performed by Danish actors.[171]

This early film review, coupled with Dreyer's recollection of first seeing *Intolerance,* set off a snowball effect. In near unanimity every film critic, scholar, and historian has compared *Leaves* unfavorably to *Intolerance*. For example, British film critic Geoff Andrew calls *Leaves* a riposte to Griffith's *Intolerance*.[172] Frank Beaver argues that Dreyer's use of four stories in *Leaves* imitates Griffith's structure in *Intolerance*.[173] Former Danish Film Museum director Ib Monty considers *Intolerance* a model for *Leaves* with the latter lacking the

former's mastery of composition.[174] Both Monty and Bowser imply that Dreyer was practically put under hypnosis as he watched *Intolerance*. Bowser claims that Dreyer operated "directly under the inspiration of his viewing of Griffith's *Intolerance*."[175] Likewise, Monty says that Dreyer took direct inspiration from Griffith.[176] In a different vein, film historian George Pratt asserts that *Leaves* was "directly influenced" by *Intolerance*.[177] Ronald Holloway complains that *Leaves* "is too much an imitation" of *Intolerance* with Dreyer's imprint only visible in the film's Finnish episode.[178] In his widely read *The New Biographical Dictionary of Film*, David Thomson goes further by suggesting that *Leaves* imitates all four episodes of *Intolerance*.[179] Milne regards *Leaves* as "a slavish imitation of *Intolerance* that lags a good way behind the Master [Griffith], and doesn't even have the redeeming feature of the spectacular Belshazzar's Palace set."[180] Peter Walsh of the Irish Film Institute writes in a blog post: "the influence of Griffith's *Intolerance* (1916) is so overwhelming that it drowns out [Dreyer's] characteristic subtlety."[181]

The intrinsic problem with these commentators comparing the two films is that they do not distinguish between the words *inspired, inspiration*, and/or *influence*. According to film scholar Charles Eidsvik, to demonstrate film influence (or the cinematic) one must first be able to identify devices and conventions of a medium and then relate them to another.[182] Eidsvik deals mostly with the pitfalls of proving how novels are influenced by the movies but his criteria can also be applied to comparing one film to another film. To consider if and how *Intolerance* influenced *Leaves*, the venue and occasion in which Dreyer first saw Griffith's film deserves renewed consideration. A movie studio's screening room is a paratextual space

in which one's colleagues and collaborators gather to watch and discuss films. Filmmakers participate in this communal activity so they can exchange ideas and learn from their peers. During their viewing of *Intolerance*, Dreyer and his fellow directors probably sat awestruck by Griffith's groundbreaking editing techniques. However, nearly a year elapsed between Dreyer seeing *Intolerance* and the commencement of principal photography on *Leaves*. Dreyer had a lot of time to ruminate on the own uniqueness he could bring to his next project. He possibly saw several different films in the interim and detached himself from Griffith's work. Dreyer was *inspired* by the idea of composing *Leaves* in four parts. But to imply that he was *influenced* by *Intolerance*'s narrative structure, editing, cinematography, *mise-en-scène*, etc., are separate matters altogether.

Leaves diverges from *Intolerance* in its story arrangement and narrative sequences. Dreyer presents all four tales consecutively in chronological order while Griffith crosscuts between four separate stories: the Modern Story (mid-1910s), the Judean Story (1st Century), the Medieval French Story (AD 1572), and the Babylonian Story (539 BC). Griffith uses the recurring image of a woman (Lillian Gish) who rocks a cradle as a thread to intertwine the stories. The chameleon-like Satan acts as the narrative centerpiece of *Leaves* so repeated shots of him at the beginning of each section are unnecessary.

Griffith and Dreyer approached their films differently. Each man consulted a diverse range of materials for the historical research that went into their films' respective periods. For instance, in preparing to design the backgrounds and costumes for the Judean Story, Griffith studied paintings and drawings in four books by the French artist, James Tissot

(1836–1902).[183] Specifically, Griffith used the garments Tissot painted in his work of watercolors, *The Life of Christ*, as a visual template.[184] He also modeled Tissot's work for the crucifixion scene in *Intolerance*, a story event that *Leaves* lacks. By contrast, in his script conserved at the DFI, Dreyer handwrote notes about different painters such as Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519), Domenico Ghirlandaio (1449–1494), and Eduard von Gebhardt (1838–1925).[185] Dreyer examined paintings by these artists as he prepared to film the Last Supper, which Griffith did not shoot. For the two middle sections of *Leaves*, Dreyer jotted notes down from the books he read on the art of the Middle Ages and El Greco, as well as books about the French Revolution by Lenôtre, Paul Lacroix, and Victor Hugo.[186] Unlike Dreyer, Griffith concentrated on a different continent and an earlier period: the Neo-Babylonian Empire during Cyrus the Great's reign. Griffith pored over books related to the Babylonian ruling class and the culture's discovery of cuneiform writing.[187] He also read several novels set in Babylon.[188] Griffith placed carved cuneiform figures on the upper part and corners of his title cards. Dreyer, however, was not influenced by this decorative design. He used the more traditional black background for his titles' white text. So Griffith and Dreyer's sources and esthetic designs were disparate and independent from the other.

To claim that *Leaves* is a slavish imitation of *Intolerance* would be to argue that Dreyer shows no artistic ingenuity or original creativity. *Leaves* contains none of the surge, splendor, and spectacle that epitomizes Griffith's historical epic. When film scholars define a movie epic, they usually refer to a screen displaying an expansive physical landscape, often inhabited by "a cast of thousands." The largest crowd scene shown in *Leaves* is a moderately

populated marketplace in Jerusalem. By stark contrast, Griffith fills *Intolerance*'s most iconographic scene, the Feast of Belshazzar in the Palace's great court, with thousands of people and giant sets. Dreyer's actors and sets pale in number and scope. Frederiksborg Castle, a Renaissance castle erected in the mid-1600s, is probably the largest set Dreyer used in *Leaves*.[189] But unlike Griffith, Dreyer filmed most of his shots in and around the castle with small groups. *Leaves* lacks the size and scope of *Intolerance*.

Before turning to discuss *Leaves*' digital incarnations, it is worth noting that ad slicks, particularly on DVD covers, continue to compare *Leaves* to *Intolerance*. Although Griffith's film was a box office disappointment during its theatrical run, it is a favorite amongst archivists and one of the most famous of all films. Although Dreyer's name is in itself a selling point for cineastes, putting Griffith and *Intolerance* in *Leaves*' plot synopsis, by coincidence, enhances the economic and symbolic value of the Dreyer work. This product placement functions not only as a marketing ploy and cross-promotional tool for Griffith (especially if the video label owns rights to his films), but also affects the authorship status of Dreyer, who is seen more as a trainee in the shadow of Griffith's.

THREE DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF *LEAVES* ON HOME VIDEO

The 2003 DVD of *Leaves* released by Grapevine Video crystalizes the impasse a piece of celluloid reaches when it is converted from an analog to digital platform. The transfer is a direct port of the video distributor's 1995 VHS copy. Viewers who watch the DVD are likely to notice that the disc has not been remastered or restored from its analog master. The aesthetic effect is that viewers experience a re-mediated version marred by a

variety of anomalies. The picture is replete with analog tape tracking errors, which include a horizontal line running continuously along the bottom frame and intermittent lines across the image. Grapevine's transfer also shows traces of edge enhancement, a black or white outline that is added to foreground figures or objects so that it stands out from the background.[190] This produces an irritating halo around objects. To make matters worse, Grapevine's disc runs 133 minutes, which seems too hurried a pace.

Like Grapevine's presentation, the 2005 Image Entertainment DVD is littered with film artifacts, deficiencies in the image that are caused by imperfections in the source material.[191] These consist of dirt, speckles, and flecks of celluloid emulsion that have fallen off the film stock. Image's back cover advertises the transfer as "monochrome with color tint." However, the disc's technical authors apply brightness boosting which affects the image's contrast levels. The net result is a smudged print that shares little in common with the original camera negative.

The Image DVD also corresponds with Dreyer and his friend's comments about the projection speed from the Oslo premiere. The film runs 121 minutes on the disc (about 20 fps) and never allows sufficient time for Dreyer's "painterly style" to unfold on the screen. As DFI curator Thomas Christensen tells this author, it behooves a film restorer to know about a silent director's subjects to determine how fast or slow a film should run on a 35mm projector. [192] Otherwise, the results can be "involuntarily comical."[193] The value of knowing about different frame rates is that it changes a viewer's perception of what genre the director made his film in. If spectators view *Leaves* with an altered speed, such as Dreyer's friend,

they may think they are watching a zany comedy or a fast-paced adventure film. Specifically, they could misinterpret it as Dreyer's parody of a conventional religious film with images of Jesus bouncing up and down in the Garden of Gethsemane. Accordingly, based on this film, viewers may associate Dreyer with directors of silent comedies such as Buster Keaton, Mack Sennett, Fred C. Newmeyer, and Sam Taylor. As a result, the perception of Dreyer's makeup as an *auteur* could change and evolve into a far different author-persona than originally intended.

Although the DFI now considers *Leaves* and other early films by Dreyer as masterpieces, few if any film archivists in the black-and-white age of the 1940s and 1950s cared about preserving tinting indications. Regrettably, the negatives were trimmed for continuity, eliminating many of the tinting instructions.[194] However, the Pacific Film Archive notes that Dreyer shot *Leaves* on orthochromatic stock,[195] a standard film stock in the silent years that is sensitive to the blue and green end of the spectrum, but not to yellow and red.[196] This indicates that film emanates subtly modulated lighting rather than higher contrast levels.[197] The latter's lighting scheme is probably more prevalent on the Image DVD than the print referenced by Pacific.

In sharp contrast to the Grapevine and Image versions of *Leaves*, the DFI's 2007 DVD brings out the lighting as well as blue and green shadings of orthochromatic stock. DFI's presentation boasts superior grayscale and contrast (without any boosting) compared to the other DVDs. The DFI also presents the film at a proper speed of 17 fps (157 minutes). Christensen's restoration team downsampled the film from 25 fps to 17.02 fps on a Digital

Betacam. They recorded the material onto a BetaSP recorder.[198] This high-definition sourced 2K transfer (from a restored duplicate negative) reifies the idea of Dreyer as an *auteur* and allows viewers to better experience his pictorial novelties. The aesthetics and demarcation of scenographic space in *Leaves* presents challenges for viewers expecting a large-scale work from this most unusual of anthology films. Dreyer was ahead of his time in his use of early cinema's technology. Like Abel Gance, Dreyer thought "rectangular" in his sense of composition. For example, in the opening scene, we see a wide shot of Jesus (Halvard Hoff) and his disciples in the den of Simon the Leper. Dreyer's meticulous framing posits Judas (Jacob Texière) at the outer left edge of the frame. For the purposes of narrative contiguity, Dreyer develops many of the characters in this horizontal shot throughout this section of the "Passion Play." In his analysis of *Day of Wrath*, Bordwell asserts that Dreyer introduced a new lighting scheme in 1943 called the "glowing-wall" technique. This consists of a soft light spread across a wall, which leaves an uneven darkness around it.[199] As early as the 1920s, Dreyer experimented with another inventive lighting device. For instance, he deals subtly and complexly with Judas's doubts about Jesus by lighting Judas in the form of an inverted triangle. For most of the other characters, Dreyer frames them through either full medium or long shots. (He also prodigiously employs close-ups which advance his contemporary Benjamin Christiansen, director of *Häxan: Witchcraft Through the Ages* [1922].) When Judas sidles from his position near a wall and walks down the steps, Dreyer follows him through a dolly shot and a masking device. Although masking (a "held" iris

where a circle forms around a character to isolate certain features) was a principal technique throughout silent cinema, Dreyer use of space and movement was quite uncommon.

Arguably the most subversive Danish film released during the silent era, *Leaves* has largely been misjudged as a footnote in Dreyer's career. Bowdlerized copies of the film have tarnished Dreyer's aesthetic achievements. More importantly, incorrect projections of the film in theaters and inaccurate frame speeds on DVDs have negatively impacted the *progression d'effet* Dreyer sought through his rhythm-based editing. In sum, Dreyer's experience producing and directing *Leaves* marked a turning point in his career. The DFI's digital restoration of the film exemplifies the *technological imperative* in the best sense. Its correctly calibrated presentation showcases Dreyer's then-new cinematic devices for telling stories via unconventional editing methods and aesthetic patterns.

FOUCAULTIAN REDISCOVERIES

In 1960, a nitrate print of Dreyer's fourth feature, *Love One Another*, was discovered in Moscow. The print was transported to Copenhagen but the nitrate deteriorated over time. In 2005, the French film scholar Bernhard Eisenschitz located the original Soviet print in the French National film archives. Two years later, the DFI commissioned a full digital restoration (at 2K resolution) of the film using Dreyer's original script and Swedish censorship records.[200] The rediscovery of this rare film by Dreyer is akin to the uncovering of Nietzsche's unpublished papers that Foucault discusses in his essay on the Author. Each shed new light on relatively unknown works of a filmmaker and philosopher.

The DFI's crisp Blu-ray presentation of *Love One Another* gives this once-lost silent film a second life. Encoded and projected at the high resolution of 1920x1080 pixels, the disc illuminates the breakthroughs Dreyer made in *Leaves*. After *The Parson's Widow* (1920), this is the second film Dreyer made independently outside of a studio system. Dreyer collaborated with émigré actors from the Moscow Arts Theatre and other thespians recruited from Denmark, Germany, Norway, and Poland. In addition, Dreyer supplied his setting of the 1905 Revolution with documentary authenticity by bringing in refugees who fled the 1917 Revolution and townspeople from the Jewish quarter in North Berlin, where Polish and Galican Jews "lived with their backs to a hostile world."[201] Milne praises Dreyer for the sharp skill with which he handles a highly complicated plot.[202] Indeed the narrative complexity within this ensemble piece presents its own set of problems for viewers tracing the various strands of protagonist Hanne-Liebe's (Polina Piekowska) journey from peasant girl to hero. With more effectiveness than he did in *The President*, Dreyer incorporates the flashback poignantly as Jakow Segal (Wladimir Gajdarov), Hanne-Liebe's brother, thinks back to an earlier moment when his father lied on his deathbed. Dreyer resuscitates the "widescreen aesthetic" he so resourcefully exhibited in *Leaves*. The shot shows Mrs. Segal (Adele Reuter Eichberg), Jakow's mother, at the left half of the frame attending to her sewing machine and Jakow kneeling beside his father on the right half. (As Dreyer does occasionally throughout the film, he lenses a single shot simultaneously across two rooms.) Without sufficient information from the intertitles, the viewer does not immediately know all the dynamics of this familial relationship. Dreyer's placement of the flashback at this

position in the story is powerful because Jakow has just learned from his sister's letter that their mother is near death. Jakow sits in his chair with a haunted look in his eyes. Though a successful lawyer, Jakow has remorse and regret over the separation he feels between himself and his parents. It may take the viewer at least two screenings to fully comprehend all the tragic elements in this sprawling tale. Later in a dream sequence, Jakow imagines that his mother has returned and senses her appearance at the door. In a similar visual sense as Victor Sjöström's *The Phantom Carriage*, released around the same time as *Love One Another*, Dreyer uses the superimposition to collapse space and time. He super-imposes an awakened Jakow over his sleeping counterpart. To his shock, Jakow discovers that the apparent maternal figure is a skeletal apparition (reminiscent of the traveling drunken ghost in *The Phantom Carriage*). Outside of Sjöström and his Swedish colleague Mauritz Stiller, few pioneering technicians in the silent era employed the superimposition with such august as Dreyer.

In addition, Dreyer uses Soviet-style montage to quite jarring effect in *Love One Another*'s climax. Rylowitsch (Johannes Meyer), a covert Russian agent disguised as a Franciscan monk, instigates a pogrom against a Jewish village. In a mass exodus sequence that presages Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* (1925), Rylowitsch and the man he has tricked in organizing the mob (Fedja, Hanne-Liebe's childhood friend, played by Richard Boleslawsky) are depicted proceeding the streets pillaging and beating Jewish citizens. Dreyer constructs a fierce denouement against anti-Semitism through his rapid crosscutting of the melee and the pernicious deeds inflicted upon rabbis and Jewish shop owners.

Although Pudovkin, Eisenstein, and Kuleshov also experimented with such ambitious editing techniques, few silent filmmakers equal the sensory overload Dreyer imparts on the audience. Overall, *Love One Another* finds Dreyer one again hitting his stride as a visionary artist. (At the time, he probably had not seen many Soviet pictures from the late teens and early twenties.) The film belongs to an authorial discourse (in a Foucaultian sense) because it adds both to the richness of Dreyer's canon and stands alongside the *oeuvres* of heralded Swedish and Russian filmmakers of the same era.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has surveyed three of Dreyer's early films and the implications they have on authorship in the analog and digital domains. Aspects of presentation such as continuity, image quality, projection speed, frame rate et al. impact a viewer's perception of a film and its author(s). The transition from analog to digital for presentations of these Dreyer films has produced mixed results. A viewer's initial experience with a film creates vivid impressions and consecrated memories of cinematic moments. However, when the film is re-mediated and redone (in the pejorative sense), a viewer can feel betrayed by the changes. Unfortunately, this has been the case with *The President* and especially *Leaves*. The discussion of *Love One Another* serves as a prelude to the next chapter, which examines the effects re-mediation and digital reconstruction have on authorship and genre in the middle period of Dreyer's silent years.

Notes to CHAPTER 2

1 Andrew Sarris, “Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962,” *Film Culture*, no. 27 (Winter 1962–63): 7.

2 Sam Kula, *Appraising Moving Images: Assessing the Archival and Monetary Value of Film and Video Records* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2003), 32.

3 Jean Drum and Dale D. Drum, *My Only Great Passion: The Life and Films of Carl Th. Dreyer*, Scarecrow Filmmakers Series 68 (Lanham, MD, and London: Scarecrow Press, 2000): 40–42.

4 Casper Tybjerg, “An Art of Silence and Light: The Development of the Danish Film Drama to 1920,” PhD diss., University of Copenhagen, 1996, 14; Lisbeth Richter Larsen and Dan Nissen, “100 Years of Nordisk Film,” in *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, ed. Lisbeth Richter Larsen and Dan Nissen (Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2006), 9.

5 Ebbe Neergaard, “The Rise, the Fall, and the Rise of Danish Film,” *Hollywood Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (Spring 1950): 217–32, doi:10.2307/1209393; Isak Thorsen, “The Rise and Fall of the Polar Bear,” in *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, 52–71.

6 Dan Nissen, “Biography - Extended,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, August 11, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/aboutdreyer/biography/biography---extended.aspx, para. 7; Stephan Michael Schröder, “The Script Consultant,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, August 11, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/aboutdreyer/biography/the-script-consultant.aspx, para. 8. For an analysis of Dreyer’s Nordisk scripts, see also Amanda Elaine Doxtater, “Pathos, Performance, Volition: Melodrama’s Legacy in the Work of Carl Th. Dreyer,” (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2012), ProQuest (3555652), 49–50.

7 Neergaard, *The Story of Danish Film.*, trans. Elsa Gress, Denmark in Print and Pictures (Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab [The Danish Institute] for Information about Denmark and Cultural Cooperation with other Nations, 1963): 63; David Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981): 12–13.

8 Carl Theodor Dreyer, “Dreyer to Harald Frost, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), October 31, 1917,” [trans. Birgit Granhøj Dam, 2013], Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2811, Danish Film Institute.

9 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 15.

10 Ibid., 23–24.

11 Lisbeth Richter Larsen, "The President - Shoot," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, April 5, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Praesidenten/Shoot.aspx, para. 1.

12 I have corrected the release dates Ebbe Neergaard lists in his monograph on Dreyer.

13 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 56.

14 Michel Delahaye, "Between Heaven And Hell: Interview with Carl Dreyer," trans. Rose Kaplin, *Cahiers Du Cinéma in English* no. 4 (1966): 14.

15 Publisher's abstract, James L. Neibaur, *Early Charlie Chaplin: The Artist as Apprentice at Keystone Studios* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012).

16 Edward Buscombe, "Ideas of Authorship," *Screen* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1973): 76.

17 François Truffaut, "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema," in *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, ed. Barry Keith Grant (Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 9–18.

18 Marguerite Engberg, "The Erotic Melodrama in Danish Silent Films 1910–1918," *Film History: An International Journal* 5, no. 1 (March 1993): 66, doi:10.2307/3815110.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid., 67.

21 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 54.

22 Cited in Tybjerg, "An Art of Silence and Light," 78.

23 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 35.

24 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work.*, trans. Marianne Helweg, British Film Institute New Index Series 1 (London: British Film Institute, 1950), 8.

25 Cited in Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 48.

26 Ibid.

27 Tom Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer.*, The International Film Guide Series (New York: Barnes, 1971): 35.

28 Ibid.

29 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 9.

30 Judith Podselver, "Motion Pictures in Denmark," *Hollywood Quarterly* 3, no. 2 (Winter 1947–48): 197, doi:10.2307/1209369.

31 Quoted in Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 15.

32 Eileen Bowser, *The Films of Carl Dreyer.* (New York: The Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art, 1964), 4.

33 Ibid.

34 Engberg, "The Restoration of Silent Films Produced by Nordisk Films Kompagni," in *Preserve Then Show*, ed. Dan Nissen et al. (Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2002), 156–57. Available at http:// www.dfi.dk/Filmhuset/ Filmarkivet/Artikler-og-links.aspx.

35 Thomas C. Christensen, "Post-Production at Nordisk," in *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, 119.

36 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 196–201.

37 One of the lone exceptions is Kirk Bond, who argues that *The President* is more polished than other directorial debuts such as Eisenstein's *Strike* and Welles's *Citizen Kane*. See "The World of Carl Dreyer," *Film Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (Autumn 1965): 27, doi:10.1525/fq.1965.19.1.04a00050.

38 Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, vol. 1, Indiana University Press Filmguide Series 1 (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1973), 8.

39 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 11–12.

40 Dreyer, "Selvbiografisk Notat (1939) [Autobiographical note (1939)]," in *Kildemateriale Til En Biografi Om Carl Th.* Dreyer [Sources for a biography of Carl Th. Dreyer], ed. Martin Drouzy, [trans. Peter Schepelern, 2013], Sekvens - Særrække (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag, 1982), 65.

41 Ibid., 65–66.

42 Preben Thomsen, "Working with Dreyer," in *Carl Th. Dreyer: Danish Film Director, 1889–1968*, ed. Søren Dyssegaard (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen: Presentation Books, 1969), 15.

43 Cited in Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 15.

44 Cited in Jordan Leondopoulos, *Still the Moving World:* Intolerance, *Modernism, and* Heart of Darkness, vol. 7, Literature and the Visual Arts: New Foundations (New York: Peter Lang, 1991), 139.

45 Tybjerg, "Red Satan: Carl Theodor Dreyer and the Bolshevik Threat," in *Nordic Explorations: Film Before 1930*, ed. John Fullerton and Jan Olsson, Stockholm Studies in Cinema (Sydney, Australia: Libbey, 1999), 22.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

48 Bret Wood, "Leaves from Satan's Book," *Turner Classic Movies*, 2004, http://www.tcm.com/this-month /article /81392|0/Leaves-from-Satan-s-Book.html, para. 5.

49 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 54.

50 Morten Egholm, "Leaves from Satan's Book: Based On," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, May 21, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Blade-af-Satans-Bog/Based-on.aspx, para. 3.

51 Ibid.

52 Tybjerg, "Red Satan," 21.

53 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 206.

54 Dreyer, "Korrespondance Mellem Carl Th. Dreyer Og Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913–24) [Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913–24)]," in *Kildemateriale Til En Biografi Om Carl Th.* Dreyer [Sources for a biography of Carl Th. Dreyer], ed. Martin Drouzy, [trans. Peter Schepelern, 2013], Sekvens - Særrække (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag, 1982), 39.

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid., 40.

57 Ibid., 42, 44.

58 Ibid., 45.

59 Ibid., 43.

60 Egholm, “Leaves from Satan’s Book: Based On,” para. 3.

61 Edgard Høyer, “A Propos ‘Blade Af Satanas Bog’ [A propos ‘Leaves from Satana’s Book’],” [trans. Peter Schepelern, 2013], *Politiken*, January 9, 1921, 2.

62 Tybjerg, “Red Satan,” 34; Egholm, “Leaves from Satan’s Book: Based on,” para. 4.

63 Dreyer, Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913-24), 41.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid.

66 Ole Olsen, *Filmens Eventyr og mit eget* [The adventure of film and my own], [trans. Peter Schepelern, 2013], (Copenhagen: Jespersen og Pios Forlag, 1940), 133.

67 Ibid.

68 Dreyer, Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913-24), 41.

69 Quoted in Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 44.

70 Ibid, 55.

71 Dreyer, “Dreyer to Wilhelm Stæhr, Frederiksberg (Copenhagen), March 23, 1919,” trans. Granhøj Dam, Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2833, Danish Film Institute.

72 Ibid.

73 Ibid.

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid.

77 Ibid.

78 Carl Theodor Dreyer, "Swedish Film (1920)," in *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Translation of Carl Th. Dreyer's Writings About the Film (Om Filmen)*, ed. Donald Skoller (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973), 22.

79 Ole Olsen, "Olsen to Dreyer, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 24, 1919," [trans. Granhøj Dam, 2013], Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2834, Danish Film Institute.

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid.

82 Dreyer, "Dreyer to Ole Olsen, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 25, 1919," [trans. Granhøj Dam, 2013], Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2835, Danish Film Institute.

83 Ibid.

84 Ibid.

85 Olsen, "Olsen to Dreyer, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 26, 1919," in *Dreyers Filmkunst* [Dreyer's cinema], by Edvin Kau, [trans. Peter Schepelern, 2013], (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989), 394.

86 Ibid.

87 Dreyer, "Dreyer to Olsen, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 26, 1919," trans. Granhøj Dam, Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2837, Danish Film Institute.

88 Olsen, "Olsen to Dreyer, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 27, 1919," in Dreyer's cinema, 394.

89 Dreyer, "Dreyer to Olsen, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 26, 1919."

90 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 16.

91 Ibid.

92 Dreyer, "Dreyer to Olsen, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 26, 1919."

93 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 63.

94 Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer*, 19.

95 Høyer, 3.

96 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 63.

97 Engberg, “The Erotic Melodrama in Danish Silent Films 1910-1918,” 64.

98 Larsen and Nissen, “100 Years of Nordisk Film,” 19.

99 Schröder, “History Without Diegesis. *The Little Trumpeter* (1909) as an Example of a Danish Historical Film of the Early Silent Film Era,” in *Film as History / History as Film*, ed. Patrick Vonderau, vol. 21, Working Papers “Gemenskaper - Gemeinschaften” (Florence and Berlin: European University Institute, Florence, Italy; Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1999), 47. Available at http://www2.hu-berlin.de/skan/gemenskap/inhalt/publikationen/arbeitspapiere/ahe_21_sms.html; Thorsen, “‘We Had to Be Careful.’ The Self-Imposed Regulations, Alterations and Censorship Strategies of Nordisk Films Kompagni 1911-1928,” 116.

100 Para. 1 quoted in Thorsen, “Ole Olsen’s Sense of Film,” trans. Lars Kaaber, *Journal of Scandanavian Cinema* 2, no. 1 (March 2012), 29, doi:10.1386/jsca.2.1.27_1.

101 Schröder, “Screenwriting for Nordisk 1906–1918,” in *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, 100, 113.

102 Schröder, “History Without Diegesis,” 46, n. 81; Schröder, “Screenwriting for Nordisk 1906–1918, ” 113, n. 14.

103 Neergaard, *The Story of Danish Film*, 13.

104 Jens Locher, *Hvorledes skriver man en Film?* [How does one write a film?], [trans. Lesley-Ann Brown 2013], (Copenhagen: V. Pios Bohandel — Povl Branner, 1916), 13.

105 Schröder, “Screenwriting for Nordisk 1906–1918, ” 100; Stephan Michael Schröder to Stephen Larson, “Locher’s Hvorledes Skriver Man En Film?,” December 14, 2013.

106 Nordisk Special Collection: II, 56:8, quoted in Thorsen, “‘We Had to Be Careful’,” 122.

107 Thorsen, “‘We Had to Be Careful’,” 117–18.

108 Danish Film Institute, “Leaves from Satan’s Book,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, accessed December 5, 2013, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Blade-af-Satans-Bog.aspx; Locher, How does one write a film?, 11.

109 One film reel's length is around 300 meters or 984 feet (15-20 minutes). When Nordisk transitioned from single to multi-reels in 1910, films surpassed 450 meters (1,476 feet) in length. See Mark B. Sandberg, "Pocket Movies: Souvenir Cinema Programmes and the Danish Silent Cinema," *Film History: An International Journal* 13, no. 1 (March 2001), p. 21 n.11, doi:10.2307/3815409.

110 The publishers of a volume containing Dreyer's *Four Screenplays* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970) note that they received information courtesy of Ib Monty at the Danish Film Museum of a print of *Leaves* listed at 3,254 meters (10,675 feet) so apparently, there were copies of the film perhaps even longer. Indeed, in his monograph, *Dreyer* (London: British Film Institute, 1977), Mark Nash lists the same number of meters for the film. Other prominent examples of Nordisk's longer films during the early 1920s include Gunnar Sommerfeldt's *Borgslægtens Historie* (Sons of the Soil, 1920) at 4,394 meters (14,416 feet), Emanuel Gregers's multipart *Den flyvende Hollænder, I-IV* (The Phantom Ship, I-IV, 1920) at 5,071 meters (16,637 feet), and Gregers's *Jafet, der søger sig en Fader, I-IV* (The Adventures of Japhet, I-IV, 1922) at 6,634 meters (21,765 feet). See Larsen and Nissen, "100 Years of Nordisk Film," 20.

111 Danish film historian Engberg reports that scriptwriters were told to use "as few intertitles as possible" (see her article, "The Erotic Melodrama…," 63).

112 Nordisk Film International Sales, "*Leaves from Satan's Book* Dialog List" (TrustNordisk ApS, November 11, 2009), http://files.trustnordisk.com/files/ftpfiles/movies/NF152/private/Dialoglist_Org_Leaves_From_Satans_Book.pdf.

113 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 29.

114 Ibid.

115 Ibid, 27, 29.

116 Neergaard, *The Story of Danish Film*, 53.

117 Ibid., 13–14.

118 Quoted in Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, 12.

119 Milne, 47.

120 Ibid.

121 Locher, How does one write a film?, 13.

122 Neergaard, “The Rise, the Fall, and the Rise of Danish Film,” 219–20.

123 Tybjerg, “Stunt-Stories: The Sensation Film Genre in Denmark,” in *Celebrating 1895: The Centenary of Cinema*, ed. John Fullerton (Sydney, Australia: John Libbey, 1998), 146.

124 Urban Gad, *Filmen: dens Midler og Maal* [Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1919]: 164, cited in Tybjerg, “Stunt-Stories,” 146.

125 Tybjerg, “Stunt-Stories,” 148.

126 Gad, *Filmen: dens Midler og Maal*: 23, quoted in Tybjerg, “Stunt-Stories,” 146.

127 Dreyer article published in *B.T.*, January 23, 1952, cited in Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 68.

128 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director’s Work*, 11; Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 206.

129 Locher, How does one write a film?, 10.

130 Danish Film Museum, “*Leaves from Satan’s Book* Full Transcription List” (TrustNordisk ApS, May 6, 2009), 7, TrustNordisk, http://files.trustnordisk.com/files/ftpfiles/movies/NF152/public/flyer/ leaves _from_satans_book_flyer_2.pdf.

131 Nordisk Film International Sales, “*Leaves from Satan’s Book* Dialog List,” 19.

132 Dreyer, “Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913-24),” 54.

133 Ibid.

134 Jim Taylor, Mark R. Johnson, and Charles G. Crawford, *DVD Demystified*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006), 1–7, n. 7.

135 Dreyer, “Dreyer to Frost, Frederiksberg (Copenhagen), November 29, 1920,” in Dreyer’s cinema, 395.

136 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 16.

137 Dreyer, “Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913-24),” 54.

138 Dale D. Drum, CARL TH. DREYER: Sixth Interview, Print, June 14, 1967, 3, http://english.carlthdreyer .dk/aboutdreyer/visual-style/my-only-great-passion.aspx.

139 Quoted in Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 12.

140 Dreyer, Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913–24), 55.

141 Larsen, "Leaves from Satan's Book: Reception," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Blade-af-Satans-Bog/Reception.aspx, para. 3.

142 *Blade af Satans Bog* (Nordisk Films Kompagni, n.d.), Protocol XII,23, Nordisk Collection.

143 "List of Countries for Distribution of *Blade af Satans Bog*" (Nordisk Films Kompagni, n.d.), Protocol XII,39, Nordisk Collection.

144 George C. Pratt, ed., *Spellbound in Darkness: A History of the Silent Film*, rev. ed. (Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1973), 525.

145 *Blade af Satans Bog*, Protocol XII,39.

146 Ron Mottram, "The Great Northern Film Company: Nordisk Film in the American Motion Picture Market," *Film History: An International Journal* 2, no. 1 (Winter 1988): 71, doi:10.2307/3814950.

147 Ibid., 79.

148 Ibid.

149 Thorsen, "'We Had to Be Careful,'" 118.

150 Thomas C. Christensen to Stephen Larson, "SV: A Report on Image's Leaves from Satan's Book Edition," May 3, 2005.

151 Høyer, 3.

152 Bordwell, *On the History of Film Style* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 26.

153 *List of Exhibitions and Special Events - Current and Future*, Press Release (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, September 1, 1952), 3, MoMA: Press Release Archives, http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs /press_archives/1639/releases/MOMA_1952_0061_56.pdf?2010; *Schedule of Exhibitions and Events*, Press Release (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, January 1, 1957), 3, MoMA: Press Release

Archives, http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/2142/ releases/ MOMA_1956_0123 _114.pdf?2010.

154 [Linda Goldsmith], *The Films of Carl Dreyer*, Press Release (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, September 24, 1964), MoMA: Press Release Archives, http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press _archives/ 3302/ releases/MOMA_1964_0089_1964-09-24_49.pdf?2010.

155 Arthur Lennig, "The Scandinavian Film: *Leaves from Satan's Book*," in *Film Notes of Wisconsin Film Society*, ed. Arthur Lennig (Madison, WI: Madison Books, 1960), 92.

156 Lennig, "Introduction," in *Film Notes of Wisconsin Film Society*, 7.

157 Lennig, "The Scandinavian Film…," 92.

158 Lennig, "Introduction," 8.

159 Lennig does not list a run time for *Leaves* in either his book or in his December 1959 Wisconsin Film Society program notes.

160 [Sarah Eaton], *Carl Th. Dreyer*, Press Release, Carl Th. Dreyer (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, February 1989), 4, MoMA: Press Release Archives, http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives /6647/releases/MOMA_1989_0014_14.pdf?2010.

161 *February 17 - March 5, 1989*, Carl Th. Dreyer (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1989), MoMA: Press Release Archives, http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/6647/releases/MOMA_1989 _0014_14.pdf?2010.

162 Pacific Film Archive, "*Blade Af Satans Bog* Program Note," [1989], University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31320.

163 Dreyer, *Leaves Out of the Book of Satan*, Film (Glenn Photo Supply; Reseda, CA, n.d.).

164 Kit Parker Films, "*Blade Af Satan's Bog* (Leaves from Satan's Book)," 1979, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/Doc Detail ?docId=31319.

165 Ibid.

166 University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, “Carl Theodor Dreyer,” *BAM/PFA - Film Programs*, November 5, 2010, http://bampfa.berkeley.edu/film/FN18859.

167 Austrian Film Museum, “Carl Theodor Dreyer,” *Filmmuseum - Scope*, November 4, 2011, http://www.filmmuseum.at/en/film_program/program_archive.

168 Queensland Art Gallery and Gallery of Modern Art, “Carl Theodor Dreyer,” *Past Cinema Programs*, December 3, 2011, http://www.qagoma.qld.gov.au/cinematheque/past_programs/2011/carl_theodor_dreyer.

169 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director’s Work*, 10. Neergaard, a Danish film critic and close friend of Dreyer’s, first reported this anecdote in his 1940 monograph, *En filminstruktørs arbejde: Carl Th. Dreyer og hans ti film* (Copenhagen: Atheneum).

170 Olsen, The adventure of film and my own, 145.

171 Quoted in Tybjerg, “Red Satan,” 20.

172 Geoff Andrew, *The Film Handbook*, G.K. Hall Performing Arts Handbooks (Boston, MA: Hall, 1990).

173 Frank E. Beaver, *On Film: A History of the Motion Picture.* (New York: McGraw, 1983), 161.

174 Ib Monty, “Carl Th. Dreyer - a Biography,” 5–6, 8.

175 Bowser, *The Films of Carl Dreyer*, 4.

176 Monty, *Portrait of Carl Th. Dreyer* (Copenhagen: Danish Government Film Foundation, 1967), n.p.

177 Pratt, *Spellbound in Darkness*, 525.

178 Ronald Holloway, *Beyond the Image: Approaches to the Religious Dimension in the Cinema* (Geneva, CH: World Council of Churches in co-operation with Interfilm, 1977), 165.

179 David Thomson, *The New Biographical Dictionary of Film*, 5th ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010), 285.

180 Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer*, 40.

181 Peter Walsh, “IFI Blog: Carl Dreyer Season: The Early Films,” *IFI Blog*, March 30, 2012, para. 3, http://irish filminstitute.blogspot.com/2012/03/carl-dreyer-season-early-films.html.

182 Charles Eidsvik, "Demonstrating Film Influence," *Literature Film Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1973): 114.

183 Joseph Henabery, assistant director and actor on *Intolerance*, interviewed by Kevin Brownlow in Hollywood, December 1964. See *The Parade's Gone By...* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968), 52.

184 Ibid.

185 Thanks to Casper Tybjerg for first pointing this out in "Forms of the Intangible: Carl Th. Dreyer and the Concept of 'Transcendental Style'," *Northern Lights: Film & Media Studies Yearbook* 6, no. 1 (2008): 59–73.

186 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 64.

187 Griffith perused *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of the Ancient Babylonians* (1887), and *Babylonians and Assyrians* (1900), by A.H. Sayce, and *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria* (1911), and *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria* (1915), by Morris Jastrow. See William M. Drew, *D.W. Griffith's Intolerance: Its Genesis and Its Vision* (Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland, 1986), 43.

188 Brownlow, *The Parade's Gone By...*, 52.

189 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 67.

190 Michael Demtschyna, "Video Artefacts - Edge Enhancement," *Michael D's Region 4 DVD Info Page*, May 18, 2001, http://www.michaeldvd.com.au/Articles/VideoArtefacts/VideoArtefactsEdgeEnhancement.html.

191 Demtschyna, "Video Artefacts - Film Artefacts," *Michael D's Region 4 DVD Info Page*, May 18, 2001, http://www.michaeldvd.com.au/Articles/VideoArtefacts/VideoArtefactsFilmArtefacts.html.

192 Christensen to Larson, "Frame Rates of DFI Dreyer DVDs," April 30, 2013.

193 Ibid., para. 2.

194 Christensen to Larson, "Restoration of Dreyer Films," March 22, 2013, para. 3.

195 Pacific Film Archive, “Jesus in the Cinema: ‘Leaves from Satan’s Notebook’ Program Note,” August 15, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31325.

196 Susan Hayward, *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*, 4th ed., Routledge Key Guides (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 223.

197 Richard Dyer, *White* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 92.

198 Christensen to Larson, “Frame Rates of DFI Dreyer DVDs,” para. 1.

199 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 127.

200 Jan-Christopher Horak, “Carl Theodor Dreyer’s *Die Gezeichneten* (1922),” *UCLA Film & Television Archive*, December 2, 2011, http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/blogs/archival-spaces/2011/12/02/carl-theodor-dreyer%E2%80%99s-die-gezeichneten-1922.

201 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director’s Work*, 14.

202 Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer*, 57.

CHAPTER 3

Reconstruction and Its Implications for Authorship and Genre in Four Dreyer Silents

INTRODUCTION

Michael (1924), *Once Upon a Time* (1922), *The Parson's Widow* (1921), and *The Bride of Glomdal* (1926)—the four films examined in this chapter—were at one time or another considered either lost or incomplete until rediscovery several decades after their premieres. Each film's restoration involved reconstructing its original narrative. In film preservation discourse, a reconstruction entails locating the most original material artifacts (if available), comparing all existing sources, and producing an Editing Decision List (EDL) that will guide the editing process throughout the workflow.[1] A completed chart will document all the decisions made by the restorer with regard to assembling the restored version and the sources needed to reconstruct it.[2]

Dreyer's fifth feature, *Once Upon a Time*, represents one of the most complex cases of reconstruction because three of the film's seven sections are partly or wholly lost. In order to give new audiences a clear idea of the original structure and storyline of Dreyer's work, the Danish Film Institute's (DFI) restoration team relied on an amalgamation of sources: two archival prints, Swedish and German title lists (to compile a new set of intertitles), production stills, studio publicity photographs, the original program booklet from the Danish premiere, Dreyer's screenplay, and Holger Drachmann's play on which the film is based.[3] The insertion of stills and photos into an incomplete film illustrates a concept of re-mediation

known as hypermediacy. A contemporary restoration tool, hypermediacy reminds viewers of the restoration process by displaying static pictures and descriptive captions in place of missing scenes.[4] The process attempts to reassemble a complete narrative line and suggest to the audience what was originally present is now lost.[5] I argue that hypermediacy in *Once Upon a Time* creates aesthetic binaries between old and new media that challenge spatial and temporal boundaries of a traditional silent film presentation. As film archivist and curator Giovanna Fossati observes, the notion of using digital means to simulate original photographic images plays an integral role in contemporary discourse about film restoration.[6]

Like *Once Upon a Time*, presentations of *The Parson's Widow* at art museums and on home video have not been considered complete. The film was trimmed in the US prior to 1930, with cuts probably made for its April 1929 New York premiere.[7] However, in 2004 Film Preservation Associates digitally mastered a 35mm camera negative that is presumably the most complete print of the film. Dreyer's penultimate silent, *The Bride of Glomdal*, remains a partially lost film, although the DFI released a Blu-ray in 2011 that runs longer than any known version. *Michael* was also considered a lost film for many years until its rediscovery in 1958 by the East German Film Archive.[8] To celebrate *Michael*'s eightieth anniversary, the British video distributor Eureka translated the film's intertitles into English for perhaps the first time since the 1920s.

This chapter has two goals. First, I examine the effects reconstructions of these films have on narrative comprehension and authorship status. Second, I unpack the discursive implications the digitalization of Dreyer's silents has on film genres and national cinemas in

the virtual world. I argue that the films' mass-produced DVDs and Blu-ray, online promotion of Dreyer retrospectives at museums and retrospectives, online video catalogs, and viral marketing all contribute to a media cultural shift in the reception of the films compared to their original releases. I first trace the inchoate phase of this shift in critical reevaluations of Dreyer in the print medium. Although book-length studies, monographs, and film museum brochures show burgeoning signs toward critical reinterpretation, the proliferation of digital artifacts and electronic documents fêting Dreyer's work promulgate a more dynamic shift. A contemporary re-reading or reappraisal of an older film should not automatically suggest that it was poorly received when first shown. In fact, although two of Dreyer's films received mixed or subpar reviews, the other two films were moderate critical successes. Rather, I purport that the original reviewers reacted indifferently to the genres Dreyer experimented with. For example, few critics initially associated *The Parson's Widow*, *Once Upon a Time*, or *The Bride of Glomdal* with what I call the *lyrical* film, a genre in Scandinavian cinema forged by Swedish directors Victor Sjöström and Mauritz Stiller. In the *lyrical* film, landscapes and nature play a prominent role in character and narrative development.

American critics likewise neglected to associate *Michael*'s characteristics with the *Kammerspiel*-film. In their book, *Film History: An Introduction*, Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell offer a succinct description of the genre:

> A *Kammerspiel*-film concentrated on a few characters and explored a crisis in their lives in detail. The emphasis was on slow, evocative acting and telling details rather than extreme expressions of emotion. The chamber drama

> atmosphere came from the use of a small number of settings and concentration on character psychology rather than spectacle. These were films set in everyday contemporary surroundings and they often covered a short span of time.[9]

German film historian Lotte H. Eisner likens the *Kammerspiel*-film to intimate theatre, a small psychological drama consisting of a limited number of characters who live in an everyday milieu.[10] *Michael* was considered a lost and forgotten *Kammerspiel*-film until its 2004 DVD release.

MICHAEL AND THE *KAMMERSPIEL*-FILM

In 1924, Dreyer traveled to Berlin to teem with renowned producer Erich Pommer (1889–1966) at UFA, the prestigious studio responsible for German Expressionist classics of the period. Dreyer chose to adapt Danish writer Herman Bang's (1857–1912) novel, *Mikaël* (1904), a European love triangle involving an aging artist, his young Czech artist, Mikaël, and a deceitful Russian aristocrat. Dreyer sets most of the film's action in the palatial abode of German artist Claude Zoret (Benjamin Christensen), whose homoerotic relationship with his dashing protégé, Michael (Walter Slezak), is interrupted by the title character's love affair with Princess Lucia Zamikow (Nora Gregor). Dreyer shot *Michael* from November 1923 to June 1924; a majority of filming took place inside UFA's Tempelhof studios.[11] *Michael* had its world premiere on September 26, 1924 in Germany where it was greeted with enthusiastic reviews. Critics also praised the film when it premiered in Denmark nearly two months later, on November 17, although they paid more attention to its treatment of Bang's novel.[12] On

the other hand, when *Michael* (retitled *Chained*) finally made its US debut in December 1926, it was met with critical backlash.

While the German trade papers mentioned *Michael* as an example of the *Kammerspiel*-film,[13] the genre eluded American press coverage of the film. Mordaunt Hall of the *New York Times* calls the film "a dull piece of work, redeemed only by some artistic scenes" as well as Christensen's performance.[14] Roscoe M'Gowen of the *Daily (NY) News* similarly describes it as a "dull depiction of a love affair between a boy and a girl and the resultant seemingly exaggerated unhappiness of, the boy's foster father."[15] *The Evening (NY) World*'s Palmer Smith comes close to identifying it as a *Kammerspiel*-film but provides a telling sign of how Dreyer's work in the genre was lost among US critics. Smith recounts: "the Sunday evening audience sat spellbound, but I suspect that it was composed largely of self-determined 'sophisticates,' who went with intent to be spellbound if possible. This reviewer was considerably bored and must confess to a lack of that 'sophistication' that 'relishes art for dirt's sake'."[16] The sophisticates Smith refers to comprise an arthouse crowd analogous to the élite who watched performances of *Kammerspiel* plays by Henrik Ibsen (1828–1906), August Strindberg (1849–1912), and Max Reinhardt (1873–1943). One reason that *Michael* may have failed to connect with US audiences is that most German Expressionist films depict lower middle class life. *Michael* is set exclusively among the bourgeoisie so Smith probably surmised that the film sought to reach an audience of Europeanized well-heeled intellectuals. This discrepancy in social class portrayal may have

befuddled and alienated the American film public from accepting *Michael* as a genuine *Kammerspiel*-film.

The poor reception overseas made *Michael* an unlikely candidate for revival at art theaters. The film vanished and no prints were believed to exist in 1939 when the first book on Dreyer went into publication.[17] *Michael* was mostly ignored in German film history books. For example, in the widely known *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* (1947), Siegfried Kracauer belittles Bang's novel, *Mikaël*, and makes only a cursory reference to Dreyer's film.[18] *Michael* is left out of Eisner's major work, *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt*. However, in 1958, a print of *Michael* was found in the East Berlin archives and handed over for restoration to the Danish Film Museum.[19]

Michael began to experience a second life. For example, film critic and director Paul Schrader's book, *Transcendental Style in Film* (1972), devotes a section on the *Kammerspiel*-film in his chapter on Dreyer and displays a production still from *Michael* to illustrate cinematic techniques inherent in the genre such as careful staging and emotive gestures from the actors.[20] Schrader lists *Michael* as the first of Dreyer's films to employ a singularly identifiable style in the *Kammerspiel* mode.[21] The film also gained critical cache abroad. In his book, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer* (1971), the late British film critic Tom Milne refuses to label *Michael* an apprentice work, anointing it instead as Dreyer's first masterpiece.[22] Although Milne does not overtly cite *Michael* as a *Kammerspiel*-film, he clearly understands its genre conventions. He recognizes the *demi-mondaine* of its setting where a fading

aristocracy is the site of social satire, observation, and criticism.[23] Milne also uncovers another generic trope; the characters' predilection for decisions is reflected in a cycle of psychological cause and effect.[24] Milne extols Dreyer for achieving a harmonious emotional, spatial, and temporal unity in which the acting, décor, and camerawork work in perfect coordination with the editing.[25] Film scholar Mark Nash, Milne's colleague and fellow Brit, likewise delivers a laudatory reassessment of the film in his monograph, *Dreyer* (1977). Drawing on semiotics and psychoanalytic film theory, Nash unpacks how the film's paintings and wine glasses function as signs of desire between the characters of Zoret, Zamikow, and Michael.[26] While Nash's piece is not a study of the *Kammerspiel* genre, it helped promote *Michael* for the London-based National Film Theatre's complete retrospective of Dreyer's films in October 1977.[27] In the years following, *Michael* continued to play sporadically at repertory cinemas and museums but it remained relatively unknown.

The digital debut of *Michael* in 2004 was celebrated as both an important film culture event and commemorative anniversary for the eighty-year-old film. London-based Eureka Video unveiled *Michael* as one of its first three releases in the label's Masters of Cinema (MoC) Series that honors past and present *auteurs*. Eureka's two-disc set inaugurated a shift in how the film was presented and received compared to when it was first shown. For instance, the back cover of *Michael*'s DVD and a catalog entry on Eureka's website touts the film's *Kammerspiel* style and compares its intimate theater to Dreyer's *Gertrud* (1964).[28] The DVD's booklet includes an essay by MoC producer Nick Wrigley who devotes about three paragraphs to *Kammerspiel* films.[29] The Eureka DVD of *Michael*, along with the

concurrent US DVD released by Kino on Video, were well-received by film e-zines and DVD review websites beginning in the fall of 2004.[30] Boston University film scholar Roy Grundmann writes in *Cineaste*: "...*Michael* is a highly sophisticated *Kammerspiel* that constitutes an early peak in Dreyer's creative trajectory and a notable experiment in style."[31] The positive reaction to *Michael*'s DVD releases has extended to Dreyer retrospectives where the film receives recurrent screenings. In January 2012, Arsenal Cinema organized a "Magical History Tour" in Berlin around *Kammerspiel* films and included *Michael* in its screening lineup. The program identifies the film's sumptuous interiors, lighting, and editing of close-ups as representative of the *Kammerspiel* genre.[32]

The digital mastering of two versions of *Michael* and the addition of new English titles contribute to the film's recent recognition as a bonafide *Kammerspiel* work. Eisner bring up an important point about the *Kammerspiel*-film when discussing director Lupu Pick's (1886–1931) work in the genre. Pick's style, like others (including Dreyer) during this period, was predicated on a deliberately slow pace. The characters exchanged carefully modulated glances and reactions with one another that resembled pantomime. The audience would watch intently as characters made an utterance and then stopped moving their lips.[33] The audience was so immersed in every detail on the screen that any extratextual device presented in a movie house would pose as a disruption to its concentration. In the pre-digital era, the device of reading aloud translated intertitles during a 16mm or 35mm screening of *Michael* probably played a role in the mixed reception of the film. The task of listening to an art museum curator or film festival employee read a script, presumably in the front of an

auditorium, adds an extra chore to an already challenging viewing experience. Because the audience is caught up in studying the film's *mise-en-scène,* it has to redirect its attention from visual stimuli to active listening. A simultaneous focus on the screen image and a live speaker's recitation of scripted material outside of the film's diegesis is especially demanding. Not only must one connect the film's settings and descriptions of the characters to a narrative arc, he or she must also process and absorb the meanings behind the characters' mediated thoughts.

The matriculation of digital media into the film industry rectified these limitations by bringing in far more subtitling options. For instance, a Blu-ray can store up to 32 text subtitles in nearly any language and display them in various fonts, colors, and positions on the screen.[34] While it does not offer as high a storage capacity as its HD counterpart, a DVD can accommodate subtitle text when they are pre-rendered as graphic subpictures.[35] To implement this feature, MoC enlisted the UK post-production facility Phaebus to perform digital authoring on the European version of *Michael*. MoC transferred a 1993 broadcast of the film courtesy of the Franco-German network Arte Television. The intertitles contain the original German text with translated English subtitles superimposed beneath them.

Conversely, the US presentation of *Michael* comes at the price of sacrificing Dreyer's authenticity. The paradox is that although American audiences were probably presented with English titles in some form when they saw the film in 1926, they would have felt cheated if they watched the US DVD. Film Preservation Associates chose to replace the German titles with new English title cards. The company's most egregious alteration was to "airbrush" or

digitally erase the printed German text of a magazine article read by Zoret and replace it with off-white, shadow-embossed English characters. By contrast, MoC displays the translated subtitles along blank white rows of space between the filmed article page. The English letters on the US version are distracting because they appear as if they are generated on a computer monitor with annoying "dot crawl," moving dots that permeate the letters' edges.

The re-mediated titles depreciate the film's artistic integrity and rob its textual authority. *Michael* is a Decla-Bioscop and UFA co-production, filmed in Berlin by German cinematographer Karl Freund along with sets designed by German architect Hugo Häring, and featuring a cast of European actors. The film is meant to be seen with its original German titles. Assuming that one knows something about *Michael*'s production, English-only titles will essentially seem foreign to any audience. (The equivalent of this compromise in the sound era would be an American viewer watching a Spaghetti Western with a dubbed soundtrack in a language different than the film's original Italian.) The "textuality" of *Michael*—from Herman Bang's novel to Dreyer's adapted script—is of equal importance to the film's *Kammerspiel* identity as are the actors' performances, interior sets, paintings, and sculptures. *Michael*'s original titles, including any unique expressions that Dreyer brings from his screenplay, do not get validated on the US DVD. The opening titles cite the F. W. Murnau-Stiftung (Foundation) as the restorer but the remaining titles, including the end credits, never specifies either who conducted a translation of the German text or who redid the intertitles in English. Usually, after the final credits of a film roll, a text credit or logo of a post-production facility flashes on the screen to attribute the subtitle work. I concur with

Taylor et al. (2006) that subtitles are best handled by a subtitling house rather than an archive because preservationists could focus solely on allocating their time and resources to image and sound restoration.[36]

While it has survived in its entirety, *Michael* shares in common with the other three films in this chapter a screening history that mainly presented the films' original foreign-language intertitles to an English-speaking audience. Electronic subtitling, a tool that can (re)interpret and re-mediate a film's aural language, raises a critical point about cinema as a visual art in the digital environment. In contrast to the pre-electronic era when it was more cumbersome and expensive to insert new sets of intertitle cards on film reels, today's digital cinema allows for the seamless integration of intertitles with the original photographic images recreated via the digital intermediate process in film labs. But as the next section on an earlier Dreyer film demonstrates, changes to the order and placement of images and titles can cause adverse effects to story flow and narrative organization.

Once Upon a Time's Missing Frames: Filling in the Gaps

In the summer of 1922, Dreyer returned to Denmark to adapt Danish playwright Holger Drachmann's (1846–1908) national-romantic fairy tale, *Der var engang* (written 1884, premiere 1887). A reworking of *The Taming of the Shrew*, Dreyer's film shares a similar premise as well as comedic and farcical elements with Shakespeare's play. Dreyer's film follows the Prince of Denmark's (Svend Methling) exploits to lure the Princess of Illyria (Clara Pontoppidan) away from Frederiksborg Castle for an agrarian life in the forest. The prince puts the princess through a series of ordeals in order to make her better appreciate her

privileged lifestyle and in turn, fall in love with her suitor. The production of *Once Upon a Time* was beset by logistical problems and received mixed reviews upon its release.[37] However, the film ran for nearly four weeks at Paladsteatret where it was shown thirty-two times to a cumulative audience of more than 45,000 people.[38] Dreyer's work garnered Paladsteatret its biggest success up to that point. Sophus Madsen's Dansk-Svensk Film, the film's distributor, pulled out an advertisement in the major Danish trade papers proclaiming *Once Upon a Time* "the biggest Danish film success to date."[39] It went on to become arguably the highest grossing film of Dreyer's career.[40]

Despite its remarkable popularity, the film disappeared for many years. In 1958 an incomplete print was uncovered in a storeroom at the Palads Teatret (the Palads Cinema) in Copenhagen.[41] To fête Dreyer for his seventy-fifth birthday in 1964, the broadcasting station Danmarks Radio asked Nordisk to find something unusual to include in a television program covering the filmmaker's life and work. Nordisk scoured its studio offices in Holte, a suburb of Copenhagen, and discovered additional reels of *Once Upon a Time* stored in a well-preserved vault.[42] Fortunately, the negative was relatively unused and the film's quality appeared on par with modern-day films.[43] The film was turned over to the Danish Film Museum which made a fine-grain master from a dupe negative that included elements from both prints.[44] Ib Monty, the museum's curator, watched the surviving fragments (about fifty minutes of raw material) and concluded that *Once Upon a Time* features some of the finest landscapes in all of Danish cinema.[45]

The film was exported to New York for a Museum of Modern Art retrospective of Dreyer's films in the autumn of 1965. Eileen Bowser, the exhibition's director, raised eyebrows with her bold claim that Dreyer uses an outdoor setting for fantasy in *Once Upon a Time* more effectively than Ingmar Bergman does in *The Seventh Seal* (1957). However, Bowser's encomium attests to Dreyer's remarkable deployment of earthy landscapes without the intrusion of sun and wind to despoil its effect of make-believe. Film critic Kirk Bond, who reviewed the Dreyer series for *Film Quarterly*, bestowed more effusive praise on the film: "It is, even in its present small, dismantled form, a veritable history of film, and to anyone with a feeling for creative film it is an overpowering experience….[it contains] great scenes that can compare with the best in film history."[46] Judging by this spate of rapturous acclaim, one would have expected *Once Upon a Time* to enter world cinema's canon of rediscovered classics. However, the film's fragmented state and German-only intertitles made it onerous for exhibitors to include it in their screening schedules. For instance, the Pacific Film Archive's Lynn Wilkinson notes that the intertitles cover just one or two frames, meaning that they cannot be translated and read aloud when the film is projected at a normal speed (20 fps).[47] The film only played a few times at retrospectives over the next three decades.

In 2002, the DFI undertook an ambitious restoration project. As mentioned earlier, the film institute used a compilation of sources in order to give *Once Upon a Time* a full narrative. Specifically, the DFI's decision to insert production photos into the film, including some from the DVD's "stills archive," raises important ontological issues about the re-

mediation of static and moving images on the electronic screen. Stills fall under three categories: (1) snippets lifted from the production in order to publicize the work at the time of filming, although not all shots will appear in the final edited version; (2) frame enlargements taken from the production itself; and (3) production stills demonstrating the process of production.[48] For a clear theoretical framing of how stills on a DVD affect a digital spectator's reading of film narrative and aesthetics, it is worth turning to Tina Kendall's analysis of the Criterion Collection edition of *Ratcatcher* (Lynne Ramsay, 1999).

Kendall argues that the hybrid and intermedial potential of still pictures and moving images challenges traditional oppositions of old versus new media.[49] Rather than simply reify binary tensions in *Ratcatcher* such as movement and stillness, presence and absence, preservation and deterioration, and life and death, Criterion's digital presentation re-mediates a space between the film's cinematographic images and the still life of photography.[50] Kendall observes that the DVD stills gallery both provides an extension of the photogenic compositions foregrounded in *Ratcatcher*'s narrative and calls into question the convergent and hybrid nature of cinema.[51] The ambivalent relationship between celluloid and the electronic encoding of photographic images onto DVD illustrates cinema's anomalous, bifurcated place in the digital arts.

Kendall brings up a new concept where various media continually refer to one another, borrow from, simulate, and displace one another. These revolving cycles are demonstrated on the DFI DVD of *Once Upon a Time*. The 75-minute restored film contains thirty-one static images integrated into the narrative. The stills are interspersed throughout

the film's seven reels/sections: four appear in Section 2, six in Section 4, ten in Section 6, and six in Section 7. They comprise photos taken during the production and publicity shots culled from the DFI/Stills & Posters Archive. The narrative also contains photograms or frame grabs, bitmapped still images that were digitally captured from a video device and then inserted in an AVID editing suite.[52] For instance, a frame grab of Kaspar Smokehat (Hakon Ahnfelt-Rønne), the prince's helper, is inserted and repeated in the second reel to supplement missing footage of a conversation between Kaspar and the King of Illyria (Peter Jerndorff). The frame enlargement is taken from an earlier scene in the second section where Kaspar stares at the princess' petticoat. To illustrate the king's reply, the DFI borrows from photography by inserting two zoomed-in head shots of the king on his throne. The DFI follows a similar pattern with frame grabs in the sixth reel's missing castle kitchen sequence. A medium close-up of the scullery maid Bolette Fadebursterne (Karen Thalbitzer), Kaspar's fiancée, is captured and placed at the beginning. A frame grab showing Bolette and the princess is also presented twice. In the fourth reel, the DFI again references the print medium by displaying pictures of Kaspar and the king from the original Danish program and the Stills Archive. Kaspar poses as a knight and tries to lure the princess away from the castle. Overall, the stills and frame grabs amplify the tension between the analog and digital domains.

In putting together *Once Upon a Time* for DVD and exhibition at its museum, the DFI engaged in a workflow that accentuates Kendall's ontological notion of hybrid media cycles. For example, after restorer Thomas Christensen and his restoration team scanned a duplicate positive of the film in standard definition (720x576 pixels), they took the EDL from the

AVID editing machine and placed it into an Inferno effects workstation for high-definition film work.[53] They then rescanned the film on a Spirit DataCine, a high-performance and high-speed film scanner, at 2K resolution (1920x1440 pixels).[54] Once the reels were assembled, the film was transferred back to 35mm black-and-white negative stock (#2238) on an Arrilaser film recorder.[55] (Christensen says that he used a few 35mm prints for theatrical projection.[56]) Finally, the 2K data was down-scaled to create a digital betacam tape video master that became the basis for the DVD's 17 fps presentation.[57]

However noble the DFI's intentions were to supply *Once Upon a Time* with a complete narrative, its incorporation of stills and photos tampers with the authenticity of the film's original narrative. These transcoded digital images may pertain to the production but they should be kept separate from the film's diegesis and narrative thread. The latter may go against the restoration community's credo for partially lost films that "something is better than nothing," but the stills invade the film's space and interrupt its narrative flow. The problem is not so much that photos and frame grabs lie outside the rubric of "moving images." Rather, the DFI arranges several of the stills out of order. This affects the tone, mood, and setting of a scene. For example, substituting a missing conversation with Kaspar and the king with a photogram of Kaspar gazing at the princess' dress comes across as gauche and awkward. It is unlikely that Kaspar would mimic the same disposition and body language for a scene with less levity.

The DFI's uneven arrangement of stills also causes incongruities and continuity issues in other scenes. For example, in the fourth reel, the still of Kaspar dressed as a knight

on the bottom steps of the castle is mismatched with an intertitle that describes him knocking on the door. Kaspar faces the camera with his back to the staircase instead of facing the doorway. To reimagine the king's response, the DFI uses a picture of the king adorned in a nightshirt and two frontal shots of him smoking a long pipe. A scene like this would typically be filmed using the shot/counter-shot exchange with the king opening the door and greeting the prince's assistant. The stills seem artificial and misrepresentative of the film's shooting style. Additionally, there is no explanation in the intertitles whether or not this is a day or night scene. Kaspar is seemingly lit during the daytime but the king is tailored with evening attire so the scene appears anachronistic.

The stills and intertitles chosen for *Once Upon a Time* often forge odd juxtapositions. For instance, in the sixth reel, the audience is shown a wide photo of the prince (now a potter) in bed with the princess knitting by his side. A still of the Pedlar/tinker (Lars Madsen) with his cane approaching the couple's thatched hut is presented after the photo. Earlier, when the prince struggles to devise a ruse to steal the princess, he meets the Pedlar in the forest. The Pedlar shows him a copper kettle which supposedly contains magical powers. Although the narrative establishes the tinker as a helper, the still of him coming to the hut does not serve any formative purpose. His role in the prince and princess' new abode is neither specified nor elaborated. Also, he is not seen in the film again. The segue from the forest to the castle in the penultimate section also suffers from a rough transition. The DFI displays a wide photograph of Kaspar confronting a maid, presumably within the castle's gate. This still creates spatial confusion because the frame grabs, which were digitally

captured from later in the scene, are moved to the beginning to introduce Kaspar's fiancée. But neither the stills nor the intertitles explain Kaspar's entrance into the kitchen. This omission is partly due to the absence of establishing shots which would help situate the change in locale. Because there are no long shots to show visual cues like objects and décor, the viewer is left in a disoriented state, uncertain of the setting's space.

Despite the reservations above, I agree with the late archivist Sam Kula that stills are highly valuable when aspects of a film production are not known to exist.[58] This is the case in the final section of *Once Upon a Time* because the seventh reel is entirely missing. To depict the wedding of the Princess of Illyria and Prince of Denmark, the DFI presents a series of stills that is sequenced in a more logistical fashion than the stills in other parts of the film. The audience is shown the maids tending to the princess' gown, the bride and the groom raising long unity candles, the wedding procession, the exchanging of vows, bride and groom exiting the sanctuary, and the late arrival of the King of Illyria. The montage of stills function as an illustrated photoplay which helps tie the loose ends of the story together. The princess expresses her true love for the beggar who tamed her in the forest and when she discovers that he is also the prince, she agrees to marry him. The scene is thus particularly helpful in bringing a conclusion to a patched narrative. However, because no raw footage survived in this section, it would have been better to include this lost ending as an extra on the DVD.

If the DFI revisits *Once Upon a Time* for Blu-ray or restores another silent film, I would recommend it take a close look at Alpha-Omega Digital's restoration of Ernst Lubitsch's *Das Weib des Pharao* (The Loves of Pharaoh, 1922).[59] Like *Once Upon a Time*,

The Loves of Pharaoh is a partially lost film that necessitated a reconstruction using extant projection print fragments, the original screenplay, production stills, the 1922 German program, censorship notes, and press reviews.[60] Unlike the DFI, Alpha-Omega is more judicious in its selection and placement of stills into the film's narrative. The completed 2011 restoration of *The Loves of Pharaoh* incorporates thirty explicatory intertitles to account for individual shots and whole scenes that are considered lost. Sixteen stills (including a few frozen outtakes) accompany the intertitles and stand in for about 600 meters (1,968 feet) of missing footage that is equivalent to ten minutes of screen duration. There are scenes where the image appears to jump ahead but Alpha-Omega does not try to overcompensate for the missing frames by inserting onset photos or production stills.

The DFI could use Alpha-Omega's intertitles as a blueprint when it designs the typeface of a specific language version. Alpha-Omega had access to Russian, Italian, and French prints of *The Loves of Pharaoh* and adapted each language's original type font for the intertitles. The DFI had access to the original German flash titles and Swedish censorship titles of *Once Upon a Time* but why could they not recreate those languages' typefaces using a word processing program? Or why could they not perform the same function for the Danish and English intertitles by consulting extant prints of films produced during the same period? The DFI's intertitles are too obviously re-mediated because the lettering borders show jagged edges (an artifact known as aliasing), which probably results from the interlaced video format and antiquated software. Consequently, the intertitles appear like they underwent too much post-processing.

The biggest difference between the DFI DVD and the Alpha-Omega DVD/Blu-ray is that the latter provides a color-coded legend for the intertitles. Using the film's original titles from primary sources as a template, Alpha-Omega displays full screen intertitles in blue for surviving shots and scenes. For the purpose of explaining missing scenes, it displays white full screen intertitles. On a Blu-ray extra titled "Missing Scenes," Alpha-Omega replicates the style of white letters for the descriptive captions that accompany a slide show of fifteen lost scenes from the film. On future restorations, the DFI could design a color key for its intertitles in order to cogently identify the relationship between visual-textual material. This tool will also help viewers avoid obfuscating the onscreen space the characters inhabit because they will be prompted to anticipate non-cinematic images that may not show (or cover) the full spatial dimensions of a filmed scene.

In sum, the organization and arrangement of the static images in *Once Upon a Time*'s reconstructed narrative exemplifies speculative guesswork by the DFI. It is doubtful that the stills' aesthetic qualities approximate the film's visual style. The lighting, the type of shot, and the angle of framing most likely were originally very different than the ancillary stills show. A photographer's preference for a certain length and width to stage a publicity photo also deviates from the scenographic space Dreyer constructs for a scene. The DFI's frequent "freezing" of original film images and their reinsertion to a different point in the narrative constitutes a pattern of inverse editing that altogether runs counter to the linear editing the story requires. By altering Dreyer's intentions and re-mediating *Once Upon a Time*'s narrative, the DFI supersedes Dreyer as the film's new *auteur*.

Once Upon a Time's DVD menus and disc contents also bear the DFI's authorial stamp. Kendall places the design of a DVD into two categories: (1) celebrates cinematic images as art and honors the film director as an *auteur*; and (2) foregrounds the medium's textual properties by highlighting its information programs, interactivity, and efficiency.[61] Kendall argues that Criterion's inclusion of *Ratcatcher* director Lynne Ramsay's short films as a special feature places it in the first category. By contrast, with its emphasis on informational expansion, the DFI's DVD belongs in the second category. On the DVD's main menu, the viewer is presented with several options: play the film, select a reel, compare two versions of a scene, access a stills gallery, and read a very brief biography of Dreyer. The version comparison allows the user to watch an edited version of the missing kitchen castle sequence and then compare it with an unedited version containing only the raw material. A screen of text states: "It was necessary to edit the sequence from the surviving elements, in some cases basing the edit on indications scribbled on the film itself." On the one hand, this restoration demonstration shows the conscientious effort made by a film museum to unify missing pieces of an incomplete film. But on the other hand, the demo showcases the technological ingenuity of digital cleanup tools. By asserting its resourcefulness in film laboratory work, the DFI stakes its claim to authorship. The stills gallery fits Kendall's second category because it is there primarily for informational value. For example, the DFI shows the pre-production stage through a colorized conceptual art drawing of the film's costumes and castle architecture. The remainder of the stills illustrates the process of production with head shots of the leading players. Dreyer's bio and filmography is relegated

to the bottom right of the menu. The organization and layout of the DVD both showcases and endorses the work of the DFI more so than Dreyer's contribution to the film.

The DFI's banner and name above Dreyer's name on the DVD front cover situates *Once Upon a Time* with a specific national film institute. This design placement also ties in with recent scholarship that associates the film with Danish national cinema in the 1920s. In an article published two years prior to the release of *Once Upon a Time*'s restoration, Tybjerg argues that the film should be branded distinctively Danish just as Sjöström's films are labeled as specifically Swedish.[62] Tybjerg defines a "national film" as a film produced in a particular country and which bears the imprint of its nation's character.[63] A national film was usually adapted from a heralded literary work and shot on location amidst landscapes and natural scenery.[64] Tybjerg, who served as co-restorer and a production coordinator for the film's restoration, remarks that *Once Upon a Time* and other Danish nature films were shown overseas to promote what the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Press Bureau describes as a "Happy, peaceful Denmark."[65] It should come as no surprise that Danish representatives would want their country depicted with pastoral images. It was desirable to have Scandinavian *lyrical* films shown at home and abroad as early as 1912. For example, in October of that year, a critic for *Politiken* (Copenhagen's daily newspaper) reviewed Sjöström's *Trädgårdsmästaren* (*The Broken Spring Rose*, 1912) and commented: "Some of the scenes unfold in a landscape of natural beauty that has never been more ravishing in our cinemas."[66]

Tybjerg's archival work of *Once Upon a Time*'s promotional literature indicates that the film sought to project an idyllic portrait of Denmark. The article displays a large photograph of the film's sprawling, heavenly forest that captures a moment of natural serenity. Wrigley's online review of the DFI DVD likewise celebrates the sumptuous lensing of the forest scenes. Wrigley and his MoC colleague Trond Trondsen created a 7x7 table of thumbnail images from the disc's digital transfer.[67] Several of the frame grabs present shining examples of Denmark's rolling hills, open vistas, and sunlit pine trees. The film's resplendent imagery displayed on the World Wide Web shows how an oft-forgotten work can reenter the canon of Danish silent films and become associated with its national identity.

THE PARSON'S WIDOW

After he parted ways with Nordisk Film Kompagni following *Leaves from Satan's Book*, Dreyer joined Swedish-based Svensk Filmindustri to helm *The Parson's Widow* (produced 1920, released 1921). Working from Norwegian author Kristofer Janson's (1814–1917) short story, *Prestekonen* (1901), Dreyer sets the action in a 17th-century Norwegian rural township. The young gentleman Søfren Ivarson (Einar Röd) beats out two other theology candidates in a sermon competition for the vacant parson position. He becomes the elected parson but learns that, per village custom, he must wed the widow of three previous parsons. Søfren struggles to accept his new role as village parson and devoted husband to feisty seventy-six-year-old Margarethe Pedersdotter (Hildur Carlberg). Upon arrival to the village, Søfren had planned to marry his fiancée, Mari (Greta Almroth), but she must pose as Søfren's sister until either Dame Margarethe dies or the couple finds a way to get rid of her.

The Parson's Widow received mixed reviews in both the Danish and Swedish trades.[68] Due to World War I and the borders closing, trade restrictions prevented the export of Dreyer's film for a long time.[69] In 1928, *The Parson's Widow* finally made its US debut where it appeared under the misleading title of *The Witch Woman*. Mordaunt Hall of the *New York Times* describes it as lethargic with scenes that border on tedium.[70] He blames an inexperienced Dreyer for not making details of the story more readily apparent. Hall also gripes that the Scandinavian film industry has not demonstrated ample progress in its handling of editing.[71]

The Parson's Widow was made at the tail end of the Golden Age of Swedish cinema (1914–1920). Films produced during this period were distinguished by a thematic connection between human will, the Swedish landscape, and a lyrical devotion to nature.[72] Dreyer worked for the enterprising mogul Charles Magnusson (1878–1948), who formed Svensk Filmindustri in December 1919 after his original studio, Svenska Bio, dissolved in June 1918.[73] Dreyer's work reveals the palpable influence of two of Magnusson's most outstanding directors under contract at Svensk: Victor Sjöström (1879–1960) and Mauritz Stiller (1883–1928). While Stiller's films express their character through rhythmic editing and carefully constructed montage, Sjöström's films distinguish their identity through physiognomic studies of people and their milieu.[74] In a 1920 article for *Dagbladet* (Copenhagen *Daily-Blade*), Dreyer calls Sjöström "the father of the Swedish *art* film....He was perhaps the first in Scandinavia to realize that one cannot *manufacture* films if they are to have at least some cultural value."[75] (Dreyer later disclosed that he also watched Stiller's

films when he first got his start in filmmaking.[76]) The *art* film that Dreyer cites is synonymous with the *lyrical* film because both genres seek genuine human representation in outdoor settings unfettered by the confines of a studio's artificial backdrop.

Film critics and historians credit Dreyer for making a successful transition from a big studio where there is a more traditional hierarchical division of labor to a smaller studio where he had extra room for creative exploration. Geoff Andrew, Ken Kelman, Tom Milne, and Ebbe Neergaard all consider *The Parson's Widow* to represent Dreyer's breakthrough film.[77] Most commentators acknowledge the influence of Sjöström and Stiller on the film's style and choice of shooting conditions. As Sjöström and Stiller would prefer, Dreyer and his cinematographer George Schnéevoigt filmed all scenes on location at the Maihaugen folk museum in Lillehammer, Norway.[78] Every shot was captured in the Norwegian landscape, in old Norwegian farmsteads, as well as in a real parsonage and church.[79] Dreyer decided not to build a single set or flat which was highly unusual for its time. Dai Vaughan identifies several of the genre qualities inherent in the *art* film and the *lyrical* film. He credits Dreyer for coalescing the film's townspeople, furniture, animals, and landscape into an authentic universe so they all seemingly exist on the same plane of reality.[80]

Dreyer puts some of these genre elements into action during the opening moments of the film. The first intertitle on the DVD reads: "Now, as a thousand years ago, the waterfall sings by the old, Norwegian village." A high-angle shot of a deluge cascading down is followed by another title: "If we listen closely, it tells a lot about the days gone by." The camera returns to the waterfall and pans left to a rocky mountain where the film's two

protagonists, Søfren and Mari, emerge from the forest to catch a view. An iris closes in on the pair before opening up as they sidle toward a village. Significantly, a card that appears in the film's original Danish title list provides additional confirmation of the film's themes and linkage to the *lyrical* film: "Years passed, generations succeeded each other, but only the torrent, the son or the mountain, remained, still remains, will always remain…"[81] Dreyer uses the language of poetic simplicity and evocative images as a metaphor to join the ever-flowing water with the fluid and cyclical nature of life in the nearby parsonage.

Scandinavian film historian Peter Cowie observes that lyrically infused films like Sjöström's *The Outlaw and His Wife* (1918) show mountains and rivers as possessing superhuman control over events. They present man with a challenge that he embraces.[82] Dreyer continues this aesthetic trope by showing Søfren witness a powerful natural force that portends the difficult adjustment he will have to make when he marries a woman much older than Mari. Since the film's title character is the Norwegian village's unofficial matriarch, it became a longstanding tradition for an incoming parson to join her in marriage. Dreyer shows Søfren and Mari together by the waterfall because they will come to represent the younger generation of the village's vicar and his wife. The waterfall bursts with bounds of energy that echo the vivacity and youth of the couple.

The relatively pristine digital transfer on the DVD of *The Parson's Widow* reveals for perhaps the first time to a wide audience a previously unnoticed dimension that Dreyer adds to the *lyrical* film. Whereas Sjöström and Stiller's films place their protagonists against a harsh physical landscape that challenges their resolve through climatic action scenes,

Dreyer's film is more philosophical in that it is a meditation on man's relationship to nature. For example, in the fourth reel, Søfren lays in the marsh playing his small flute to try to draw Mari's attention. He appears looser outdoors compared to the agitated demeanor he exudes in Margarethe's repressed domestic spaces where she is master of the house and he must cater to her wishes. Dreyer also contrasts interior with exterior when the camera pans from right to left as Søfren plays his music to try to muffle out the irritating noise of a spindle operated by Margarethe's groom in the parsonage, Steinar (Emil Helsengreen). Søfren feels liberated amongst rural spaces where he can spend some rare quiet time with Mari. Dreyer links Søfren's flute playing to private moments with Mari as in the first reel when he plays a few notes for her as the couple rest outside a neighboring parish. After Mari recovers from a broken thighbone and concussion she suffered, Søfren takes her out with the animals and by the lake so she can test her feet. Land and water are thus places for reflection, strength, and sustenance.

Dreyer unifies the start of the film with an ending where things come full circle. Margarethe passes away (one assumes) from natural causes and Søfren and Mari prepare her body for burial. Dreyer again shows the married-to-be couple but in contrast to their naïve beginnings by the waterfall, Søfren and Mari appear solemn, older and more mature. He shows them clothed in black, mourning a woman they learned much from. Søfren expresses his sentiments through a final title: "We owe a debt of gratitude to her, Mari. She taught you to be a good housewife, and she taught me to be an honorable man." Dreyer closes this *lyrical* film with a brightly lit yet bleak long shot of the couple amidst oak and other trees.

But instead of an iris, Dreyer uses the shape of a cross as his framing device. The final image recalls Cowie's notion that "the dark recesses of the forest become the abode of Death and his ministers."[83] Though Søfren and Mari may at one time have wished Margarethe dead, her rather sudden passing comes as bittersweet. Dreyer employs the cycle of life and death to bookend the film.

THE BRIDE OF GLOMDAL

Following the critical and commercial success of his comedy of manners film, *Master of the House* (1925), Dreyer took a summer sojourn to Norway to make *The Bride of Glomdal*. Adapted from two works by Norwegian author Jacob Breda Bull (1853–1930), the novels *Glomdalsbruden* (1908) and *Eline Vangen* (1906),[84] the film follows the budding romance between poor farmer Tore Braaten (Einar Sissener) and the daughter of a well-to-do farmer. The problem is that Berit Glomgaarden's (Tove Tellback) father, Ola (Stub Wiberg), disapproves of Tore's lifestyle and instead wishes that Berit marry Gjermund Haugsett (Einar Tveito), a man Berit does not like. Since the Norwegian stage actors Dreyer hired were only available for a short time, Dreyer shot the film quickly over a couple weeks. *The Bride of Glomdal* (hereafter cited as *Glomdal*) met with generally favorable reviews although Danish critics did not give it as much attention as Dreyer's other films of the period.[85] While Monty considers it as possibly Dreyer's least important work, he concedes that it gave the Dane a chance to work as a "nature portrayor."[86] Bowser cites *Glomdal* as a mature work through its contrasting of outdoor environments between the humble farm boy and the affluent farmer's daughter.[87]

The DFI's 75-minute presentation of *Glomdal* was digitally remastered from the camera negative courtesy of the National Library of Norway. When shown at 17 fps, it is known to have the longest running time of the film. It exceeds the 61-minute runtime (20 fps) of the 35mm print screened in 1989 at the Museum of Modern Art and Pacific Film Archive.[88] The DFI also well surpasses a 1997 screening in Australia where the film only ran 48 minutes.[89] Its length of 1,393 meters (4,570 feet) is also longer than the 1,237 meters (4,058 feet) Nash lists in his monograph on Dreyer.[90] But according to Dreyer scholar Morten Egholm, the DFI's print remains incomplete because the film had a length of 2,525 meters (8,284 feet) at its world premiere in Oslo on January 1, 1926.[91] Apparently, the film was re-edited for the Copenhagen premiere on April 15, 1926 using new Danish intertitles that differ from the Norwegian title list.[92] The film is a reconstruction in the sense that scenes were rearranged and trimmed to conform to narrative coherence and logic.[93] Even though the DFI does not match the original release version, the Blu-ray debut of *Glomdal* marks its first release on home video and introduces the film to a new generation.

Although generally regarded as secondary Dreyer, *Glomdal* makes an important contribution to the *lyrical* film. Like *The Parson's Widow*, it furthers the growth of the genre. Dreyer deploys the river as an intermediary that separates the Braaten farm from the Glomgaarden farm. The opening shot shows Tore paddle his way back to his family's deteriorating farm. Tore pledges that he will get the farm back in working order and return it to prosperity. Dreyer cuts to a similar shot of Berit paddling to see her childhood friend, Tore. An intertitle notes that the Glomgaarden family's prospering farm is located on the

opposite side of the river from the Braaten's. Dreyer's editing serves the dual purpose of comparing class differences between the two families (particularly the interiors of the Braaten and Glomgaarden homes) and depicting the discreet visits Tore and Berit make to each other's homesteads across the river. In a style similar to the way he frames Søfren and Mari in *The Parson's Widow*, Dreyer affectionately photographs Tore and Berit's intimate encounters amidst wide-open spaces that contrast with the small rooms and low ceilings in their homes. Since few Norwegian silent films were produced or survive, Dreyer's staging of a festival dance on a large meadow is especially unique. A group of people join hands in a big circle and dance together or with a single partner to the ballad of a violinist. Dreyer and his cinematographer Einar Olsen fill the frame with trees, bales of hay, and the river as an aesthetic device to demonstrate that the celebrating villagers are attune with nature's glories.

Because the river is a recurring motif, it becomes an inevitable site of conflict and ultimately resolution for the principal characters. Leading up to the film's climax, a resentful Gjermund disrupts Tore and Berit's transport plans for their wedding guests when he moves two of the boats from near shore to the middle of the river. Gjermund's motive stems from a priest's decision that he and Berit's marriage was illegally arranged by her father. He is also jealous that Ola finally agrees to let Tore marry Berit. Tore tries to cross the river on his horse but falls off once the water becomes too high. Commentators of the film tend to overemphasize the climatic frozen river scene in Griffith's *Way Down East* (1920) as a definite influence on Dreyer. Milne's reference to Stiller's *Johan* (1920) is a more apt comparison but it is Stiller's lesser known film *Sången om den eldröda blomman* (Song of

the Scarlet Flower, also known as Across the Rapids, 1919) that shares the most in common with *Glomdal*'s climatic sequence. Stiller's film also features a hero's treacherous journey downriver balancing himself on a log to stay afloat. Stiller expands the "real time" it would take to film this scene by stretching it out four or five times the normal length. Graham Petrie describes the climax's three parallel lines of action: "the hero, seen in long-shot from the bank, making his way through the rapids; spectators watching from a bridge; and another group of spectators trying to keep pace with him as they run along the shore—are cut together in a way that corresponds to the psychological time experienced by the characters rather than clock time."[94]

Dreyer likewise prolongs the regular runtime by crosscutting between five parallel lines of action: Tore's perilous trek through the river and descent from a waterfall as he holds on to a log; the petrified reactions of Tore's parents; Berit scurrying around the meadow and forest trying to catch a clear vantage point; Ola on horseback observing the action; and Gjermund watching Tore's every movement intently. The scene arrives at a resolution when Berit pulls Tore safely out of the water. The sequence demonstrates Petrie's notion that nature in Scandinavian films transforms into an awe-inspiring experience and quasi-mystical force for the characters to sort out their problems.[95]

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has considered the effects that reconstruction, an aspect of re-mediation, has on four films' narratives and their implications for authorship and genre. The European DVD of *Michael* enhances its status as a *Kammerspiel*-film while the US DVD denigrates its

reputation by replacing the original intertitles. The DFI DVD of *Once Upon a Time* meddles with Dreyer's original narrative and replaces him as the author. On the other hand, the digital presentations of *The Parson's Widow* and *The Bride of Glomdal* elevate Dreyer's works as resuscitated classics in the genre of the *lyrical* film.

Notes to CHAPTER 3

1 Giovanna Fossati, *From Grain to Pixel: The Archival Life of Film in Transition*, Framing Film (Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 39–40.

2 Ibid.

3 See Casper Tybjerg and Thomas C. Christensen, "The Restoration of Dreyer's *Der var engang*," *Journal of Film Preservation* 67 (June 2004): 31–36.

4 Fossati, From Grain to Pixel, 139.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid., 42.

7 Jean Drum and Dale D. Drum, *My Only Great Passion: The Life and Films of Carl Th. Dreyer*, Scarecrow Filmmakers Series 68 (Lanham, MD, and London: Scarecrow Press, 2000), 86; See Mordaunt Hall, "The Screen: A Norwegian Story," *New York Times*, April 8, 1929.

8 Casper Tybjerg, 1:19:50 into his "Full-Length Audio Commentary," Disc 1, *Michael* (80th Anniversary Edition), Directed by Carl Theodor Dreyer (1924; London: Eureka Video, 2004), DVD (PAL).

9 Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell, *Film History: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010), 95.

10 Lotte H. Eisner, *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt*, trans. Roger Greaves (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 177, 179.

11 Lisbeth Richter Larsen, "Michael: Shoot," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Michael/Shoot.aspx, para. 1.

12 Larsen, "Michael: Reception," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Michael/Reception.aspx, para. 1-3.

13 Tybjerg, 31:57 into his "Full-Length Audio Commentary."

14 Mordaunt Hall, "The Screen: Another German Contribution," *New York Times*, December 15, 1926, sec. Hotels and Restaurants, 30.

15 Roscoe M'Gowen, "Censor Must a Slipped Up in Letting 'Chained' Loose," *Daily (NY) News*, December 16, 1926, 42.

16 Palmer Smith, "Reel Reviews," *The Evening (NY) World*, December 14, 1926, 28.

17 Tybjerg, 1:18:44 into his "Full-Length Audio Commentary."

18 Siegfried Kracauer, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1947), 128.

19 Keith Keller, "Michaël," *Variety*, November 16, 1988, sec. Pictures: Archive, 28.

20 Paul Schrader, *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 115.

21 Ibid., 114.

22 Tom Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer*, The International Film Guide Series (New York: Barnes, 1971), 65, 78.

23 Ibid., 74.

24 Ibid., 76.

25 Ibid., 65, 78.

26 See "II. Notes on the Dreyer-text" in Mark Nash, *Dreyer* (London: British Film Institute, 1977), 5–12.

27 See Nash, "Carl Dreyer," Program Notes (London: National Film Theatre, October 1977), University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu /cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31444.

28 Carl Theodor Dreyer, Michael *(80th Anniversary Edition)*, DVD (PAL), Spine # 3, The Masters of Cinema Series (London: Eureka Video, 2004); "Michael | Eureka! Catalogue | The Masters of Cinema Series," 2004, www.eurekavideo.co.uk/moc/catalogue/michael.

29 Nick Wrigley, "Dreyer's *Michael* – 80 Years Old," in Michael *DVD Booklet*, The Masters of Cinema Series, Spine # 3 (London: Eureka, 2004), 13.

30 See Noel Megahey, “Michael | DVD Video Review | Film @ The Digital Fix,” *The Digital Fix*, November 17, 2004, http://film.thedigitalfix.com/content/id/13329/michael.html; John Sinnott, “Michael : DVD Talk Review of the DVD Video,” *DVD Talk*, November 21, 2004, http://www.dvdtalk.com/reviews /13362/michael/; Mark Zimmer, “dOc DVD Review: Michael (Mikael) (1924),” *digitallyOBSESSED!*, December 9, 2004, http://www.digitallyobsessed.com/displaylegacy.php?ID=6696.

31 Roy Grundmann, “Gay-Themed Films of the German Silent Era,” *Cineaste* 31, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 65.

32 “Magical History Tour – ‘Kammerspielfilm,’” *Arsenal – Institute for Film and Video Art*, January 2012, http://www.arsenal-berlin.de/en/arsenal-cinema/current-program/single/article/3151/2803.html.

33 Eisner, *The Haunted Screen*, 194–95.

34 Jim Taylor et al., *Blu-Ray Disc Demystified* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009), 3-5.

35 Ibid.

36 Jim Taylor, Mark R. Johnson, and Charles G. Crawford, *DVD Demystified*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006), 16-28.

37 Larsen, “Once Upon a Time: Reception,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, http:// english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Der-var-engang/Reception.aspx, para. 1.

38 Ibid; Tybjerg, “Dreyer and the National Film in Denmark,” *Film History* 13, no. 1 (March 2001): 30.

39 Quoted in Tybjerg, “Dreyer and the National Film in Denmark,” 31.

40 Ibid.

41 Tybjerg and Christensen, “The Restoration of Dreyer’s *Der var engang*,” 32.

42 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 101.

43 Ibid., 102.

44 Tybjerg and Christensen, “The Restoration of Dreyer’s *Der var engang*,” 32.

45 Ib Monty, “Carl Th. Dreyer - a Biography,” in *Carl Th. Dreyer: Danish Film Director, 1889–1968*, ed. Søren Dyssegaard (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen: Presentation Books, 1969), 5.

46 Kirk Bond, “The World of Carl Dreyer,” *Film Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (Autumn 1965): 31–32, doi:10.1525/fq.1965.19.1.04a00050.

47 Lynn Wilkinson, “Fragments of Det Var Engang” (Pacific Film Archive, n.d.), para. 1, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/Doc Detail?docId=31374; Pacific Film Archive, “*Der Var Engang* Program Note,” n.d., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31375.

48 Sam Kula, *Appraising Moving Images: Assessing the Archival and Monetary Value of Film and Video Records* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2003), 89.

49 Tina Kendall, “The Still Life: DVD Stills Galleries and the Digital Uncanny,” in *Framing Film: Cinema and the Visual Arts*, ed. Steven Allen and Laura Hubner (Bristol, UK, and Chicago, IL: Intellect, 2012), 115. Available at https://www.academia.edu/4306572/The_ Still_Life_DVD_Stills_Galleries_and_the_Digital_Uncanny.

50 Ibid., 118.

51 Ibid., 121–22.

52 Tybjerg and Christensen, “The Restoration of Dreyer’s *Der var engang*,” 35.

53 Ibid., 35–36.

54 Ibid., 36.

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.

58 Kula, *Appraising Moving Images*, 89.

59 Ernst Lubitsch, *Das Weib des Pharao* (The Loves of Pharaoh), Blu-ray (Germany: ALPHA-OMEGA digital GmbH, 2011).

60 Thomas Bakels, “THE FILM AND THE RESTORATION,” in The Loves of Pharaoh *Booklet* (Munich: ALPHA-OMEGA digital GmbH, 2011), 1–2.

61 Kendall, “The Still Life,” 121.

62 Tybjerg, “Dreyer and the National Film in Denmark,” 23.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid., 23–24.

65 Ibid., 27–28.

66 Quoted in Bengt Forslund, *Victor Sjöström: His Life and His Work*, trans. Peter Cowie (New York: New York Zoetrope, 1988), 37.

67 Nick Wrigley, “Der Var Engang, Dfi Dvd,” *Carldreyer.com*, 2003, http://www.mastersofcinema.org /dreyer/resources/dervarengangdvd.htm The webpage is no longer online but a hard copy resides in the author’s collection.

68 See Larsen, “The Parson’s Widow: Reception,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Prästänkan/Reception.aspx.

69 Bengt Idestam-Almquist, *Classics of the Swedish Cinema: The Stiller & Sjöström Period*, ed. Henning Österberg, trans. James Harker (Stockholm: Swedish Institute, 1952), 10.

70 Hall, “The Screen: A Norwegian Story,” *New York Times*, April 8, 1929, 32.

71 Ibid.

72 Idestam-Almquist, *Classics of the Swedish Cinema*, 14.

73 Forslund, *Victor Sjöström*, 99.

74 Idestam-Almquist, *Classics of the Swedish Cinema*, 11.

75 Quoted in Carl Theodor Dreyer, “Swedish Film (1920),” in *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Translation of Carl Th. Dreyer’s Writings About the Film (Om Filmen)*, ed. Donald Skoller (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973), 27.

76 Michel Delahaye, “Between Heaven And Hell: Interview with Carl Dreyer,” *Cahiers Du Cinéma in English*, no. 4 (1966): 11.

77 See Geoff Andrew, *The Film Handbook*, G. K. Hall Performing Arts Handbooks (Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1990), 88; Ken Kelman, “Dreyer,” *Film Culture*, no. 35 (Winter 1964–65): 1; Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer*, 47; Ebbe Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director’s Work*, trans. Marianne Helweg, British Film Institute New Index Series 1 (London: British Film Institute, 1950), 12.

78 Sandberg, Mark B. “Mastering the House: Performative Inhabitation in Carl Th. Dreyer’s *The Parson’s Widow*.” In *Northern Constellations: New Readings in Nordic Cinema*, edited by C. Claire Thomson, 27. Series A 26. Norwich, UK: Norvik Press, 2006.

79 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director’s Work*, 13.

80 Dai Vaughan, “Carl Dreyer and the Theme of Choice,” *Sight and Sound* 43, no. 3 (Summer 1974): 157.

81 Carl Theodor Dreyer, “Prastankan Intertitles,” n.d., 1, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31391 These translated intertitles probably originate from the unpublished 1953 Danish-language intertitle list conserved at the Danish Film Institute.

82 Peter Cowie, *Swedish Cinema*, The International Film Guide Series (New York: Barnes, 1966), 8.

83 Ibid.

84 Morten Egholm, “Jacob Breda Bull: The Bride of Glomdal,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, May 22, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Glomdalsbruden/Based-on.aspx.

85 Larsen, “The Bride of Glomdal: Shoot,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Glomdalsbruden/Shoot.aspx.

86 Ib Monty, *Portrait of Carl Th. Dreyer* (Copenhagen: Danish Government Film Foundation, 1967), n.p.

87 Eileen Bowser, *The Films of Carl Dreyer* (New York: The Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art, 1964), 4.

88 *February 17 - March 5, 1989*, Carl Th. Dreyer Bio and Film Schedule (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1989), 5, MoMA: Press Release Archives, http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/6647/releases/MOMA_1989_0014_14.pdf?2010; Pacific Film Archive, "*Glomdalsbruden* Program Note," n.d., 8, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31286.

89 Michael Koller, "The Bride of Glomdal," *Metro*, no. 111 (1997): 54.

90 Nash, *Dreyer*, 51.

91 Egholm, "*The Bride of Glomdal* (Norway, 1926)," in Love One Another / The Bride of Glomdal *Blu-Ray Booklet*, Danish Silent Classics (Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2010), 15.

92 Ibid.

93 Ibid.

94 Graham Petrie, *Hollywood Destinies: European Directors in America, 1922–1931*, Rev. ed., Contemporary Film and Television Series (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2002), 124.

95 Ibid., 150.

CHAPTER 4

The Passion of Joan of Arc (1928)—The Changing Roles of Authors

INTRODUCTION

In the climatic immolation scene of Dreyer's screenplay, *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (The Passion of Joan of Arc, 1928), the titular heroine's executioner sifts through the fire to see if he can find any remains of the Maid of Orléans. After he discovers Joan's heart unscathed, he pours oil on the sulphur and coal around it to try to ignite the flames. But the fire dwindles and the heart stays intact. General Warwick orders him to throw the heart in the Seine. The executioner obliges and sends Joan's heart down the river. "The heart which from that time became the heart of France, just as she herself was the incarnation of the eternal France."[1] Joan's heart serves as the perfect metaphor for the harrowing journey Dreyer's eponymous film has endured since its 1928 premiere. In a fate similar to Joan's heart, prints of *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (hereafter cited as *Passion*) were butchered and put through fires on at least three reported occasions.[2] However, the film miraculously survived and resurfaced in almost immaculate shape.

Passion had become so associated with flames, both in Joan's ordeal and the film's prints, that a book publisher titled an anthology of Dreyer's screenplays, *Fire Film.*[3] Ironically, in a strange twist of fate, objects that burned with Joan on the pyre later helped save one of the few prints of *Passion.* After he co-founded the Cinémathèque Française in 1936, film archivist Henri Langlois (1914–1977) located an interpositive of *Passion* that he included as one of the film museum's top artifacts.[4] When the Germans occupied France

during World War II, Langlois reportedly hid this print in his bathtub through the end of the war.[5] Coal and firewood apparently covered the boxes of film reels, which contained a copy of *Passion*.[6] After the war, Ebbe Neergaard, manager of Denmark's national film institution, Statens Filmcentral, obtained a new print made from Langlois's duplicate negative. This copy was handed over to the Danish Film Museum (DFM).[7] The Langlois print became known as the "mother copy" for all later prints made in the US.[8]

This chapter examines the areas of authorship, re-mediation, digital restoration, and genre covered in earlier chapters but sheds additional light on how they function in relation to *Passion*. However, the added discussion of sound and music essentially separates this chapter from the others. I unpack how voice-over narration and musical score play integral roles in reshaping *Passion* into a sound-on film in at least three versions. Richard Einhorn's opera/oratorio, *Voices of Light*, deserves special consideration because it acts as an equal partner with the film. Einhorn's work functions as both a commentary on and a counterpoint to the film. When *Voices* is performed in tandem with *Passion*, Einhorn merits the title of co-author with Dreyer. Because this chapter seeks a balanced analysis of *Passion*'s various incarnations and their content (re)producers—delivering relatively equal breadth and depth to each—only a handful of cues from *Voices* are discussed. (*Voices* is such a textually rich and variegated work that it deserves a full-length monograph.)

My focus here is on the various roles alternative *auteurs* play in changing the form and content of *Passion*. To understand how Dreyer and his collaborators became the film's chief *auteurs*, I first survey the film's origins and its production history. I then deliver a

chronological history of *Passion*'s release versions. The purpose of this section is to identify the film's different authors, ascertain their roles in the process of re-mediation, and determine specific changes that they made to the original. More, I offer a brief summary of the scores written for *Passion* and explain how Einhorn's music reinterprets Joan of Arc and extends her character's mythology beyond actress Renée Falconetti's portrayal in the film. Finally, I look at several examples in social media where users have re-mediated *Passion* on YouTube.

GENESIS OF A CLASSIC

In 1926, *Master of the House* (Dreyer's seventh silent feature) became a box office success in France, screening in fifty-seven Parisian cinemas in three weeks and seventy-two provincial cinemas overall.[9] Dreyer emerged as a rising director in Western Europe, prompting the French company, Société Générale des Films (SGF), to offer him a major film project on one of three historical female figures: Catherine de Medici, Marie Antoinette, or Joan of Arc. Dreyer chose the last and SGF granted him a budget of 7 million francs (about $300,000).[10]

SGF's producers purchased the rights to Surrealist writer Joseph Delteil's (1894–1978) biographical novel, *Jeanne d'Arc* (1925).[11] They were likely attracted to Delteil's work since it garnered the Prix Fémina (one of France's top literary prizes), became a national bestseller, and was widely read through its many language translations.[12] Although adaptation study is not a focus of this chapter, it is necessary to rectify common misconceptions critics have had about Delteil's involvement with the film, his novel, and his own script. David Bordwell asserts that Delteil's role in the project was "slight," while Tony

Pipolo claims that Delteil's scenario was "not used at all."[13] While the form and structure of the novel bear little relation to the finished film, Dreyer retains at least a handful of Delteil's story events. Granted, Delteil devotes only three of his novel's nineteen chapters to Joan of Arc's trial and its aftermath. But significantly, important scenes that Delteil created such as the torture chamber episode, the graveyard outside the prison, the doves flying overhead the castle yard at Rouen while she burns, and the guards peering through the slits and peepholes of Joan's cell wall are all transferred to the screen. While these scenes are part of Joan of Arc's historical legend, their reoccurrence came about because Delteil and Dreyer wanted to do something new with them. Together, the two scribes researched many possibilities and directions for the film during their one-month collaboration in 1927.[14] (Dreyer began work on a script in October 1926.[15]) Delteil contributed ideas and images with exuberance and "à l'envi" to Dreyer.[16] In January 1927, Delteil completed a "conrinuite cinematographique et filmee" (continuity script or "scénario-roman") for Dreyer.[17] Delteil's screenplay adapts material from two of the last chapters of his *Jeanne d'Arc* and adds other scenes such as the donning of Joan's straw-crown, the blood-letting scene, and the crisscrossed prison windows displaying crosses on the stone door.[18] So Delteil's role in the pre-production of *Passion* is more substantial than he is usually given credit for.

Aside from choosing passages from Delteil's work, Dreyer also based his screenplay on Anatole France's novel, *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc* (1908), and Pierre Champion's authoritative two-volume record of the trial's testimony, *Procès de condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc: Texte, traduction et notes* (1920–21).[19] Dreyer compresses the twenty-nine interrogations of Joan's

eighteen-month trial to five sessions over the course of two hours. He adheres purposively to Aristotle's three classical unities: (1) *action* (Joan's spiritual battles with her ecclesiastical judges), (2) *place* (the Rouen Castle and its surrounding locales), and (3) *time* (less than 24 hours). Furthermore, the making of the film mirrored the actual trial since the beginning of writing the script through the completion of editing also took a year and a half.[20] Dreyer began shooting the film on May 17, 1927 in the studios of the Omnium Films of Billancourt, a suburb of Paris.[21] Filming wrapped six months later followed by several months of post-production work.[22] SGF gave Dreyer free rein on all aspects of the film.

A HISTORY OF *PASSION*'S PRINTS

In order to establish a framework for *Passion*'s re-mediated states, it is necessary to specify which versions of the film are under consideration, which will help account for the various censorial cuts and transmutations the film has undergone. Although there is a lack of documentation on any of the prints in the vaults of the Cinémathèque Française and the Danish Film Institute Archives,[23] there is nonetheless an amalgamation of sources from a variety of works that can help provide answers to the following questions:

- Who were the film's "re-makers" and how did they inflict changes on the original?
- What roles did the film's new *auteurs* occupy?
- What is the length of the original releases compared to the truncated versions?
- Which countries banned the film and why?
- Why was the film censored in France?

Before *Passion*'s opening, Dreyer recalled the circumstances underlying possible censorship guidelines at a test screening:

> When in Paris in 1928 I had finished the cutting of my film *The Passion of Joan Arc*, the company's managers decided that the finished copy should be shown at a preview to a party of 70 or 80 specially selected and impartial intellectuals—mainly authors, clergymen, psychologists, historians, and editors of periodicals of different complexions. The purpose of this preview was, of course, to find out if there were scenes or sequences which might be offensive or unhistorical, as there was time to make changes before the film was to be shown to the great public. There was nothing to be said against the length of the film; it was only 7200 feet long.
>
> In order to provide some positive material as a result of the preview, I suggested that we among ourselves should divide the party into smaller groups; and that each one of us, as soon as the light went on again, should ask the opinion of every single person in our group, particularly aiming at clarifying what the person concerned might have to frown on and might want to get changed or possibly cut out.
>
> Everything was carried out according to plan, and when the guests had left, the rest of us got together with our notes and made a list on a big sheet of paper so that we could compare possibly offensive sections, desirable changes and what might be cut out entirely. When the material collected had been

> arranged in accordance with the plot, we found that if all objections had to be considered, nothing would be left of the film in the form I had given it. The managers now knew for certain: the film had to be shown to the public in the form I had given it.[24]

SGF made two prints (each 2,210 meters or 7,250 feet in length) with Danish intertitles.[25] The first print passed through the censorship board on April 20, 1928 without any cuts. The second print also passed unconditionally the following day.[26] Dreyer's wishes for an untampered print came true when *Passion* had its world premiere on April 21 in Copenhagen at Palads Teatret (the Palace Cinema). No evidence has ever materialized that the film was trimmed or altered for its general release in Denmark. The director's cut was presumably the only version shown there. Danish critics almost universally praised the film. It played a dozen times at Palads.[27] It is a misnomer to judge *Passion* a box office failure as some have. Palads had a spacious auditorium with 1,930 seats and was sold-out on *Passion*'s opening night.[28] Also, it was not uncommon for a film to screen just twelve times at Palads. Dreyer's *The Bride of Glomdal* and *Master of the House* played only eight times there.[29] *Passion* could not receive more than twelve screenings because Palads, like other theatres in Denmark, closed during the summer months and the spring season of '28 concluded on April 30.[30] The film must have done reasonably well because circa May 15, it was picked up by another cinema in Copenhagen, Odeon Teatret, which ran it for nearly a week.[31]

Passion would not experience the same fortunes in France. The film fell under both clerical censorship and public state censorship. With the goal of appeasing a manifest

audience of Catholics, the film's producers invited a Parisian clergy to a June 1928 press screening of *Passion* in order to gain the Church committee's acceptance of the film.[32] Officials of the Archdiocese stated that the film in unexpurgated form "risked being denounced from the pulpits and attacked by the Catholic patronage."[33] Representatives of the Catholic Church soon incorporated changes to the script.[34] The Archbishop demanded many excisions, including the scene where Joan's arm is bled.[35] ("You don't bleed a saint!"[36]) Conservative journalists and politicians were offended at the idea that Dreyer, a foreigner and a Protestant, would film a subject that is so distinctively a part of French history.[37] The Archbishop pressured SGF and L'Alliance Cinématographique Européenne (ACE, *Passion*'s French distributor) to re-cut the film sans Dreyer's involvement.[38] Dreyer told DFM archivist Arne Krogh that he was barred from the studios and had no say over which scenes were altered.[39] Without Dreyer's permission, the producer and distributors complied with the French censors to make cuts.[40]

When the film opened on October 25, 1928 at the Salle Marivaux in Paris, it was nearly eight minutes shorter than the print approved by Danish censors six months earlier.[41] According to film journalist Léon Moussinac, who saw the truncated version, "the public would only perceive a tedious Catholic film in which the Tribunal of Rouen had become almost sympathetic and in which the trial was reduced to a theological discussion without dramatic progression."[42] The bowdlerized version proved a major miscalculation on the part of business dealers since the film did not perform well.[43] Apparently, eight months elapsed until an unabridged presentation screened in France.[44] Antonin Artaud, who played the film's

sympathetic monk, Jean Massieu, corroborates this fact. He claimed in a 1929 interview that he was "glad that the presentation of [*Passion*'s] uncut version has changed the general opinion of this overwhelming film."[45]

The film also ran into trouble with the British censor. It was first reported by Carl Herring of *The London Mercury* in summer, 1928 that there was no news of a release date for *Passion* in Britain. Herring acknowledges that he saw the film twice in May at a private press screening but laments: "It is absurd that it should be in this country and not be shown at once."[46] The *New York Times* film critic Mordaunt Hall attributes as a reason for the ban the stark realism of the scenes where Joan is led to the stake in the Place du Vieux Marché, Rouen.[47] In fact, the British censor initially demanded trimming the stake scene.[48] He then ordered additional cuts to the middle of the film.[49] The unflattering light in which Dreyer cast the English army that supervises Joan's trial also irked the censor. In January 1929, *Vossische Zeitung* (Berlin's daily newspaper) confirmed that Britain had banned *Passion* because its anti-British attitude was too conspicuous.[50] I agree with film critic George Blaisdell's insinuation that the military attire and tin hat worn by General Warwick resembles those donned by British soldiers circa 1914.[51] Indeed, another reason that *Passion* may have incensed British authorities is that the sight of army apparel rekindled the recent wounds of World War I only a decade earlier. At the BFI National Archive in London, a 35mm nitrate print of *Passion* from 1928 is conserved in four reel cans that total 6,203 feet (1,890 meters), nearly 1,000 feet (304 meters) less than the pre-release version.[52] This is likely the same print that Herring saw. Several shots were deleted, including the blood-letting

shot where Joan's arm is punctured.[53] The ban was not lifted until November 16, 1930 when the film was shown to the Film Society of London.[54]

Between late 1928–30, troubling things began happening to prints of the film. Dreyer recounted in an interview from the 1960s that on December 6, 1928, a fire permeated UFA's labs in Berlin where chief cameraman Rudolph Maté had developed the film's panchromatic stock, destroying the original negative and leaving only a few worn prints.[55] But scholars could take Dreyer's recollection with a certain degree of skepticism. Two critics who saw the film in Berlin do not refer to any fire or damaged prints. For example, *The Christian Science Monitor* sent its foreign correspondent "P. B. W." to Germany and the Dec. 24, 1928 review reveals no traces of a worn theatrical release print: "The intensity of Carl Dreyer's realistic vision floods the film with wonderful pictures and striking tableau vivants."[56] Additionally, an anonymous reviewer for *Vossische Zeitung* watched *Passion* at Berlin's Gloria Palace. The *New York Times* picked up this review on January 20, 1929. Nothing about the print appeared out of the ordinary and there were no scenes deemed missing: "At all events we have never experienced the tragedy of Joan in such a way before, not even with [George Bernard] Shaw, not to mention [Friedrich] Schiller."[57] Global news coverage of Dec. 1928 contains no items about a laboratory fire at UFA. Dreyer scholar Casper Tybjerg found no mention of it in the German film trade papers.[58] A detailed search of the *New York Times* and the *Los Angeles Times* archives through the ProQuest Historical Newspapers database did not produce any results. The Berlin fire is not printed in the list of documented film fires found in the volume, *This Film Is Dangerous: A Celebration of Nitrate Film*.[59] Also, it is not cited in

Klaus Kreimeier's book, *The Ufa Story: A History of Germany's Greatest Film Company, 1918-1945*.[60] Still, it remains a possibility that the original negative perished in the fire but it is equally possible that it simply went missing.

In any case, Dreyer presumed the camera negative lost and proceeded to reconstruct the film. With the aid of a release print for comparison, Dreyer and editor Marguerite Beaugé put together a new version using existing rushes, outtakes, and alternate shots.[61] Dreyer used between five and ten takes for most of the shots.[62] He also repeated scenes thirty or forty times until they accorded to his exacting demands.[63] Dreyer initially brought 85,000 meters of film (about 276,000 feet) in the editing room so he had a surfeit of footage to work from when he assembled the second negative.[64] This also became known as Dreyer's work print, which is a copy of the film spliced with tape or glue that acts as the basis for reconstructing the original editing.[65] Unfortunately, Dreyer's hard work appeared to go to waste when, in early 1929, a fire supposedly demolished the Gaumont laboratory in Paris where the work print was stored.[66]

Passion experienced a far more auspicious fate when copies of the film that avoided the fires were exported to the US in late March 1929. The film opened at the Little Carnegie Playhouse in New York to glowing reviews. Critics mentioned the UK ban and French sanctions imposed on the film but all indications are that only the uncut version played. Earlier that January, the reviewer and editor of *National Board of Review Magazine* noted the presence of dual-language intertitles in French and English, which likely derive from the uncensored print that initially screened in France in summer, 1928.[67] According to Comte de

la Roziere, who was well-acquainted with the film's production details, *Passion* was assembled in eight reels.[68] An April 1929 review in *The Film Daily* lists the film's length at 7,000 feet (2,133 meters),[69] making it close to the pre-release version. The disparity of 200 feet (60 meters) may have something to do with the different set of intertitles that were spliced on each print's reels, although it remains unknown which print contained more title cards. A *Variety* review (also from April '29) records that the film ran for 85 minutes.[70] I concur with Tybjerg that *Passion* was most likely projected at 24 fps in the US since that had become the standard speed for all films.[71] After it played in New York for at least two weeks, the film also had showings in Washington, DC, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Boston.[72]

THE DEATH OF AN *AUTEUR*: I

Passion played sporadically on the US film exhibition circuit from 1930–31. As its prolonged run winded down, talkies were already firmly established as the medium's preferred mode of entertainment. Since *The Jazz Singer* (Alan Crosland, 1927) ushered in synchronized sound and spoken dialogue, most studios worldwide made the transition to sound-on films. Because *Passion* was a resounding critical success and was likely seen by a lot of people in major metropolitan areas, it became a popular candidate for a re-mediated sound version. In 1933, the New York film producer and distributor Sherman S. Krellberg (1891–1979) hired well-known radio commentator David Ross to record voice-overs that played over Dreyer's film. Pierre Arnaud, Krellberg's editor, recut *Passion* to a runtime of between fifty-seven and sixty-one minutes.[73] Ross's narration supplanted all the film's intertitles (which were removed) and was accompanied by Massard Kur Zhene's original

score.[74] Ross described the onscreen action using original notes by John Michael Flick from Joan of Arc's trial.[75] When *Passion* returned to the Little Carnegie Playhouse in the autumn of '33, critics embraced Krellberg's new rendition. William Boehnel's headline in the *New York World Telegram* read: "Sound Film Greatly Aids Joan of Arc."[76] Boehnel singles out Zhene's music as bringing "a new value to [the film's] dramatic theme."[77] While Boehnel has reservations about Ross, *The Film Daily* calls his narration "masterful."[78] The *Motion Picture (NY) Herald*'s Charles S. Aaronson likewise praises Ross and Zhene's contributions, which "unquestionably add definitely to the effectiveness of the whole film."[79] Aaronson also provides a telling sign for perhaps why *Passion* was severely abridged from its original runtime of eighty-plus minutes to only an hour. According to Aaronson, Midtown Manhattan had a solid Catholic community at the time and based on the shortened version he saw, the exhibitor had "a strong selling film."[80] Aaronson encourages religious groups and school organizations to flock to the theater "if they are properly approached."[81] Clearly, Krellberg not only refashioned *Passion* so it became a more marketable film, but he also likely toned down its brutality so that he could ingratiate a wider audience, especially a younger demographic. This re-edited cut likely resembled the censored version shown in Paris where Catholic groups had strong sway over the film's content.[82] WorldCat's catalog records indicate that the Krellberg version still exists, with 16mm or 8mm prints held in at least five libraries across the US.[83]

While various European censors made different cuts to prints of *Passion*, Krellberg was the first alternative *auteur* of the film because he added narration, music, and sound

effects. Krellberg fits the profile of what Paul Read and Mark-Paul Meyer call a commercial entrepreneur restorer, an individual who only wants make to money from an older film without considering the basic principles of preservation or moral conduct that concern restoration.[84] Krellberg repositions Dreyer's work from that of an artistic film to a commercial vehicle. The advertising and publicity materials designed by SGF and Capital Film Exchange (CFE, Krellberg's marketing firm) illustrate completely different intentions by Dreyer and Krellberg. In the weeks leading up to its US debut, SGF pulled out several publicity advertisements in the industry trades promoting *Passion* as a legitimate *film d'art* and a visionary triumph by its director. For example, in one pre-release ad, the French production company highlights these aspects in the body copy[2]: "A Distinguished contribution to the art of the motion picture…Produced with a new conception and technic [technique] under the direction of Carl Dreyer."[85] Two other ads put "A CARL DREYER PRODUCTION" beneath the film's title.[86] At the top of one ad, Dreyer's depth of field is illustrated with a wide, deep-space composition of Nicholas Loyeseleur (Maurice Schutz) praying in the right foreground of the ante-room as Joan (Falconetti) receives her final communion from Massieu (Antonin Artaud) in her cell.[87] The subhead, "A Cinematographic Inspiration," appears at the bottom. Another ad promises that the film will break new ground with the headline: "…An Unusual Cinematographic Achievement."[88] In a special weekend movie advertising section, the *Los Angeles Times* drama editor Edwin Schallert assembled a collage of stills from *Passion* and underlined the film's succession of close-ups as well as

---

2 The main text of a print ad that appears below the headline and any subheads.

Maté's use of novel camera angles.[89] Schallert lauds Dreyer for a confrontational approach that charts "new paths for the silent film."[90] In short, Dreyer's name appeared prominently in most print ads.

By stark contrast, CFE's promotional materials all but eliminate Dreyer and rebrand the film a fiery spectacle. For instance, a color poster put Joan in the center, encircled by flames and her judges.[91] It also misled the audience into thinking that the new version contained "English dialogue" and recognized Ross's "radio fame."[92] (A two-page spread even proclaimed: "You hear [Joan's] immortal utterances as she answers the judges' questions!"[93]) Dreyer's name appeared nowhere on the poster. CFE also distributed 28" x 42" posters, cut-outs, and photographic enlargements to exhibitors for display in theater front windows and lobbies. Two stills featured theater-ticket insets with "Sherman S. Krellberg presents…" followed by the film's title.[94] Another poster reproduced Krellberg's credit with the headline: "A NEW THRILL IN TALKING FILMS!"[95] The movie title appeared Art Deco with ornamental characters and alternating fonts, which contrasted with SGF's more traditional lettering style. The Deco typefaces on the poster gave a potential viewer the false impression that *Passion* may be an avant-garde film in the sound era, a label that Dreyer did not want.[96] Because Dreyer's name appeared only once on CFE's distribution materials (toward the bottom in a tiny font), an audience which is acclimating itself to *Passion* for the first time may have inferred that Krellberg wa v

s both the central *auteur* and the person that made the film. In sum, the 1933 sound version

established Krellberg as the first significant re-maker of the film, essentially superseding Dreyer's authorship status.

For the next two decades, prints of *Passion* became scarce but more copies were made after the opening of several film museums. On May 18, 1939, Iris Barry (1895–1969) of the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) acquired a copy of Langlois's positive print, which ran longer than other US prints in circulation and replicated one of the versions approved by Dreyer.[97] This print measured at 2,355 meters (7,726 feet), although it is unknown whether it included intertitles.[98] Following the war, *Passion* played many times on Avenue de Messine, no. 7, then the address of the Cinémathèque Française.[99] The Danish Film Museum, founded in 1941, acquired various prints of *Passion* from European archives in the fifties and sixties. Arne Krogh compared them and assembled a composite 35mm print that included shots absent from individual prints.[100] Krogh's compilation did not produce a complete version of the film but it presented visitors to the museum with a longer cut than some of the censored versions. Apparently, Krogh did not consult the prints stored at the Cinémathèque or at Gaumont.

THE DEATH OF AN *AUTEUR*: II

In 1951, the Italian-born film historian Joseph-Marie Lo Duca (1910–2004) visited a warehouse at Gaumont's studios where he discovered Dreyer's reconstructed print of *Passion* in near-pristine condition.[101] Lo Duca's attempt to transform *Passion* into a hybrid silent/sound-on film make him the amalgam of a commercial entrepreneur restorer and what Read and Meyer deem an artist-restorer. Artist-restorers are defined in two distinct ways. On

the one hand, they unearth older materials to restore the film without deliberately inflicting any physical damage to the original elements. On the other hand, they create a new product from the original work without showing any respect for the film's foundational materials.[102]

Lo Duca definitely embraced the second role. He added a sound track with excerpts from pieces by Bach, Vivaldi, Albinoni, and other classical composers. In order to accommodate the music on the filmstrip, Lo Duca had to create an analog optical variable-area sound track. A pair of squiggly lines (i.e., the "waveform") appears in the sound track area of the film between the sprocket holes (perforations) and the picture frame.[103] In the process, Lo Duca cropped one-third of the image along the right side of the frame. The loss of image information means that viewers of Lo Duca's print are only seeing two-thirds of Dreyer's original film. When Dreyer and Maté photographed *Passion* in the standard Academy aspect ratio of 1.37:1, they carefully thought out material they wanted to fit into all four sides of the image. Aesthetically, *Passion* is a unique film because it makes full use of practically every camera angle. Because the compositions resulting from those angles are so precise and distinct from most other films, they need to be projected that way. Lo Duca's image trimming produces aesthetic harm in which portions of heads and faces are cut off from view.[104]

Furthermore, Lo Duca tried to modernize the film by designing new main titles, intertitles, and subtitles (in French) that rewrite and overwrite Dreyer's narrative lexicon. Lo Duca apparently neither consulted any intertitle lists from known prints of the film nor utilized the original trial transcript or Dreyer's continuity script. Instead, Lo Duca

reconstructed the dialogue with the aid of lip-readers.[105] It is strange that Lo Duca entrusted this not entirely reliable method to others when he could have requested the script from Dreyer or through a film archive. After all, Dreyer instructed his actors to speak their lines *in toto* during filming.[106] The script could have provided Lo Duca with a verbatim record of the dialogue. Lo Duca's neglect of primary sources is significant since there are several moments where characters speak without the display of subtitles or intertitles.

Moreover, Lo Duca fails to explain or communicate to the viewer why he switches from intertitles to subtitles when characters speak. He displays subtitles at the bottom-fourth of the screen in about forty-six shots. The only evident reason for this oscillation is that the subtitles are generally shorter than the intertitles and often accompany shots that only appear for a few seconds. But Lo Duca never identifies a specific compositional pattern or camera angle of Dreyer's that would necessitate a subtitle rather than an intertitle with background décor. The subtitles also give the misleading impression that *Passion* was originally a sound film or at least featured some spoken dialogue heard by viewers. Various audiences first saw Dreyer's film between 1928 and 1931, a period when sound-on films and talkies surged in growth and popularity. In addition, when Lo Duca produced his sonorized version of *Passion* in the early fifties, foreign films began to enjoy wider international distribution so audiences overseas became increasingly accustomed to reading subtitles. Lo Duca perhaps realized this opportunity for commercial exploitation and decided to "window-dress" the film for contemporary viewers.

Originally, Dreyer insisted that the opening contain no credits. “Why put our name on the film? Why impose our livelihoods on the characters we play? That is how one takes away all illusion from the audience. We have to become capable of really giving the audience the impression that they’re watching ‘reality’ from a keyhole.”[107] Lo Duca, however, inserts several title cards that credit all major cast and crew members. Although he attributes the film’s direction to Dreyer in a separate card, he creates a reedited version credit for Gaumont and himself: “Sous la Direction de LO DUCA.” Rather than place the credits on a black background—as was the custom for most silent films—Lo Duca superimposes them over a gothic painting of a church interior containing recessed archways and a statue of a Biblical figure. Lo Duca returns to this backdrop once more before Joan is escorted to the cemetery following her interrogation in the torture chamber. (This is an odd moment to use it as a transitional device since the film moves from indoors to outdoors.) The painting provides an aesthetic blueprint for Lo Duca’s other pictorial representations of the Middle Ages throughout the film.

Lo Duca also departs from the film’s narrative space by inserting seventy-seven shots (including repeated images) of stained-glass windows depicting medieval icons. The first prominent example occurs when Bishop Pierre Cauchon (Eugene Sylvain) asks Joan to recite the Lord’s Prayer. Lo Duca displays a full shot of Christ on the cross accompanied by young followers at his side. This foreshadows Joan’s own crucifixion and identifies her passion with Christ’s. When an examining judge asks Joan if she hates the English, Lo Duca cuts to a window depicting a person with a sword slicing a figure amid strewn bodies. This icon is

likely a reference to the Siege of Orléans (1428–1429) where Joan enjoyed her first significant military victory over the English. Initially, it appears that Lo Duca's linking of shots in the film with stained-glass windows will carry relational value. However, while Lo Duca sporadically connects the intertitles with medieval imagery, his rather haphazard edits throughout betray that intention. Rather than create consistent emblematic associations between cinematic compositions and church icons, Lo Duca's juxtapositions appear random and arbitrary to viewers from three different eras: those who caught a theatrical screening of *Passion*'s uncut version in the twenties; those who saw the compilation print Krogh put together in the sixties at a film museum or art cinema; and those who watched one of the first theatrical versions (Danish or French) on either the Criterion DVD or Eureka Blu-ray. In a letter dated March 16, 1956, Dreyer writes to Jean Jay, chairman and president of Gaumont, complaining that none of Lo Duca's chosen backgrounds "has anything to do with the style of the film."[108] It is easy to understand Dreyer's consternation. Lo Duca too often aims for visual abstraction between his word-image pairings, producing a disjointed relationship between Dreyer's shots and the pictorial objects seen on the stained-glass windows. Aesthetically and conceptually, the filmed images of real actors and the static compositions of church architecture appear incompatible when edited together in a sequence of shots. In other words, the raw celluloid material that Dreyer captured seems more "filmy" and organic compared to the ersatz pictures that Lo Duca took and inserted into the Gaumont print.

The stained-glass windows alter the audience's sense of orientation in a scene. They particularly affect both one's perception of what a character sees and the unknown

perspective of Dreyer's subjective camera. For instance, Lo Duca inserts a dome-shaped window with sequined patterns on grisaille glass panels during Joan's swearing-in. This cut-in makes it seem Joan is looking up at the church's ceiling instead of at the person off-screen administering the oath.[109] The shift in Joan's point of view from a figure to a ceiling is important since the camera is nearly always looking up at people at a low angle.[110] In his analysis of *Passion*, Bordwell refers to camera angles and movements that seemingly represent optical vantage points as *Impressionist* subjectivity.[111] The insertion of church windows in between a character's (specified or unspecified) point of view ruptures the camera movement and montage of shots that depict Joan's clashes with her judges. Lo Duca's extraneous material further obfuscates the film's *Impressionist* subjectivity. The film critic and director Paul Schrader observes that Dreyer's camera takes as many as four or five vantage points in a single scene.[112] The straight-on or low angle shots of the windows add a sixth "screen" that intrudes upon the trial proceedings.

In addition to stained-glass windows, Lo Duca also used nineteen static shots depicting gothic architecture and the city of Rouen as backdrops for the intertitles. Showing full views of medieval buildings is something that Dreyer did not want. None of the other versions of the film contains any "magnificent vista shots."[113] In an article on cinematography, Dreyer articulates that "the task of photography is, through the exposure, to draw the spectator's eyes toward what is essential in every single shot...The background must only *be felt*, not *seen*."[114] Dreyer uses the physiques of his actors and the white walls in the church to "abstract" from space. In other words, the actors become a human landscape amidst

their spare setting. Lo Duca, however, pulls the audience out of the narrative center so they are drawn to extra-diegetic locales outside of the film's domain. Lo Duca thus ignored Dreyer's preference for a minimalist *mise-en-scène* and followed the original wishes of the film's financiers, who wanted to display the production's expensive set as decorative spectacle.[115] When they presumably saw the finished film, *Passion*'s financial backers complained that the set was not "made full use of."[116]

It is true that Dreyer wanted a large set built but for a very different purpose than the aesthetic goals which his executive producers sought. According to Paul La Cour (1902–1956), Dreyer's assistant director, the French architect Jean Hugo (1894–1984) consulted the illuminated manuscript, *Livre des Merveilles* (ca. 1400), at the French National Library for hand-drawn pictures of miniatures that eventually became models for the film's sets.[117] Hugo and the German art director Hermann Warm (1889–1976) erected a large septagonal or octagonal castle with a tall tower in each of the corners and a high wall running between the towers. The church or chapel was built in the center of the courtyard, opposite the drawbridge. The crew constructed a seven-sided city square that bore a likeness to Trafalgar Square.[118] Dreyer had his crew go to the trouble of building a big set because even though little of it was shown in the film, it provided members of his cast with a simulacrum of a fifteenth-century setting that they could experience daily for nearly the same duration as Joan of Arc's actual trial. An elaborate set allowed Dreyer's actors to absorb details from a particular historical milieu. Their assimilation into a specific period of history would contribute to performances drawn from the inside. Dreyer refers to this category of actors as

"those who build [their parts] up from *within*…[He] begins by identifying himself with the character he is to portray and he won't be satisfied until his heart is beating in the other chest."[119] Dreyer means that actors perform naturally or instinctively according to their environment and not by individual features such as costume and makeup.

Lo Duca demonstrates a lack of respect for Dreyer's artistic intentions and filmmaking philosophy. He breaks away from the actors and their relationship to uncluttered settings. More precisely, Lo Duca's nineteen static shots of Rouen encroach upon Dreyer's enclosed locales and confined narrative spaces. For example, during the judges' interrogation of Joan in her cell, the inserted shot of a building exterior pushes the viewer away from the white walls. The cutaway to an outdoor setting that has nothing to do with the interrogation shatters the bound space in the scene and jettisons the viewer's feeling of claustrophobia. Lo Duca repeats this editing pattern several more times. He inserts a cityscape of Rouen to accompany Joan's answer of whether or not she is in a state of grace and when she requests to attend Mass. He returns to the shot of the building after Joan collapses in the torture chamber and is brought back to her cell. Lo Duca also incorporates part of the building's architecture as a backdrop to accompany Joan's exchange with Judge Guillaume Erard (Jean d'Yd) in the graveyard. Lo Duca additionally shows shots of church pews that appear unrelated to Joan and Erard's discussion of the King of France's religious motives.

Given *Passion*'s sad history with fires, Lo Duca's insertion of fifteen moving images of flames adds an ironic insult to injury. He was perhaps aware that prints of *Passion* had been consumed by fires but his cutaways to them are unnecessary. For example, he shows an

extreme close-up of flames as Erard pressures Joan to sign a confession stating that her revelations came from the Devil. “If you do not sign, you will be burned alive.” Lo Duca intersperses images of flames throughout the graveyard scene as Erard and Loyeseleur urge Joan to sign. Most expectedly, Lo Duca inserts the same shot after Joan recants her confession. “Joan has retracted … she will be burned at the stake …” a spectator on stilts yells to the crowd in the castle courtyard. An ill-timed moment when Lo Duca rekindles the fire imagery occurs during the coda: “Joan above Joan! Flame above flame!” Rather than stick with Dreyer’s choice to punctuate Joan’s spiritual transcendence with a tilt up to the clouds, Lo Duca inserts a static shot of the sky and another shot of artificial flames. These two pictures appear too stagnant when seen in the context of Maté’s bustling camera movement and Dreyer’s ultra-rapid montage (over sixty shots in this final scene).[120] Overall, Lo Duca’s shots serve paratextually as aesthetic addendums to dramatic points in the story.

The addition of sound also distracts the viewer from the action onscreen. Like Krellberg, Lo Duca employs voice-over commentary but this time in the form of a French narrator who summarizes the social and religious circumstances surrounding Joan’s incarceration and trial. The spoken words distract the viewer from Dreyer’s long tracking shot behind the benches in the chapel, which establishes the space for the scene and situates the positions of the judges and clerics in the courtroom.[121] According to Bordwell, who viewed footage of *Passion* culled from “many different prints,” none of the other versions’ openings contain any “commentative” or explanatory intertitles that replicates the narration.[122] Lo Duca also digresses from the original Danish print, which displays a

crawling scroll on a black screen describing the trial transcript conserved in the library of the Chamber of Deputies in Paris.[123] Along with the '33 sound version, the voice-over signifies a re-mediation of content at the film's beginning compared to the Cinémathèque and MoMA copies.

RECEPTION OF THE LO DUCA VERSION

In early March 1952, Gaumont unveiled the Lo Duca version at a Gala held at the Cinema D'Essai, a Parisian experimental film house. According to one of *Variety*'s foreign correspondents, the reissue was "well received" by audiences.[124] In late 1953, Dreyer told film preservationist James Card that "[audiences] are not seeing the original version. [Lo Duca's] cutting has weakened many scenes."[125] Despite numerous objections from Dreyer, the Lo Duca print became the most well-known version of *Passion* for the next three decades. It was also shown in schools and cinema clubs on occasion. In January 1967, for instance, the Associated Students of Occidental College (CA) screened it in Los Angeles along with *Vivre sa vie* (Jean-Luc Godard, 1962). The event organizers apparently approved of Lo Duca's 77-minute presentation of *Passion*, complimenting the stained-glass windows for serving as a suitable backdrop for the intertitles and for their often-symbolic relation "to the dialogue and the events of the trial."[126] By the early 1970s, the Lo Duca version became the film's most widely circulated print in commercial distribution.[127] Later that decade, Gaumont brought it back to Paris cinemas where it was greeted with a "fresh set of raves."[128] The Lo Duca version remained in circulation until 1988 when Gunni Dreyer (1913–1990), Carl's daughter, filed a lawsuit disputing Gaumont's ownership of the film. The French

distributor agreed to withdraw all circulating prints in an out-of-court settlement with Gunni Dreyer.[129]

The Lo Duca version was not seen again by the public until 2012 when Eureka Entertainment and the Masters of Cinema (MoC) released it on Blu-ray in the UK. While Eureka presents it in high-definition, the video label's decision not to give it a photochemical or digital restoration underscores the complex ethical judgments film restorers face. Though the sonorized version was popular with audiences and some critics, Dreyer scholars (e.g., Eric Breitbart, Tony Pipolo, et al.) dislike the boldness with which Lo Duca drastically reshaped Dreyer's narrative. As Pipolo points out, Lo Duca "is the prime offender in most areas….All the evidence indicates that an obvious tampering with the original footage characterizes this print, obliterating many signs of compositional variation and intertitle/image relationship."[130] Breitbart compares the alterations to a painting retoucher "who, not being content with cleaning and restoring the surface, decides to enhance certain areas to make it more pleasing to the public's eye."[131] Lo Duca's butchering of Dreyer's film revises an *auteur*'s vision. Lo Duca's mockup of the film is a historical curiosity (hence its presence on the disc) but, as demonstrated in the next section, film restoration experts and archivists are more likely to give special care and meticulous attention to an *auteur*'s original work, albeit with mixed results.

THE RE-BIRTH OF DREYER'S *AUTEUR* STATUS

In 1981, one of the most remarkable discoveries in film history occurred in Norway. A workman was cleaning out a cellar at Dikemark Sykehus (Dikemark Mental Asylum),

located in the Oslo suburb of Asker, where he found several film canisters in a trunk. These contained ten prints: nine shorts and one feature film.[132] The workman telephoned the Norwegian Film Institute (NFI) to see if they were interested in acquiring them and they were.[133] Although Dikemark shipped the canisters to the NFI in autumn of '81, it took archivists two years to sort through the contents due to an inundation of other prints flowing into the archives.[134] In early June 1984 senior NFI archivist Arne Pedersen approached DFM director Ib Monty during an intermission to a meeting at the FIAF Congress in Stockholm with some exciting news. "I think that we have found an original print of *Jeanne d'Arc* with Danish intertitles in Oslo," Pedersen calmly told Monty.[135] After the NFI made a duplicate negative of the print for their collection, they sent the original nitrate print to the DFM as a gift later that September.[136] After it arrived, Monty ran the print on a Steenbeck. (It was too shrunken to run through a projector.) Monty immediately noticed the superior image quality compared to all other prints he had seen. The improved clarity made it easier to spot details on the white walls (e.g., the drawing of a cock crowing).[137]

Official documentation in one of the reel boxes confirmed that this print of *Passion* was one of the two prints shipped to Denmark in April 1928. The original wrapping paper contained a censor's card dated April 21, 1928, along with other papers sealed by the Danish censorship office that certify the print's authenticity.[138] The Danish intertitles on the filmstrip bear the mark of being printed on French machines since "æ," a Danish monophthongal vowel phoneme, had to be replaced with the letters "ae."[139] No grammatical errors existed on

any of the titles so they must have been proofread by a Dane, either Dreyer or one of his assistants, Paul la Cour or Ralph Holm.[140]

The specific reasons for why an original negative of *Passion* was sent from Denmark to Norway remain unknown. (The film was never shown publicly in Norway.[141]) The boxes of reels were addressed to Consultant Physician Harald Arnesen (1862–1953), the director of the Dikemark Sykehus at the time. Arnesen had an affinity with France's medieval period. He wrote a 1928 book on Jean-Lambert Tallien during the French Revolution and also may have had an interest in Joan of Arc. Arnesen knew Henrik Refsland, a private importer and distributor of films in Norway, who likely ordered *Passion* from Denmark.[142] Program notes inside one of the film cans suggest that Arnesen screened the film privately several times, possibly for patients in the ward.[143]

Jon Stenklev, director of the NFI, made an official statement about the discovery of the Oslo print in a press release on November 16, 1984.[144] The original version debuted later that month at a Dreyer symposium in Verona, Italy, followed by its first public showing at the Sixth International Odense Film Festival in Denmark in August 1985.[145] *Passion* attracted wide attention at the September 1985 Toronto International Film Festival (TIFF), which followed screenings in Bologna and Turin.[146] The DFM sent TIFF a safety dupe negative with English intertitles "carefully timed and framed so that they are exact replicas of the Danish originals" courtesy of the National Film Archives (NFA) in London.[147] Film critics and scholars made observations about the print that echoes Monty's. Dreyer scholar Mark Nash, who first saw the print at a National Film Theatre screening in May '85, remarks

that it "is in better condition than many new prints from old negatives."[148] Dave Kehr points out that "every pore of Falconetti's face seems visible…the walls of the prison house, a wavering gray in the old copies, now shine with a celestial whiteness."[149] The discovery of the Oslo print resurrected Dreyer's authorship because it contained reels shot and edited by him. However, Dreyer's authorial status became compromised after all the original Danish intertitles were removed and replaced with a new translation of titles in French. In addition, a handful of shots filmed presumably by Dreyer's crew were subsequently left out of circulating prints and neglected in the explicatory prologue.

Film historian Vincent Pinel and Dreyer biographer Maurice Drouzy presided over the restoration of *Passion* at the Cinémathèque Française. Pinel and Drouzy worked from a sparkling 35mm nitrate print, blemished by only one splice and signs of decomposition at the beginning of reel 2.[150] While audiences reportedly saw the "original version" of *Passion* at various film festivals and Dreyer retrospectives beginning in the mid-eighties, the film was re-mediated due to a lack of oversight on Pinel and Drouzy's part. Ostensibly, the underlying intent behind their restoration was to recreate a complete and uncut version of *Passion* that audiences would have seen at the Salle Marivaux in Paris in late October 1928. In projection prints, Pinel and Drouzy added ten Gaumont newsreel segments consisting of aviation milestones, international sporting events, and other newsworthy incidents spanning the globe in the summer and fall of '28.[151] Pinel and Drouzy included newsreels to transport modern viewers back in time to social happenings that the film's original audiences saw before the start of the main feature. In the introductory credits and notes, a brief three-paragraph scroll

summarizes the print history of *Passion* and acknowledges Drouzy for reestablishing the French text for a restored French version that is "probably very close to the original."[152] Drouzy, in fact, translated all of the Danish intertitles on the Oslo print into French and displayed them on a black background. The Cinémathèque's prologue mentions general sanctions imposed on the film but does not go into the Archbishop's decision to censor part of the film or the eight minutes deleted from the Paris premiere. Since Pinel and Drouzy intended to present a cut of the film that closely resembled the uncensored version Dreyer showed in Paris at a private screening, any information about changes to the film would have been both essential and welcome. Audiences are thus deprived of important contextual details about the film's release history.

Another way that Pinel and Drouzy re-mediate *Passion* is by means of exclusion: i.e., existing footage that they neglected to incorporate into the Oslo print. According to Pipolo, there are at least five shots in a truncated print acquired by the NFA in 1947 as well as a similar print conserved by the Yugoslavian Cinematek (now the Bibliothèque) that are missing from the Oslo print, the Lo Duca version, all MoMA prints, and Dreyer's work print/second negative at the Cinémathèque:

1. a long shot of the opening trial scene in the chapel where the viewer sees a full view of the tribunal; Joan is seated on a small stool directly in front of the clergy with her back to the viewer; Massieu comes over to help her rise and leave the chapel as the others begin to disassemble.

2. another long shot that presents an even wider view of the span of benches where all the judges and priests have sat during the trial;
3. a shot of Joan being led up the stairs to her cell by Massieu after the initial interrogation scene; a full view of the landing reveals her cell door in the deep left background; a guard stands between the middle ground and the stairs where Joan and Massieu have just climbed on the right;
4. an establishing shot that occurs at the outset of the cemetery scene where Joan will be persuaded to sign publicly the recantation after the harangue of Erard; and
5. a shot at the entrance to the cemetery showing Joan being carried through an archway on a stretcher by guards; the canopy and judges' stand are visible in the background from which Erard will presumably speak.[153]

These shots are also present in an archival print that Bordwell viewed at the DFM in the mid-seventies.[154] Pipolo gathers that the NFA print containing these shots originates from the censored version in France rather than the censored version in Britain.[155] The two prints are not identical. The NFA print has 328 feet (or about 100 meters) more than the 1928 print purportedly shown to critics in Britain.[156] Further, cuts in the NFA print mainly have to do with eliminating the Church's cruelty and persecution of Joan as opposed to curtailing the brutality and belligerent appearance of the English.[157] Excisions were obviously made to the NFA print but I disagree with the Criterion Collection's presumption that someone other than Dreyer put the five shots into the film during the censorship period.[158] It is possible that Dreyer added these shots for the special preview screening in Paris following the film's

theatrical run in Denmark. Two weeks after *Passion* opened at the Palads, a review by Ebbe Neergaard appeared in *Politiken* (Copenhagen's daily paper) that mentioned how Dreyer's recurring emphasis on close-ups confused the audience about the action in the scenes.[159] Neergaard suggested that Dreyer should integrate establishing shots with the close-ups.[160] It is important to note that Neergaard was a dear friend and confidant of Dreyer's.[161] In fact, according to Dreyer biographers Jean Drum and Dale D. Drum, Neergaard's May 1928 article on *Passion* marked the beginning of the critic's friendship with Dreyer.[162] Dreyer read the review and agreed with Neergaard's opinions. In a 1963 monograph, Dreyer admitted that the succession of close-ups threw *Passion* out of balance and vowed that he would not repeat the experiment in later films.[163]

Moreover, it is highly unlikely that SGD, ACE, or a censorship board inserted the five shots after the film was taken out of Dreyer's hands. None of the shots are "establishing" shots in the conventional sense that they open a scene and situate the axis of action. For example, Dreyer seems to have placed the two wide shots inside the chapel—one of Joan seated on a stool in front of her judges and the other a full view of the tribunal from behind the benches—at the very end of the first round of interrogations in order to reorient the audience to the location of the trial. Dreyer had already executed a long tracking shot behind the chapel's benches at the beginning so he likely would have deemed another shot from the rear redundant at that point. Had Dreyer's producers or the studio decided to use these shots, they likely would have inserted them much earlier in the scene or opened the film with them. From the standpoint of editing, the presence of these shots as placement markers at the

conclusion of the scene initially seems odd. However, the edits have something in common with the unconventional camerawork in the film. Both aspects subvert one's traditional viewing expectations of a picture made in the formative years of classical Hollywood cinema. Also, it was necessary for Dreyer to add the wide shots at scene's end to give the audience a breather. Dreyer had subjected the audience to a lengthy series of uninterrupted close-ups and canted framings. The audience needed an establishing shot to rediscover the scene's whereabouts and get its bearings. The shot where Massieu leads Joan to her cell serves a similar purpose because it acts as a bridge between the scenic transitions of the chapel and the site of Joan's incarceration. The other establishing shots in the cemetery do not give the audience a complete representation of the castle courtyard (like the wide shots of the chapel do) but they nonetheless provide visual cues for the action: e.g., the archway and peasants observing Joan as she is carried outside for her meeting with Erard. Altogether, these set of shots were originally photographed by Dreyer and Maté so they deserve to be seen in an alternate cut. No evidence has ever surfaced that SGD brought the film's cast and crew back together for re-shoots. These shots are not "throwaways" and are an important part of *Passion*'s production.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINTS

In addition to the Oslo and NFA prints, there are aesthetic discrepancies between other versions of *Passion*. Pipolo, who went through the MoMA/Cinémathèque, Lo Duca, and Oslo prints exhaustively on a Steenbeck as well as the Krogh-assembled print on 35mm, has noted every shot and intertitle difference.[164] Pipolo discovered that although the Oslo

print “essentially differs very little” from the Cinémathèque and MoMA copies, there are some important differences between the number of shots and intertitles.[165] Drouzy’s decoupage of the Oslo print tallies 1,343 shots and 174 intertitles, while Pipolo’s shot analysis of the MoMA print totals 1,333 shots and 166 intertitles.[166] One significant difference is the opening shot of a figure’s movement toward a table and the opening of an old book (the transcript of the trial of Joan of Arc). The Oslo has the part where a person sets the book on the table, while the MoMA copies apparently do not.[167] This is important because it situates the film as a historical film and a document of the past. MoC printed a shot-by-shot comparison in its Blu-ray booklet comparing the Oslo print (“A Negative”) and the Lo Duca version (“B Negative”). The frame illustrations reveal numerous differences in framing, composition, and performance. Furthermore, I want to add that there still may be a copy of the B Negative without any of Lo Duca’s changes stored in a Milan film archive. The Italian filmmaker Francesco Pasinetti (1911–1949) once owned a print that was believed to be the only copy of *Passion* in Europe during the 1940s.[168] An illustrated book published in 1945 contains 118 frame enlargements from Pasinetti’s print that reveals several identical shots to the B Negative. There are also some alternate takes when compared to the A Negative.[169] The print appears not to have been censored as it contains shots of the torture instruments and a doctor wrapping a tourniquet around Joan’s arm. This is all likely confirmation that the Pasinetti copy is struck from Dreyer’s work print. According to Blu-ray.com and the CriterionCast, Gaumont is reportedly working on a new digital restoration of *Passion* that is different from Criterion and Eureka’s.[170] One anticipates that it may be the B

Negative, which deserves to be seen by a wide audience in an untampered version. There is also the unresolved issue of a mysterious scene missing from all US prints, the Lo Duca version, and the A Negative. According to foreign film translator Herman G. Weinberg (1908–1983), the scene in question is actually an extended version of the blood-letting. At the moment of incision by the physician of Joan's arm, an extreme close-up shows a priest's foot stepping (pressing) down into her cell. The camera pulls back to reveal who it is—Loyeseleur who pretends to befriend Joan. In the version Weinberg saw, the edit had the effect of making it seem as if the weight of Loyeseleur was forcing the needle into Joan's arm.[171] It would be important to know if the prints Gaumont works from contain this snippet or whether it is in a print held by a foreign archive. If it is found, which version of the film does it appear? Since it does not appear that it was in any of the original theatrical prints, it might be an ideal inclusion as an extra on the DVD/Blu-ray.

MUSICAL RE-MEDIATION: *PASSION*'S MANY SCORES

Ever since *Passion* began shooting in 1928, the decision of whether to add sound or music to the film has been the subject of continuous debate. I differ from Tybjerg and other commentators on the film who claim that Dreyer originally did not want a talking film. The prolific British author and filmmaker Roger Manvell (1909–1987), who interviewed Dreyer in the postwar years, learned that the Danish filmmaker "would like to have made the film with sound."[172] However, European studios like SGF did not yet have the technology so Dreyer was obliged to make *Passion* silent.[173] But since it first opened at the Palads, *Passion* was never silent. (Between sixteen and thirty composers have written or arranged scores to

accompany *Passion*.[174]) Palads had a large orchestra that regularly performed a piece of music before the feature and during the intermission.[175] Jacob Gade, Palads' orchestra conductor, arranged a program with the overture of "The Virgin of Orléans," written by Swedish composer Johan August Söderman (1832–1876), and unspecified musical selections that played during the screening.[176]

For *Passion*'s premiere in Paris, SGD hired Léo Pouget and Victor Alix, French composers with background in musical comedy and operettas, to write a feature-length original score that would act as counterpoint to the film's arresting images. Pouget and Alix composed a "symphonic poem" in thirteen parts for orchestra, organ, choir, and soloist that was eventually transcribed for piano and played under this form at screenings of the film during its first release in France.[177] Dreyer reportedly did not like this score. The score was also performed in Germany and the US between 1928 and 1930.[178] At the Library of Congress, librarian Gillian Anderson uncovered a copy of the score's sheet music with a copyright date of December 31, 1928.[179] A notice appears on the conductor's copy: "Performance of this score is OBLIGATORY during presentation of the film."[180] The Danish composer Svend S. Schultz re-transcribed the score for orchestra, organ, choir, and soloist for a screening of *Passion* at Odense on August 8, 1985.[181] In conjunction with the restored Oslo print, Anderson conducted this score at TIFF and other festivals. According to French film scholar Lenny Borger, Pouget and Alix's music failed to make a deep impression on festival attendees and overall audience reaction was mixed.[182]

THE COMPOSER AS CO-AUTHOR OF THE FILM

Film and television composer Richard Einhorn's (born 1952) opera/oratorio, *Voices of Light* (premiered 1994), signaled the first major musical work written for *Passion* that broke into the mainstream. In 1988, Einhorn was browsing the film library at MoMA where he came across a still from *Passion* and asked to screen the film. Dreyer's work made a profound impression on Einhorn as he embarked on an ambitious six-year project on Joan of Arc. With the exception of Philip Glass's opera triptych for the prose and films of Jean Cocteau, the journey that Einhorn took to eventually "score" *Passion* differs from that of any other composer whose written new music for a silent film or for the early years of sound films. In the teens and twenties, a studio's producers or director would hire a composer to write an original score or sync preexisting compositions to the picture. Long after the original makers were gone and the film changed ownership, the hiring process was similar. National film institutes and video distributors would reach out to new composers to score the picture. In Einhorn's case, the reverse scenario occurred. Before he completed *Voices* in 1994, Einhorn sought organizations in the arts to sponsor his work and help find performance venues. Einhorn found a backer in the Northampton (MA) Arts Council, which bequeathed the composer with $3,000 in grant money to support a chorus, orchestra, and preparation for the score and parts.[183]

Einhorn's *Voices* represents a unique "collaboration" with Dreyer's *Passion*. When *Voices* is performed simultaneously with *Passion*, Einhorn deserves to be regarded as a co-author with Dreyer. For the last two decades, *Voices* has regularly teemed with *Passion* in a

performance environment that recalls the original roadshow presentations in movie palaces where an organist or orchestra would perform music before, during, and after the feature. But unlike the roadshow format, where a conductor directs players in a lowered area of the stage (the orchestra pit), the music for *Voices* is performed on center stage with a large screen projecting *Passion* directly atop the chorus and musicians. In this spatial arrangement, the live musical accompaniment acts as a performance partner with the film. The music or film may seem to compete against the other as each vies for the attention of audiences who fill the concert halls and packed auditoriums.

Voices is not "background music"—i.e., music that people are really not supposed to notice. It comments on the action in the film or acts as a counterpoint to it rather than serving as its subordinate. This notion evokes the role of the Greek Chorus in which an audience saw and heard a combination of singing and dancing that adjoined the drama (*ca.* 5th century B.C.).[184] Peter Arnott argues that the Chorus was a central, unifying building block to the production as a whole and should not be considered secondary in any way.[185] *Voices* likewise serves a complementary role to the film it accompanies. In a hybrid form that I call "music-cinema," the tandem of *Voices* and *Passion* has transformed into a prominent multimedia event. After it sold out its premiere, *Voices* went on to achieve global recognition with more than 250 public performances to date.[186] Sony Classical released a CD album of Einhorn's oratorio that became a classical bestseller on Billboard's list.[187] *Voices*' critical success and mass popularity convinced Home Vision Entertainment to pair it with *Passion* on the video

label's VHS edition. In addition, Criterion (HVE's then-sister company) followed suit with a separate sound track of *Voices* on the DVD.

The preparatory process and technical means by which Einhorn conceived *Voices* represents a radical departure for scoring silent films compared to the pre-digital era. When composers wrote original music in the silent days, they had strict deadlines and only one format in which to view the film. Einhorn's case was unusual because he worked on his own deadline. Einhorn also had the luxury of different formats in which to view *Passion*. While the film was not available on any digital formats at the time, Einhorn had video copies he used to watch the film "at least 200 times."[188]

There is also a wide technological disparity in music equipment between the two eras. In the first half of the last century, composers primarily had a piano, an organ, and the traditional family of instruments at their disposal. Scores accompanying silent films on VHS and LD typically only featured an organ or a piano. On DVD and its digital successors, however, sound tracks for silent titles have included more complex orchestral and symphonic works. From the mid-1980s onward, synthesizers and digital samplers became increasingly more prominent. Einhorn had an array of electronic instruments to sample his pieces. During the early '90s, Einhorn presaged today's composers through his use of sequencing software with digital audio capabilities. As he watched *Passion*, Einhorn displayed notational images (or what he calls "computer clippings") as a visual reference so he could stitch together themes and create finished sketches of the whole score.[189] Einhorn composed *Voices* in his Midtown Manhattan studio on his Macintosh hooked up to nine synthesizers, two mixers, an

amplifier, a keyboard, and a video monitor.[190] As he crafted his 700-page score, Einhorn composed on an Opcode Studio Vision sequencer (via his Mac), which locked to Dreyer's film with SMPTE timecode.[191] Although he did not employ synthesizers in the recording, Einhorn came up with specific sketches using an Emulator Archive Proteus 2 (a high-quality orchestral sampler), a Korg M1REX (a digital synth workstation), an Akai S1000 (a 16-bit stereo sampler), and an Akai S900 (one of the industry's first digital samplers).[192] When he completed the sections, Einhorn exported them as Musical Instrument Digital Interface (MIDI) files and imported them into Coda's *Finale*, a music notation editing software program.[193] When he composed *Voices*, Einhorn conceived fifteen different pieces with each structured as a movement.[194] Each cue that Einhorn wrote was spotted and timed to specific moments in *Passion*. The music was synchronized and played entirely during the film's 82-minute runtime.

With *Voices*, Einhorn introduced a new genre into film music circles known as the *multilingual motet*.[3] To come up with his motets, Einhorn drew from over 3,000 pages of writings by female mystics before choosing texts that he would ultimately use in a libretto.[195] Einhorn sought motets that would represent Joan's world and her time. He determined that all the words should be sung in the languages of Latin, Old and Middle French, and Italian.[196] In order to create a template for the various singers who perform the motets,

---

3 The motet, which originated in thirteenth-century France, employs three-part musical polyphony. It contains a texture incorporating several equally important lines with each part articulating a unique text. *See* Rachel May Golden, "Polyphonies of Sound and Space: Motet, Montage, *Voices of Light*, and *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," *Musical Quarterly* 96, no. 2 (Summer 2013): 297, doi:10.1093/musqtl/gdt013.

Einhorn enlisted the medieval scholar Nadia Margolis to recite the lyrics into a tape recorder.[197] Viewers and listeners can follow the motets in text form as *Voices* is performed on different media. At concert performances, attendees are given a copy of the libretto with lyrics of each piece sung in its original language on one column, and an English translation in the other column. The CD album of *Voices* and the Criterion DVD of *Passion* also contains the same libretto.[198]

Einhorn's motets expand on and reinterpret the Joan of Arc character depicted in *Passion*. One way that Einhorn reinterprets Falconetti's Joan is by giving her character voices. In all versions of *Passion*, the voices that supposedly gave Joan her spiritual guidance play a very minor and insignificant role. In Einhorn's work, however, voices play an important role in commenting and reflecting upon the action during nearly every movement. Using *Letters of Joan of Arc* as a principal source, Einhorn wrote lyrics sung by the medieval vocal group Anonymous 4 and other female vocalists for seven of the pieces. Since no historical evidence exists to reveal what Joan of Arc sounded like, Einhorn made her voice both a soprano and an alto sung in unison. During the opening credits ("Prelude: Exclamavit,"), Anonymous 4 represents Joan and sings a passage from Daniel 13:42: "Everlasting God, who knows things hidden and all things before they happen, you know they have borne false witness against me; and see! I die, although I am innocent of everything their malice has invented against me."[199] Before Joan is shown on screen, this piece both foretells the viewer of Joan's fate and expresses the ill feelings she must have had

against the English. Einhorn and Anonymous Four use this same stanza as a refrain later in the film when Joan is escorted outside the castle for her execution ("The Final Walk").

Voices deviates substantially from a traditional film score. Most works of silent film music feature either a piano/organ score performed by the composer or a symphonic score with an orchestral ensemble. Einhorn eschewed all conventional methods and produced a multilayered polyphonic work comprised of four vocal soloists, a large chorus, strings, a quartet of woodwinds (two flutes and two oboes), and a digital sampler. *Voices* also differs significantly from standard film music through the technique of counterpoint. Einhorn says that he tried to avoid a "Mickey-Mouse" type of score.[200] The phrase "Mickey-Mousing" refers to a technique of scoring popularized by Walt Disney animation and Golden Age composers like Max Steiner in which the music directly imitates the motions of the characters. With counterpoint, Einhorn employs a very different approach. The late Swiss musicologist Hansjörg Pauli defines counterpoint (*kontrapunktierung*) as "the specific character of the music contradicts the specific content of the picture; thus, the music conveys irony or comments on the content of the picture in another way."[201] Einhorn uses counterpoint to contrast Joan's spiritual visions with her patriarchal judges so their clash becomes, to borrow Bordwell's phrase, a "battle of discourses."[202] The piece, "Interrogation," begins with a tenor and bass-baritone duet. They sing in unison: "HOMASSE!" (Masculine Woman!). It sounds like a strong male choral chant, clearly intended to represent Joan's examining judges. "HOMASSE!" was a medieval slur directed at women so it corresponds with the judges' scorn of Joan wearing men's clothing and, in

their view, blaspheming God. Einhorn uses "HOMASSE!" as a refrain but also interleaves verses with quotations by early feminists and medieval mystics to counter the slur. For instance, a tenor sings a verse from the poem, *Ditié de Jehanne d'Arc* (1429), by Christine de Pizan. "Oh! What an honor for the feminine sex!... This entire realm, once lost by [wretched men], restored and saved by a woman again." Einhorn also uses words by Na Prous Boneta, a 14th Century French heretic burned at the stake, as a mouthpiece for Joan's martyrdom: "Whether or not you wish it, this will be yours. I know what I have chosen." Einhorn counterbalances those verses with different vocal soloists and alternating lines. Due to its immersive soundscape, neoclassical tones, and powerful multi-vocal performances, *Voices* acts as a strong contrapuntal force to the searing images of the film it accompanies.

PASSION AND SOCIAL MEDIA

Since the release of Einhorn's *Voices* on various media, musical re-mediation of *Passion* on social media sites—YouTube especially—has been abundant, assuming different genres and appearing as user-appropriated content. YouTube users have taken analog and digital copies of *Passion* and either uploaded extant soundtracks or synchronized a new score to the film. For instance, the user Valerie Stephens excerpts scenes from the Oslo print and accompanies them with a soulful, New Age work by Kirlian Camera.[203] Stephens transforms the film into the combination of a cinematic slideshow and a digital photoplay. She takes selected scenes from the film, slows down their frame rates, and adds lap dissolves in which the images and intertitles overlap. The result is akin to watching a portion of *Passion* in slow motion with mesmerizing mood music. In addition, the user Philippe Lejeune employs

similar video editing techniques with Dreyer's film but on a more ambitious scale. Intended as a piece of performance art in collaboration with the Boston Experimental Theatre Company, Lejeune takes a sepia-tinted print of *Passion* with dual-language intertitles and remixes it with Claude Debussy's *Prélude à l'après-midi d'un faune (L. 86)*.[204] Like Stephens, Lejeune alters the projection speed and incorporates dissolves. But unlike Stephens, Lejune subordinates the music to aesthetic effects that he creates through superimpositions. The images continually flow into each other. Lejune often repeats a series of shots and then superimposes them into a different scene. The result is "visual convergence": individual compositions and mobile camera shots are strung together to produce a simultaneity of events within an intersecting narrative that the viewer tries to makes sense of.

Other YouTube users have added original scores that play during the whole film. For example, the user David Vaipan removed Einhorn's work from the Drouzy/Pinel version and replaced it with a public performance of a 2011 feature-length instrumental score by the Chicago-based rock band, Joan of Arc.[205] Vaipan also posted links for users to purchase Joan of Arc's digital album from the record label, Joyful Noise Recordings, as well as e-commerce sites and mobile apps.[206] Vaipan explains his decisions in a vituperative paragraph on popular music and Einhorn, attacking the latter for his alleged didactic style and unsubtle compositions.[207] As of this writing (late July 2015), the *Passion*/Joan of Arc recording has nearly 182,000 views and more than 250 registered user comments.[208] The high-viewing tally

and feedback indicate that movie fans use social media lot to watch classic films but do not really care about how it was originally conceived.

Users also spend little time fretting over the integrity of the work. In one case, the user "VASILISG841" attempts to colorize a part of *Passion* with the software program, Adobe After Effects. The user presents several before-and-after comparisons of a black-and-white filmed shot of Falconetti's Joan that is converted into color-composited images.[209] The visage of Joan is given different skin tones as the light density and color spectrum fluctuate. The user goes so far as to animate Joan with monochromatic effects. Although "VASILISG841" did not go to the extent that Turner Entertainment did with colorizing every reel of a classic film, he or she commits an act of aesthetic and cultural vandalism. Dreyer or his collaborators never imagined that *Passion* would be shown in color. The user posts rather sardonic remarks about his re-creation: "There was no intention to insult neither the film nor the artist."[210]

As a user-sharing site containing thousands of archival audiovisual recordings, YouTube represents a medium of its own kind where the boundaries for propriety and copyright reside in murky waters. *Passion* is a classic example of this legal and ethical dilemma. For instance, it has become more commonplace for concert or theatergoers to film a screening of *Passion* alongside a live performance of a new score with their smartphones. YouTube features several examples of this trend.[211] A troubling aspect is that the video recordings appear to indicate that they are taken from the same print that Criterion used for its DVD. However, none of the uploaders acknowledge the original source. This raises the

issue if it is lawful beyond fair use to record, post, and distribute the filming of a projected movie without the distributor's consent. Furthermore, a one-minute clip from organist Rosa Rio's (1902–2010) score to an old VHS tape of *Passion* resides on YouTube but no provisos has been given for its posting.[212] Although this is only a short segment, it is bewildering that the user "montrealfilmguy" apparently did not seek permission from Rio's family estate or from the video outfit. These are only some examples of the many different forms of re-mediation social media users have produced in appropriating and reworking versions of *Passion*.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has delivered a comprehensive purview of *Passion*'s print history from the time it was consumed by fires to its rise from the ashes. In the process, I have identified the various authorial roles content providers have assumed in re-mediating the content of Dreyer's original film. The information in this chapter suggests a way forward to the re-mediation of classic film. The closing paragraph offers a description of it.

I propose that Criterion or another video distributor take the supplementary shots from the NFA print and insert them into the Oslo print for what I call the Extended Cut (EC) of *Passion*. Criterion included three of these shots as playable clips on the DVD's version history of *Passion* so they have the source to work with.[213] According to notes left by NFA archivist "J.D.G.," the archive's 35mm print contains English credits and intertitles but most of them appear in the wrong position.[214] If the extra shots contain any accompanying intertitles, they need to be moved to their proper places for the EC. One indication that the

NFA print is an “original version” is that the canisters contain eight reels, the same number from which the film was assembled.[215] It would be advantageous to restorers if they created a spreadsheet with intertitle comparisons and potential suggestions for slotting the title cards. When the restoration is completed, the EC could be released on DVD/Blu-ray and streamed on digital platforms. If a video label chooses to use music, it should pair the film with Einhorn’s *Voices of Light*.

Notes to CHAPTER 4

1 Carl Theodor Dreyer, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*)," in *Four Screenplays*, ed. Ole Storm, trans. Oliver Stallybrass (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970), 76. The script was originally titled *Jehanne: La Passion et la Mort d'une Sainte.*

2 On December 6, 1928 at UFA Studios, in early 1929 at a Gaumont lab, and in 1937 in either France or Italy.

3 Dreyer, *Fire Film:* Jeanne d'Arc, Vampyr, Vredens Dag, Ordet, ed. Ole Storm (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1964).

4 Marguerite Engberg, "Historien om den Genfundne *Jeanne d'Arc* [The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*]," trans. Peter Schepelern [2014], *Kosmorama* 31, no. 171 (May 1985): 42.

5 Ibid.; *Passion* was banned in all Nazi-occupied countries from 1940–44. Georges Sadoul, *Dictionary of Films*, ed. and trans. Peter Morris (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 276.

6 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 42.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 Ebbe Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, trans. Marianne Helweg, British Film Institute New Index Series 1 (London: British Film Institute, 1950), 17; Lisbeth Richter Larsen, "Master of the House: Reception," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, para. 3, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Du-skal-aere-din-Hustru/Reception.aspx.

10 This seems like a moderately high budget for a film in the twenties but it should come as no surprise since the same studio supplied Abel Gance with more than twice that amount for his superproduction of *Napoléon* (1927). Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 19; "'Joan of Arc,' French Film Ready for Release," *The Film Daily*, April 1, 1928, 2.

11 Joseph Delteil, *Jeanne d'Arc* (Paris: Grasset, 1925), trans. Malcolm Cowley as *Joan of Arc* (New York: Minton, Balch, 1926).

12 Nadia Margolis, "Trial by Passion: Philology, Film, and Ideology in the Portrayal of Joan of Arc (1900–1930)," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 27, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 466.

13 David Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, vol. 1, Indiana University Press Filmguide Series 1 (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1973), 14; Anthony Thomas Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*: A Comparison of Prints and a Formal Analysis" (PhD Diss., New York University, 1981), ProQuest (AAT 8127953), 15.

14 Wilhelmina Van Ness, "Joseph Delteil: *The Passion of Joan of Arc*," *Literature Film Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (Fall 1975): 292.

15 Alan Stanbrook, "Great Films of the Century —— No. 12: The Passion of Joan of Arc," *Films and Filming* 8, June 1961, 13.

16 Van Ness, "Joseph Delteil: *The Passion of Joan of Arc*," 292.

17 Margolis, "Trial by Passion," 467; Gail Orgelfinger, "Carl Dreyer's Passion Play in *Jeanne d'Arc* and *Jesus*," *Film & History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies*, Film & History CD-ROM Annual, 2003: 8.

18 Margolis, 467, 471.

19 Jean Drum and Dale D. Drum, *My Only Great Passion: The Life and Films of Carl Th. Dreyer*, Scarecrow Filmmakers Series 68 (Lanham, MD, and London: Scarecrow Press, 2000), 126; Orgelfinger, "Carl Dreyer's Passion Play in *Jeanne d'Arc* and *Jesus*," 5.

20 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 21.

21 "French Film News," *Variety*, June 1, 1927, sec. Pictures, 12, Variety Archives; Larsen, "The Passion of Joan of Arc: Shoot," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, para. 3, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/La-Passion-de-Jeanne-dArc/Shoot.aspx.

22 Larsen, "The Passion of Joan of Arc: Shoot," para. 4, 5.

23 Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 6.

24 Ibid., 42–43.

25 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 40.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid; Larsen, "The Passion of Joan of Arc: Reception," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, para. 4, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/La-Passion-de-Jeanne-dArc/Reception.aspx. It was also shown locally in May of that year at Park Teatret for seven days and at Odeon Teatret for five days.

28 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 40.

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid., 41.

33 Léon Moussinac, "La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc," *Panoramique du cinéma* (Paris: Au sans reveil, 1929), 77n, quoted in Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 2.

34 Eric Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*: A Classic Film Rises from the Ashes," *Sightlines*, Fall 1986, 27.

35 Ibid.; James Reid Paris, *The Great French Films* (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1983), 28; Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 41.

36 Quoted in Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 41.

37 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 143. Jean-José Frappa wrote in January 1927 of Dreyer: "Whatever the talent of the director (and he has it) … he cannot give us a true Joan of Arc of the French tradition … To let [the film] be made in France would be a scandalous abdication of responsibility." Quoted in "History and production: Version history; THE MANY INCARNATIONS OF *JOAN*," *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, Directed by Carl Theodor Dreyer (1928; Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 1999), DVD (NTSC).

38 Richard Abel, *French Cinema: The First Wave, 1915–1929* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), 487.

39 Herman G. Weinberg, "Dreyer's Joan," *Sight and Sound*, Summer 1975, sec. Correspondence, 197. Krogh mistakenly informs Wilhelmina Van Ness in the quoted letter that the film was taken out of Dreyer's hands and cuts were made to the release print *before Passion*'s global premiere in Copenhagen. The film was not trimmed until either the summer or early fall of 1928.

40 Breitbart, *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*, 27; Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 143; Christopher Adcock and Dale Ann Stieber, La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc *Souvenir Program*, Los Angeles International Film Exposition (Los Angeles, CA: Wadsworth Theatre, May 27, 1983), 4, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32120.

41 Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 27; Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 143.

42 Moussinac, "La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc," 77n, quoted in Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 2.

43 Ibid.

44 Paris, *The Great French Films*, 28.

45 Antonin Artaud, "Interview for *Cinémonde* (1929)," in *Antonin Artaud, Selected Writings*, ed. Susan Sontag, trans. Helen Weaver (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976), 184.

46 Carl Herring, "The Movies," *The London Mercury*, August 1928, 424.

47 Mordaunt Hall, "Poignant French Film," *New York Times*, March 31, 1929, sec. 8, X7.

48 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 41.

49 Ibid.

50 [Vossische Zeitung], "Joan of Arc Picture," *New York Times*, January 20, 1929, sec. 8, X7.

51 George Blaisdell, "Looking In on Just a Few New Ones," *International Photographer*, October 1931, 28–29.

52 Carl Theodor Dreyer, *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*), 35mm (British Film Institute, 1928).

53 Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 4. Pipolo learned this through a conversation with British film historian, William K. Everson.

54 Paris, *The Great French Films*, 28; Stanbrook, "Great Films of the Century...," 11.

55 Casper Tybjerg, "Two Passions – One Film?," in The Passion of Joan of Arc *Blu-Ray Book*, The Masters of Cinema Series, Spine # 50 (London: Eureka Entertainment, 2012), 67.

56 P. B. W., "New Joan of Arc Film in Berlin," *The Christian Science Monitor*, December 24, 1928, Pacific edition, 8.

57 Zeitung, "Joan of Arc Picture," X7.

58 Tybjerg, "Two Passions – One Film?," 67.

59 See Roger Smither and Catherine A. Surowiec, eds., "A Calendar of Film Fires," in *This Film Is Dangerous: A Celebration of Nitrate Film* (Brussels, Belgium: International Federation of Film Archives [FIAF], 2002), 429–53.

60 Klaus Kreimeier, *The Ufa Story: A History of Germany's Greatest Film Company, 1918-1945*, trans. Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber (New York: Hill & Wang, 1996).

61 "THE MANY INCARNATIONS OF *JOAN*," *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, The Criterion Collection, DVD.

62 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC: Textual Variations in the Key Prints of Carl Dreyer's Film," *Film History: An International Journal* 2, no. 4 (December 1988): 303.

63 Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 27.

64 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 303.

65 Paul Read and Mark-Paul Meyer, eds., *Restoration of Motion Picture Film*, Butterworth-Heinemann Series in Conservation and Museology (Oxford and Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2000), 62.

66 Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 27.

67 Harry Alan Potamkin, "The Passion of Jean D'Arc," *National Board of Review Magazine*, January 1929, 9, Internet Archive.

68 Comte de la Roziere, "Trial of Joan of Arc," *New York Times*, April 1, 1928, sec. 9: Amusements, X5.

69 “The Passion of Joan of Arc,” *The Film Daily*, April 14, 1929, 12.

70 Sime Silverman, “Passion of Joan of Arc,” *Variety*, April 10, 1929, sec. Film Reviews, 25.

71 Tybjerg, 2:14 into his “Audio Essay,” *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, Directed by Carl Theodor Dreyer (1928; Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 1999), DVD (NTSC).

72 See “French Story First of Year on Little Bill,” *The Washington Post*, September 8, 1929; W. W. Whitney, “Little Theater,” *The Washington Post*, September 9, 1929, sec. The New Week’s Bills; “‘Joan of Arc’ Film Entering Second Week,” *The Washington Post*, September 15, 1929; Elena Boland, “Contrasts Feature at Filmarte,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 16, 1929; Mae Tinée, “Trial, Burning of Joan of Arc Put on Screen,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, January 14, 1930; “‘The Passion of Joan of Arc’ at Fine Arts,” *Daily Boston Globe*, March 29, 1930.

73 Pipolo, “The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC,” 305.

74 Ibid., 305–06.

75 “The Passion of Joan of Arc,” *The Film Daily*, September 9, 1933, 4.

76 William Boehnel, “Sound Film Greatly Aids Joan of Arc,” *New York World Telegram*, September 15, 1933.

77 Ibid.

78 “The Passion of Joan of Arc,” September 9, 1933, 4.

79 Charles S. Aaronson, “The Passion of Joan of Ar,” *Motion Picture (NY) Herald*, September 16, 1933, 39.

80 Ibid.

81 Ibid.

82 Ca. 1930, an ecclesiastical community pressured exhibitors to withdraw *Passion* in Chicago but film critics Carol Frink and Clark Rodenbach’s acclaim of the film helped prevent any cancelled showings. Charles Teitel, “Chicago Boasts Top Film Critics, Part Of Solid Tradition,” *Daily Variety*, January 21, 1983, 53, Variety Archives.

83 This version is owned by Carson-Newman (TN) University’s Stephens-Burnett Library, Gustavus Adolphus (MN) College’s Folke Bernadotte Memorial Library, University of Alaska Fairbanks’s Elmer E.

Rasmuson Library (which has two copies of the print), University of California, Riverside Library (which houses two film reels), and Onondaga Community (NY) College's Coulter Library. See catalog record of Carl Theodor Dreyer (director), Sherman S. Krellberg (producer/distributor), *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, 16mm and 8mm, Drama (New York: Film Classic Exchange, 1933), WorldCat (OCLC: 4410545), https://www.worldcat.org/title/passion-of-joan-of-arc/oclc/4410545?referer=br&ht=edition.

84 Read and Meyer, Restoration of Motion Picture Film, 69.

85 Societe Generale de Films, "A Super Production *From France*: The PASSION *of* JOAN *of* ARC," *Motion Picture News* 37, no. 6 (February 11, 1928): 414.

86 See advertisement by Societe Generale de Films, "*Announcing To The Screens Of America An Unusual Cinematographic Achievement*, 'The Passion of Joan of Arc'; A CARL DREYER PRODUCTION *of* Societe Generale De Films; Paris, France," *The Film Daily*, February 9, 1928, 3; advertisement, Societe Generale de Films, "SOCIETE GENERALE DE FILMS *of* PARIS, FRANCE *Invite the Attention of Critical America to an Unusual Motion Picture*, 'The PASSION of JOAN of ARC', A CARL DREYER PRODUCTION; A Cinematographic Inspiration," *Motion Picture News* 37, no. 7 (February 18, 1928): 490.

87 Societe Generale de Films, "A Cinematographic Inspiration," 490.

88 Societe Generale de Films, "...*An Unusual Cinematographic Achievement*," 3.

89 Edwin Schallert, ed., "The Tragic Ending of Jeane d'Arc," *Los Angeles Times*, February 24, 1929, sec. Weekly Film Pictorial Section: The Pre-view, I8.

90 Ibid.

91 Lenin Imports, "Film Poster - *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (1928)," *Silent Film Renée Maria Falconetti :: Biography and Gallery*, July 9, 2013, http://www.leninimports.com/renee_maria_falconetti_11a_e.jpg.

92 Ibid.

93 "'The Passion of Joan of Arc' Sherman S. Krellberg Distributor Materials," 1933, n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles

/DocDetail?docId=32147.

94 "'The Passion of Joan of Arc' Exhibitor Manual" (Capital Film Exchange, 1933), n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles /DocDetail?docId=32154.

95 "Krellberg Distributor Materials," n.p.

96 In an introduction to a screening of *Passion* at the Danish Film Museum in 1950, Dreyer stated: "My film about Jeanne d'Arc has incorrectly been called an avant-garde film, which it absolutely is not. It is not a film aimed at film theoreticians but at all humankind. It is intended for the broad masses, and it has something to give to every open human mind." Quoted in David Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981), 234, n. 12.

97 Iris Barry, *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, Series III, Program 7, The Film in Germany and the Film in France: Transition to Sound (New York: The Museum of Modern Art Film Library, 1940), para. 6, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles /DocDetail?docId=32122; Pipolo learned from film historian Jay Leyda that the prints Barry referred to possibly originate from Dreyer's work prints. Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 5.

98 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 42.

99 Ibid.

100 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC, 9.

101 Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 27.

102 Read and Meyer, *Restoration of Motion Picture Film*, 69.

103 Chace Audio, "Variable Area," Audio Post Production Knowledge Base, *TriggerTone*, (n.d.), http://www.triggertone.com/term/V%5Bslash%5DA.

104 For a detailed analysis of the effects cropping has on the image, see Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC: Textual Variations in the Key Prints of Carl Dreyer's Film," 309–10.

105 Margolis, *Joan of Arc in History, Literature, and Film: A Select, Annotated Bibliography*, vol. 1224, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities (New York: Garland, 1990), 396.

106 Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, 15; Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 139.

107 Dreyer quoted by Tybjerg, 2:21 into his "Audio Essay."

108 Quoted from translation in Breitbart, *"La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 28.

109 A production still reveals that it is Massieu holding the Bible. Only Massieu's hands are shown in the film. See Edvin Kau, *Dreyers filmkunst* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989), 154.

110 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 68.

111 Ibid., 81.

112 Paul Schrader, *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 123.

113 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 23.

114 Carl Theodor Dreyer, "Photography in Danish Film (1940)," in *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Translation of Carl Th. Dreyer's Writings About the Film (Om Filmen)*, ed. Donald Skoller (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973), 117–18.

115 The chief financier to S.G.F. was the German-based consortium Westi, an international production firm founded by the German industrialist Vladimir Wengeroff (1891–1946) and the Russian émigré Hugo Stinnes (1870–1924). Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 18.

116 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 23.

117 Ibid., 22; Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 134.

118 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 134; Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 22–23.

119 Dreyer, "Dreyer's Reply (in BT)—About Playacting: On the Occasion of the Jannings Film (1936)," in *Dreyer in Double Reflection*, 69–70.

120 Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, 59.

121 For a detailed analysis of the opening scene, see "Appendix A" of Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 232–39.

122 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, xi, 90.

123 Dreyer, "*The Passion of Joan of Arc* Intertitles," ed. Vincent Pinel, trans. Maurice Drouzy (Cinémathèque Française, 1985), 4, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32151.

124 "Reissues Pay Off in Paris Houses," *Variety*, March 12, 1952, 11, Variety Archives.

125 Quoted in James Card, "Visit with Carl Th. Dreyer," *Image* 2, no. 9 (December 1953): 61.

126 "The Associated Students of Occidental College Present LA PASSION DE JEANNE D'ARC and VIVRE SA VIE," January 13, 1967, para. 3, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32132.

127 Bordwell, *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, 20.

128 "Paris," *Variety*, July 5, 1978, sec. International, 28, Variety Archives.

129 Gaumont was also obliged to pay Gunni Dreyer $30,000 in damages and 40 percent of future receipts. See "Gaumont Will Withdraw Its Sound Version of Dreyer's 'Joan of Arc,'" *Variety*, June 28, 1989, sec. Film, 10, Variety Archives.

130 Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 41, 48.

131 Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 27.

132 Tammy Kinsey, "The Mysterious History and Restoration of Dreyer's *The Passion of Joan of Arc*," *The Moving Image* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 100.

133 Nicholas de Jongh, "Dreyer's La Passion Found in Cellar," *The Guardian (London) Weekly*, May 5, 1985, 20, LexisNexis Academic.

134 Kinsey, "Mysterious History and Restoration," 100.

135 Quoted in Ib Monty, "Life with Nitrate," in *This Film Is Dangerous: A Celebration of Nitrate Film*, ed. Roger Smither and Catherine A. Surowiec (Brussels, Belgium: International Federation of Film

Archives (FIAF), 2002), 9. Pedersen learned that the 35mm print of *Passion* was 200 meters (656 feet) longer than the copy the NFI had in its collection. Pedersen sent the film to Stantens Filmsentral-Laboratoriet in Oslo on February 21, 1984 for lab work. Kinsey, "Mysterious History and Restoration," 101.

136 Kinsey, "Mysterious History and Restoration," 101; Monty, "Life with Nitrate," 9.

137 Monty, "Life with Nitrate," 9.

138 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 42; Gary Crowdus, "Providing a Film Archive for the Home Viewer: An Interview with Peter Becker of The Criterion Collection," *Cineaste* 25, no. 1 (December 1999): 49.

139 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 42.

140 Ibid.

141 Ibid., 41. Engberg reports that the film was shown in Sweden but not until May 7, 1932, under the title: *A Woman's Martyrdom*. The Swedish censor trimmed 57 meters (187 feet) off the already abridged (2,167 meters or 7,109 feet) version of the film. The censor made cuts to the following: the display of torture instruments, close-ups of the blood-letting, close-ups of Joan's face at the stake, and some brutal scenes involving the soldiers. When the film finally passed, children under the age of fifteen were restricted from seeing it.

142 Kinsey, "Mysterious History and Restoration," 100–01.

143 Breitbart, "*La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 28.

144 Kinsey, "Mysterious History and Restoration," 101.

145 "International Sound Track: Rome," *Variety*, December 5, 1984, sec. International, 98, Variety Archives; "SRO Attendance at Odense Fest," *Variety*, August 14, 1985, sec. Pictures, 6, 22, Variety Archives.

146 "International Sound Track: Copenhagen," *Variety*, November 28, 1984, sec. International, 82, Variety Archives.

147 Toronto International Film Festival, "The Open Vault: *Le Passion de Jeanne D'Arc* [Program Notes]" (TIFF, September 1985), n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32143.

148 Mark Nash, "Joan Complete: A Dreyer Discovery," *Sight and Sound* 54, no. 3 (Summer 1985): 158.

149 Dave Kehr, "Northern Lights," *Film Comment* 21, no. 6 (December 1985): 74–75.

150 Ibid., 74; Thomas C. Christensen to Stephen Larson, "Questions about JEANNE D'ARC Prints," January 6, 2015.

151 Dreyer, "*The Passion of Joan of Arc* Intertitles," 1.

152 Ibid., 2.

153 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 306.

154 Bordwell displays four frame grabs of them in his book on Dreyer. *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 79.

155 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 323, en. 43.

156 Carl Theodor Dreyer, *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*), 35mm (British Film Institute, 1947).

157 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 323, en. 43. The censored NFA print is missing about 190 shots and over a dozen intertitles measured against both the MoMA print and the Oslo print. Ibid., 310.

158 "THE MANY INCARNATIONS OF *JOAN*," *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, The Criterion Collection, DVD.

159 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 235, 4en.

160 Ibid.

161 Dreyer wrote a glowing tribute to Neergaard in a short introduction to the latter's study of Danish film history. Dreyer recalled that the two of them spent long evenings in Paris discussing *Passion* and Falconetti's performance at the time Dreyer was filming *Vampyr*. See Dreyer, "Preface," in *The Story of Danish Film*, by Ebbe Neergaard, trans. Elsa Gress, Denmark in Print and Pictures (Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab (The Danish Institute) for Information about Denmark and Cultural Cooperation with other Nations, 1963), 3–5.

162 Drum and Drum, *My Only Great Passion*, 136.

163 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 235, 4en. I do not want to imply that Dreyer always slavishly followed a critic's wishes but other reviewers beside Neergaard made similar observations. For example, Evelyn Gerstein noted the succession of close-ups and that Joan was shown in full profile only three times. See Gerstein, "Joan of Arc," *The New Republic*, April 10, 1929, 228. Werner Klinger believed that Dreyer should have shown more group shots of the priests in order to accentuate and contrast their collective psychological differences to Joan's. See Klinger, "Analytical Treatise on the Dreyer Film, 'The Passion of Joan of Arc' with Appendix of a Constructive Critique," trans. Christel Gang, *Experimental Cinema* 1, no. 1 (February 1930): 10. Arthur L. Gale thought that the presence of medium or long shots would have given the film's production design a more distinctive fifteenth century appearance. See Gale, "Critical Focusing," *Movie Makers* 4, no. 4 (April 1929): 253.

164 Pipolo, "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*," 33; Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 306.

165 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC: Textual Variations in the Key Prints of Carl Dreyer's Film," 301.

166 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 314.

167 Kinsey, "Mysterious History and Restoration," 102.

168 Guido Guerrasio, ed., *La passione di Giovanna d'Arco, di Carl Theodor Dreyer*, 1st ed., vol. 2, Cineteca Domus (Milan: Editoriale Domus, 1945), xvi author's translation.

169 Guerrasio, *La passione di Giovanna d'Arco*.

170 Blu-ray.com "Webmaster," "Gaumont Secures Funding to Restore Classic Films," *Blu-Ray.com News*, March 23, 2012, http://www.blu-ray.com/news/?id=8423; Joshua Brunsting, "Gaumont Announces First 25 Blu-Ray Restorations As Studio Canal And Lionsgate Re-Up Distribution Deal," *CriterionCast*, May 24, 2012, http://criterioncast.com/news/gaumont-announces-first-25-blu-ray-restorations-as-studio-canal-and-lionsgate-re-up-distribution-deal. In addition, the pending announcement was leaked to me through private correspondence with Dr. Svet Atanasov, a Blu-ray.com reviewer.

171 Herman G. Weinberg, *Saint Cinema: Writings on Film, 1929–1970*, 2nd ed. (New York: Dover Publications, 1973), 228.

172 Quoted in Roger Manvell, "Revaluations—6," *Sight and Sound* 19, no. 8 (December 1950): 337. See also Manvell, *The Film and the Public*, Pelican Books A334 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex [UK]: Penguin Books, 1955), 54–55. French journalist Georges Sadoul (1904–1967) also claims that Dreyer preferred to work with a sound track. Sadoul, *French Film*, National Cinema Series (London: Falcon Press, 1953), 55.

173 Adcock and Stieber, "La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc *Souvenir Program*," 4.

174 Amy Gamerman, "The Man Who Gave 'Joan of Arc' Her Voice," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 23, 1996, Eastern Edition, sec. Leisure & Arts, A12; Traci Hukill, "An Arc Du Triomphe," *Metro Santa (CA) Cruz*, August 1, 1996, sec. MetroGuide, 12; Mark Longaker, "Music, Film as Passionate as Inspiration, Joan of Arc," *The Washington Times*, July 28, 1996, Final edition, sec. Arts, D1.

175 Engberg, "The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*," 40.

176 Ibid. The overture had also been played at performances of Schiller's play, *The Maid of Orleans: A Tragedy*, since 1867.

177 Ibid., 41; Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 322, en. 31.

178 Pouget and Alix's score was not the only music set to *Passion* that American audiences heard in the late twenties. For example, several preexisting compositions accompanied the film when the Washington Film Arts Guild presented it on a double-bill with *The Fall of the House of Usher* (Jean Epstein, 1928) at the Little Theater in September, 1929. The orchestra performed some pieces on Joan of Arc, including excerpts from Giuseppe Verdi's opera, *Giovanna d'Arco* (1845), as well as Paul Pierné's oratorio, "Jeanne d'Arc; Une Poème Symphonique" (1923–24). The orchestra also played music by Caesar Franck, Camille Saint-Saëns, Jules Massenet, Claude Debussy, and Maurice Ravel. "French Story First of Year on Little Bill," A2.

179 Gillian Anderson, *Music for Silent Films, 1894–1929: A Guide* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1988), 90.

180 Tag Gallagher, "Chains of Dreams: Carl Th. Dreyer," *Senses of Cinema* 45 (December 2007): n.p., http://www.sensesofcinema.com/2007/feature-articles/carl-dreyer/.

181 Pipolo, "The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC," 322, en. 31.

182 Lenny Borger, "New Score for Dreyer's 'Joan;' 4 Presentations Set for Classic," *Variety*, January 6, 1988, sec. Pictures, 7, Variety Archives.

183 Ernie Rideout, "Hearing Voices: Richard Einhorn Follows His Own," *Keyboard* 22, no. 3 (March 1996): 62.

184 Humphrey Davy Findley Kitto, "The Greek Chorus," *Educational Theatre Journal* 8, no. 1 (March 1956): 3.

185 Peter D. Arnott, "The Lost Dimension of Greek Tragedy," *Educational Theatre Journal* 11, no. 2 (May 1959): 101.

186 Kenneth Turan, "Silent Films and Their Soaring Music Are Rediscovered," *Los Angeles Times*, October 25, 2014, para. 3, http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/movies/la-et-mn-on-film-kenny-silent-films-joan-of-arc-20141026-column.html#page=1.

187 Derrick Henry, "Voices of Light," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, October 25, 1996, sec. Classical Preview, 5P, LexisNexis Academic.

188 Einhorn quoted in Gamerman, "The Man Who Gave 'Joan of Arc' Her Voice," A12.

189 Nicole Potter, "Conversation with Richard Einhorn," *Films in Review* 47, no. 3/4 (April 1996): 32–33.

190 Gamerman, "The Man Who Gave 'Joan of Arc' Her Voice," A12.

191 Hukill, "An Arc Du Triomphe," 13; Rideout, "Hearing Voices: Richard Einhorn Follows His Own," 62.

192 Rideout, "Hearing Voices: Richard Einhorn Follows His Own," 62.

193 Ibid.

194 Stuart Cohn, "Richard Einhorn," *BOMB*, no. 57 (Fall 1996): 40.

195 “A Conversation with Richard Einhorn,” *Richard Einhorn Composer*, January 10, 2011, para. 3, http://www.richardeinhorn.com/vol/volrichardInterview.html.

196 Richard Einhorn, “LINER NOTES FROM THE SONY CLASSICAL RELEASE OF COMPOSER RICHARD EINHORN’S VOICES OF LIGHT,” *Richard Einhorn Composer*, January 10, 2011, http://www.richardeinhorn.com/vol/VOLLinerNotes.HTML.

197 Amy Gamerman, “The Man Who Gave ‘Joan of Arc’ Her Voice,” *The Wall Street Journal*, January 23, 1996, Eastern ed., sec. Leisure & Arts, A12.

198 Richard Einhorn, *Voices of Light*, with Anonymous 4, the Netherlands Radio Choir, and the Netherlands Radio Philharmonic, conducted by Steven Mercurio, recorded at Music Station of the Netherlands Radio and Television, August 23–25, 1995, Sony Classical SK 62006, 1995, compact disc.

199 Richard Einhorn, “VOICES OF LIGHT: LIBRETTO,” *Richard Einhorn Composer*, June 17, 2008, 1, http://www.richardeinhorn.com/vol/vol.libretto.pdf.

200 Stuart Cohn, “Richard Einhorn,” *BOMB*, no. 57 (Fall 1996): 40.

201 Quoted in Claudia Bullerjahn and Markus Güldenring, “An Empirical Investigation of Effects of Film Music Using Qualitative Content Analysis,” *Psychomusicology: A Journal of Research in Music Cognition* 13, no. 1–2 (Spring-Fall 1994): 100.

202 Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, 90.

203 Kirlian Camera, “Kirlian Camera-Heldenplatz-Carl Theodor Dreyer’s The Passion Of Joan Of Arc (Part One),” YouTube video, 6:32, posted by Valerie Stephens, (April 29, 2015), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_IbiLdjepNA.

204 Remix of a famous silent movie [La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc], “Trial of Joan of Arc ~ Remix,” YouTube video, 9:40, posted by Philippe Lejeune, (June 27, 2012), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iVIZb82_rIo&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=12.

205 Joan of Arc (American rock band), "Joan of Arc Presents Carl Theodor Dreyer's 'The Passion of Joan of Arc,'" YouTube video, 1:22:10, posted by David Vaipan, (July 16, 2012), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CxJSGMK9yRE&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=1.

206 Ibid.

207 Ibid.

208 Ibid.

209 Attempt to colorize part of a silent cinema classic, "La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc Colorized in After Effects (alternate Versions)," YouTube video, :26, posted by "VASILISG841," (September 18, 2011), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qYltN_SDGks&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=10.

210 Ibid.

211 See Rob Byrd's guitar score, "The Passion of Joan of Arc- Rob Byrd," YouTube video, 3:38, posted by "dustypony," (May 11, 2008), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OMiY8wrFNrA&index=14&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy; Adrian Utley & Will Gregory's new score for the 1928 film, The Passion of Joan of Arc, "The Passion of Joan of Arc @ ATP's I'll Be You Mirror, Alexanda Palace," YouTube video, 1:30, posted by Nick Hider, (July 24, 2011), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_r8iS1hT0qk&index=15&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy; In The Nursery, "The Passion of Joan of Arc (Music by In The Nursery)," YouTube video, :23, posted by "satosato1," (May 16, 2008), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h_F0iKbn_8I.

212 Rosa Rio Hammond, "Dreyer's Joan of Arc with Rosa Rio Hammond Organ Score (60-Sec Clip)," YouTube video, 1:01, posted by "montrealfilmguy," (December 30, 2014), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tGXkVNWoh10&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=4.

213 "THE MANY INCARNATIONS OF *JOAN*," *The Passion of Joan of Arc*, The Criterion Collection, DVD.

214 Dreyer, *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*), 1947.

215 Ibid.

CHAPTER 5

Vampyr (1932)—Aura, *Sfumato*, and Decay

INTRODUCTION

In his famous essay, "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility [1935–36]", Walter Benjamin (1892–1940) articulates his concept of aura:

> A strange tissue of space and time: the unique appearance of a distance, however near it may be. To follow with the eye—while resting on a summer afternoon—a mountain range on the horizon or a branch that casts its shadow on the beholder is to breathe the aura of those mountains, of that branch.[1]

Whether Benjamin uses aura to discuss nature, a person, portrait photography, Baudelaire's poetry, or film, he usually means that each entity possesses unique qualities in a particular time and place. The "aura" that imbues an item is always context-dependent. It requires one's acute sense of sight, hearing, and/or smell to produce experiential meaning. Benjamin also warns that the recurrent technological reproduction of an *objet d'art* will extradite the latter from its sphere of tradition and in turn, desecrate its aura.[2]

Vampyr (produced 1930–31; released 1932) is a prime example of aura's dual paradox. Dreyer's work is an auratic *film d'art* because it adopts a unique style from the fine arts to its cinematic palette. While Dreyer lived in Paris during the late twenties and early thirties, he became interested in an amalgam of modern art movements such as abstract art, Cubism, Dadaism, and Surrealism.[3] However, the Renaissance tradition and Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) had a more subtle influence on Dreyer's aesthetic design of *Vampyr*.

Dreyer generates aura in *Vampyr* through *Stimmung* (atmosphere) and *sfumato* (hazy) images in particular.[4] *Sfumato*, generally translated as "dark smoke," refers to a style or technique in painting or drawing that Leonardo developed in his artworks. *Sfumato* applies thin layers of color that are superimposed and melded to produce effects of depth, perspective, and volume.[5] Dreyer and his cinematographer Rudolph Maté captured features of *sfumato* onto the panchromatic film stock, which they had first used on *The Passion of Joan of Arc*.[6] *Sfumato* became the "signature style" stamped on *Vampyr*'s black-and-white photography.

However, the filmmakers' infusion of *sfumato* began losing aura when mechanically reproduced copies of *Vampyr* were shown at different venues. As is the case with most of Dreyer's films, *Vampyr* has repeatedly been divorced from its original mode of production and re-mediated many times over in the analog and digital eras. *Vampyr* epitomizes Benjamin's adage that when an object is put on an assembly line or a conveyor belt, the copies that roll out drain the first object's aura and relegate it to a state of decay.[7] "The duplication [of *Vampyr*'s prints] that has been done in the past decades does not do justice to the extremely delicate *sfumato* images and to the *con sordino* [muffled] sounds captured on the variable-density track," writes Martin Koerber, who coordinated the 1998 restoration of *Vampyr*.[8] Peter Swaab, a Professor of English at University College London, echoes Koerber's remarks: "[T]he very problematic nature of prints of *Vampyr* has made it impossible to distinguish between its crafted mysteries and those resulting from damage or distortion."[9]

For Benjamin, "decay" carries denotative and connotative meanings. One's standard definition of decay could state that an object will reveal a process of disintegration over time. However, while Benjamin would likely agree with that generic description of the term, he delivers a more nuanced and multifaceted reading of decay. When an object has lost some of its aura or if its compositional makeup is no longer retainable, the figurative distance between that object and its viewer(s) is "inapproachable," as Benjamin puts it.[10] In the era in which he discusses mechanical reproduction, Benjamin envisages that the masses wanted to "get closer" to things so that they could replicate the object or make a direct facsimile of it.[11] In other words, make the object more visible by enhancing its details.

Vampyr was tailor-made for passages into denigration and artificial enhancement since most of the film's prints projected on celluloid and transferred onto video and DVD have demonstrated various degrees of decay. Benjamin's ideas thus have contemporary relevance when older films are reproduced on physical discs or digital copies are made. Thus, DVD and Blu-ray studios often carry the marketing slogan, "digitally remastered picture and sound from the original negative" on websites, product covers, and ad slicks. The Criterion Collection, for instance, is an exemplar for this branding phenomenon in its technical specifications for the *Vampyr* DVD: "The original German version in a new high-definition digital transfer…"[12] The digital tools that Criterion employ to remove film grain from *Vampyr* accentuate hypermediacy—a central tenet of re-mediation—by making the viewer consciously aware of the process that went into the film's re-presentation.[13] By "scrubbing" the film clean, Criterion purportedly attempts to bring the viewer closer to the "real" of

Vampyr but as Benjamin argues, technology diminishes the here and now of the *objet d'art*.[14] The authenticity and authority of the object is most affected because its physical structure has changed from the time it was first created.[15] Criterion's re-mediation of *Vampyr* usurps authenticity from the film's core, which could cause the viewer to have a less-than authentic experience.

Re-mediated artifacts of *Vampyr* place it in a genre of new media Jay David Bolter et al. (2006) call "mixed reality."[16] *Vampyr* is not really a film anymore because it has been converted into a constellation of technologies that merge computer-generated visual, aural, and textual information into a viewer's physical environment.[17] The steps that Koerber undertook to "restore" *Vampyr* illustrate the process in which Dreyer's work transformed from a film into an artifact of mixed reality. After concluding that all of the original image and sound negatives of *Vampyr* were lost, Koerber sought surviving elements in the best possible condition.[18] He also chose reels that were in relatively good shape so he could determine which shots appeared undamaged.[19] Koerber collected all of the reels and then reassembled and duplicated them into a new image negative.[20] He repeated the same steps for the audio track. He transferred and assembled a new sound mix from all extant sources "on the digital level."[21] Koerber restored the elements on a computer and recorded them back to film before making a digital intermediate. On a restoration log (a spreadsheet template for film restorers), Koerber cataloged the locations from which every shot of the restored version derives and charted the algorithms and filters employed for the sound work.[22] So the transmutations that *Vampyr* has undergone suggest that this onetime film has been

transported into the hypermediated world of digital machines and assumed the façade of mixed reality.

This chapter applies Benjamin's theories about aura and decay, as well as literature on *sfumato* and Leonardo's writings/paintings, to an analysis of the making of *Vampyr*, its critical reception, and the effects digital apparatuses have had on its aesthetic composition. Whereas the other chapters deal with aspects of positive re-mediation (e.g., ancillary photographs incorporated into the narrative of *Once Upon a Time*, music added to the sound track of *Passion*, et al.), this chapter addresses aspects of negative re-mediation (i.e., things that are taken away from the film). The focus here is on the various ways in which *Vampyr*'s images are wiped away and how this erasure affects the overall scope of the work.

The analysis of *Vampyr*'s home video editions will contribute to the inchoate literature on *sfumato* in the digital arts. Scholarly conversations about twenty-first century technological applications of *sfumato* have thus far examined digital artists' adoption of different conceptual *sfumatos* into physical experience and virtual reality. For example, Cami Nelson unpacks how the contemporary artists Marcos Novak and Char Davies experiment with Leonardo's obfuscation of traced lines or borders on figures or objects through "transarchitectures," architectures created in art installation spaces and across cyberspace that both transcend and join together the boundaries surrounding physical and virtual materials.[23] In addition, Philippe Walter has uncovered new vestiges in Leonardo's use of *sfumato* through the method of analytical chemistry.[24] X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy (XRF), a special x-ray instrument, analyzed seven of Leonardo's paintings on display in the Louvre

museum. Walter discovered that XRF could both qualitatively and quantitatively determine the nature and size of pigments in the shadows of each painting, which are not visible to the naked eye.[25] A critical analysis of *sfumato* as appropriated in the electronic media arts, however, is still absent. A considerable portion of this chapter seeks to fill that void.

This fifth and final chapter is organized as follows. The first section covers *Vampyr*'s inception from pre-production through the end of filming. It also tries to clarify the film's allusive narrative structure by offering a cogent summary of the story and plot. The second section begins with a brief historical analysis of *sfumato*. This will provide an epistemological foundation for studying films like *Vampyr* that adopt painting techniques from one medium to another. The next part traces the genesis of filmic *sfumato* (a special adaptation of the term) in *Vampyr* and how its discovery became auratic moments for Dreyer and Maté. The last part of this section attempts to elucidate misconceptions commentators on *Vampyr* have had about how the film was visually conceived and is supposed to look. A discussion of primary photographic evidence from *Vampyr*'s negative will follow to try to provide some hypothetical answers to the film's stylistic questions. The third section begins in part with a critical assessment of *Vampyr*'s reception at premieres and film societies as well as its treatment in film archives. This section also unravels the movie's complex version history and its circulation of mutilated copies. The fourth section unpacks the scattered treatment DVD production companies have given *Vampyr*. It considers how restoration software has led to electronic encumbrances of the original work's integrity.

PRODUCTION HISTORY AND SYNOPSIS OF *VAMPYR*

After *Passion* failed to turn in a profit at the box office, Société Générale des Films breached its multi-film contract with Dreyer. Free to work on his own, Dreyer formed his own production company (Film-Production Carl Dreyer) in Paris. Along with his writing friend, fellow Dane Christen Jul, Dreyer developed a screenplay very loosely inspired by a collection of five short stories in the anthology, *In a Glass Darkly* (1872), by Irish author Sheridan Le Fanu (1814–1873). Dreyer sought funding from the wealthy socialite, Baron Nicolas de Gunzburg (1904–1981), who agreed to finance the film on the one condition that he could play the lead role. Dreyer acquiesced and cast de Gunzburg for the part of Gray (David in the French version, Allan in the German).

Vampyr is the first international vampire film not ostensibly based on a variation of the *Dracula* story.[26] While Dreyer and Jul wrote *Vampyr*, over twenty vampire films were made (a lot of them Scandinavian) during 1931–32, a period that primarily featured a male vampire as the antagonist.[27] Rather than couch its premise with a male vampire lurking in a castle, *Vampyr* reverses course with a stout old woman in the title role who patiently awaits her prey mostly outside of the castle.

Principal photography on *Vampyr* began April 1, 1930 and concluded mid-October of that year in Senlis, Montargis, and surrounding areas in the north of France.[28] Dreyer and Maté shot *Vampyr* exclusively during the hours of dawn and dusk.[29] They chose a compressed window to film with limited natural light because it created more uncertainty about when the vampire would appear, which heightened the suspense. Dreyer and Maté

filmed each scene thrice without any sound so that the actors could later lip-synch their lines in French, English, and German.[30] Dreyer's decision to film and record *Vampyr* in three separate languages is a classic case of Benjamin's mechanical reproduction since there could be no definitive version or decisive point of origin. Post-synchronization work was conducted at UFA's Tobis-Film, one of the world's finest sound facilities at the time.[31] After the spoken shots for each language were recorded, they were spliced, one language at a time, into the main camera negative.[32] These were coalesced into a complete print with a sound track in their own language.[33] At that point, those takes were extracted from the negative so the same process could be repeated in the next language.[34] Dreyer wanted three different languages so he could target specific geographic regions and promote a wider distribution platform. (Both voice-recorded and silent versions were prepared for commercial release.[35])

Vampyr is widely regarded as one of the most narratively confusing films in cinema history. At its world premiere in Berlin, for example, "large sections of the audience understood so little of the symbolism in it that they laughed out loud, which ruined the effect of the film for the rest of the audience."[36] *Berlingske Tidende* (Berling's Times), Copenhagen's daily national newspaper in 1933, acknowledged that *Vampyr* is a very challenging film "because it places insurmountable demands on the viewer…And the film requires considerable advanced knowledge on the part of the audience…Without knowledge of these matters a film like this can seem parodic to the viewer."[37] *Vampyr*'s story and plot thus require a clear and concise synopsis. Dreyer uses a plot structure that narratologist Noël Carroll calls the discovery plot.[38] In a discovery plot, the story is arranged according to three

main movements: onset, discovery, and confrontation. A horror film essentially begins when the onset of the monster (or in the case of *Vampyr*, the title character) is implied, shown directly, or a mixture of the two. When it is at large, the monster is made available for one or more characters to discover and confront.[39]

Each movement has a specific function in *Vampyr*'s narrative thread. The film can be divided into three main parts.[40] Part one introduces the itinerant traveler, Gray, and his brief stay at the inn; the old chatelaine's (Maurice Schutz) unexpected visit to Gray's room; Gray's furtive exploration of the evil doctor's (Jan Hieronimko) lair; and the killing of the chatelaine in his castle. The first part signals the onset of the vampire, Marguerite Chopin (Henriette Gerard); the audience is gradually given different visual and aural cues of Chopin through retarding devices (e.g., the dancing shadows on the wall, the coffin, and the "children and dogs" dialogue heard off-screen).[41] Part two unveils Chopin's biting of the chatelaine's youngest daughter, Léone (Sybille Schmitz), near her Adam's apple (the victim's Mark of Eternal Damnation); Léone's carnal lust for her older sister, Gisèle (Rena Mandel); the return of the deceased coachman on horseback; the blood transfusion of Gray; and the attempt to poison Léone. Part three consists of Gray and the old servant's confrontation of the vampire. It shows in surrealistic fashion two dreams that Gray experiences; Gray preventing the poisoning; the impalement of Chopin's fresh corpse at the churchyard (and the eventual demise of her active physical self); the death of the peg-legged musketeer (George Boidin); Gray freeing Gisèle from the doctor; the death of the doctor in the flour mill; and the film closes with Gray and Gisèle safely making it to shore by boat on one of the banks of Lethe.[42]

Vampyr fits Benjamin's criteria for a film that finds expression through a dialectical structure.[43] By this phrase, Benjamin refers to filmmaking along a technological continuum whereby "discontinuous images replace one another in a continuous sequence."[44] Benjamin implies that although films can be shot out of order and also constructed in a non-linear mode, they are edited in the cutting room so that their montage or assemblage demarcates a distinctive type of "linearity." In other words, although the filmstrips are arranged in such a manner that the story events transpire non-chronologically, the editing builds a narrative out of them so they can be consumed and presumably understood (to some degree) by the audience. Benjamin's discontinuity element is especially applicable to the highly uncommon time-image-space relationship in *Vampyr*. Film theorist Noël Burch observes that Dreyer's unusual temporal fragmentation of a series of shots across several different scenes in the film leads to what he calls a dialectic of temporal uncertainty.[45] More specifically, *Vampyr* creates confusion through its devices of discontinuity. For example, Dreyer violates story space and the axis of action by circumventing eye-line matches between two characters, by employing a variation of the cutaway, and through the ellipsis.[46] These devices make it difficult to keep track of all the odd episodes occurring throughout the film. Yet, despite the impediments, *Vampyr* has linearity through its precise framings, elegant *mise-en-scène,* and cinematized *sfumato* that make the tone of the movie more easily apparent to viewers. However, as will be addressed later in this chapter, impressions of a movie's mood and atmosphere are entirely dependent on which version and copy that viewers get to see.

THE ORIGINS OF *SFUMATO*

Although this chapter uses *sfumato* mainly as a noun, it draws on characteristics of the adjective and verb forms, too. *Sfumato* originates from the Italian word for smoke, *fumo*.[47] From the late fourteenth century through the tail end of the eighteenth century, *sfumato* was only used as an adjectival past participle of the verb *sfumare*.[48] The latter means "to tone down" or "to evaporate like smoke."[49] Galileo applied *sfumare* to painting in order to describe the ways in which colors rub or mesh together to produce soft and round edges.[50] In 1681, *sfumare* entered the vernacular of Southern Europe when the Italian art historian Filippo Baldinucci (1624–1697) wrote the first definition of the verb in a *Dictionary of Artistic Terms*.[51] Toward the end of the eighteenth century, though, writers adapted *sfumato* mainly as a noun to characterize the style or technique of an *objet d'art.*[52] Painters like Leonardo, Gentile da Fabriano (ca. 1370–1427), Fra Filippo Lippi (ca. 1406–1469), Rembrandt (1606–1669), and Johannes Vermeer (1632–1675) incorporated *sfumato* in their various artworks.[53]

Leonardo shepherded the Renaissance-era scholarship for the way in which it uses aspects of *sfumato* to describe aesthetic effects. Specifically, Leonardo developed an acute perspective of visual perception based on mathematical principles and demonstrations. According to Leonardo, the acuity of human vision relies on the eye's ability to fix on something and adapt to peripheral factors such as atmosphere, illumination, distance, and size.[54] Leonardo organized these aspects of vision into a system of three perspectives with *spedizione* being the most prominent. *Spedizione* compares an unquantifiable relationship

between the finite properties of objects and the visual aspects that they present to the naked eye.[55] *Spedizione* also underscores how details and edges outwardly fade from view in remote distances.[56] In other words, individual features of a painting will appear less finished the farther away the eyes of the beholder are from the actual work.[57] *Spedizione* will later be demonstrated in a scene from *Vampyr*.

AURATIC MOMENTS IN DISCOVERING *SFUMATO*

Sfumato came to Dreyer and Maté courtesy of two seminal auratic moments that helped to shape *Vampyr*'s style. One case occurred prior to the start of filming when Dreyer and Maté decided on pure white as a recurring motif to the film's *sfumato* palette. Originally, Dreyer and Jul scripted a climax in which the village doctor was to drown in a bog. Dreyer scouted marshes and mud-baths but could not find one that satisfactorily met his aesthetic requirements.[58] One day, while traveling along a country road en route to Paris following a day of shooting, Dreyer and his crew spotted a factory whose walls, windows, and doors appeared covered in a white smudge.[59] The goings-on inside the factory of peculiar white shadows dancing around gave the impression that a white fire was emitting clear flames through the cracks and crevices. Everything was covered in white. Intrigued, Dreyer and company stepped inside to discover a grindstone where two workers were assembling a plasterwork of Paris. The filmmakers also noticed lumps of plaster ground into powder. These elements became the building blocks for the film's aura and inspired Dreyer to write a new ending. In Dreyer's revised version, the doctor becomes trapped in the steel cage of a granary where the grinding of flour suffocates him to death. In addition, Dreyer got the idea

that he could deploy black silhouettes against a white background.[60] White would become compatible with the translucent gray that Dreyer and Maté found just after filming commenced.

Another auratic moment also confronted the filmmakers by happenstance. In a 1966 interview, Dreyer recollects that Maté and he initially planned to design *Vampyr* with an unexplained "heavy style" but scrapped those plans when they watched the film's first rushes.[61] Maté stopped one of the dailies to show Dreyer a test shot that he took of the inn at Courtempierre.[62] The image looked somewhat out of focus with muddled hues of gray and white. When they noticed the fog, Dreyer and Maté realized that they found the proper aesthetic for the film.[63] Benjamin would describe the scenario of Dreyer and Maté sitting in the screening room and peering at the fog on a projected screen as a perceptive experience in which the two men discovered magical aura.[64] (Benjamin acquired the interrelated ideas of perceptibility of and attentiveness to an object from the German romantic poet Novalis.[65]) Benjamin theorizes that

> looking at someone [or something] carries the implicit expectation that our look will be returned by the object of our gaze…Experience of the aura thus rests on the transposition of a response common in human relationships to the relationship between the inanimate or natural object and man. The person [or object] we look at, or who feels he is being looked at, looks at us in turn. To experience the aura of an object we look at means to invest it with the ability to look back at us.[66]

This symbiotic, mediated exchange can also apply to the scene that took place in the screening room. The gaze that Dreyer and Maté directed at the fog anthropomorphized it and reflected its aura back at them like a mirror. It is almost like the fog spoke to them metaphorically, as if to say, "You found the right atmosphere and visual style for the film so you should stick with it."

To sustain this aura of simulated mist throughout, Maté affixed yellow and orange filters on the camera lens.[67] For each take, he also put a thick piece of black gauze about three feet in front of the camera in a flexible position so that it could also function for pan and tilt shots.[68] Maté also attached a couple of mirrors on each side of the camera in order to irradiate the gauze.[69] This reflected the light back to the camera.[70] *Vampyr*'s cinematography exhibits tinted and diffused light values.[71] For the interiors, Maté employed mostly incandescent lamps but also used arc lamps for the shadow effects.[72] Members of Dreyer's crew put an electric generating plant aboard two big lorries that were transported from set to set so Maté had ample quantities to light indoors.[73] Altogether, the filters and lighting effects produces a "gray mist" that resembles the smoke-like periphery that permeates Leonardo's paintings.[74] It is not surprising that Dreyer would again draw from Leonardo's work since the filmmaker had already used the painter's *The Last Supper* (ca. 1492/94–1498) as a visual model for the staging of Jesus and his disciples in the first section of *Leaves from Satan's Book*.[75] There is a striking parallel between how Leonardo applied *sfumato* in his paintings and how Dreyer and Maté adopted it as a cinematic technique in *Vampyr*. For instance, Dreyer and Maté's choice to film at dawn and dusk as well as their decision to use the foggy

weather that accompanies the opening shots are comparable to similar variant conditions that Leonardo embraced in his painting. Like Dreyer and Maté's experience of filming *Vampyr*, Leonardo came to prefer cloudy skies and dimly lit interiors.[76]

Over the years, the continual degradation of *Vampyr*'s prints has caused a great misunderstanding over the fidelity of the film's initial aesthetic design. *Vampyr*'s compositions are bereft of any sharp clarity and sometimes appear to disintegrate, leading some to believe that the print they are watching is simply a bad duplicate negative.[77] In a poetic and irreverent lecture on Dreyer's *oeuvre*, the avant-garde filmmaker Stan Brakhage highlights *Vampyr*'s B-grade production values and analogizes Maté's discovery of the fog as if he "directed every shot to look as crude as 'home movies' would." In other words, Brakhage means that the images enter into a state of decay in which they start showing erosion and assume a faded look.[78] Brakhage also addresses the binary worlds and settings that Maté created but later inverted. Initially, Maté used real objects and non-studio locations to create a façade of everyday reality. However, through devices such as the gauze filter and false light, he turns that world upside down in favor of a supernatural environment in which props and sets acquire otherworldly qualities.

Primary photographic evidence suggests that *sfumato* was the original look of *Vampyr*, and not the result of subsequent film degradation. *Close Up* (1927–1933), a quarterly film magazine devoted to the art of films, printed a half-dozen pictures in a March 1931 issue that "are direct enlargements from the negative of the film."[79] The Internet Archive's digitization of a high-resolution scan of the pages—in pristine condition with little

ghosting or fading—illumines the black-and-white beauty of Maté's images. For example, a medium long shot of a stealthy Gray inside the doctor's lair exhibits translucent whites and grays all around the middle of the frame.[80] A sliver of iridescence permeates the outside of Gray's black suit. The photo also preserves *sfumato*'s soft outlines and the blurred delineation between two or more things: e.g., the figure of Gray, the interconnected chain behind him, and the silvery shadows of cartwheels on the white wall.[81] It depicts an unsullied portrait of the intended effects produced by Maté's fine gauze filter and artificial light. A medium shot taken from the rear of the ferryman holding a scythe with his left hand—another original composition reproduced in the magazine—exhibits the same aesthetic qualities as the one featuring Gray.[82] Indeed, the frame enlargements affirm the *mise-en-scène* commentators of the film like Thomas G. Aylesworth have deemed characteristic of the supernatural: "[Maté's camera tricks] gave a weird glow to objects and [the ill-defined edges] made the actors appear indistinct, as though they were moving about in a constant twilight."[83]

A different shot filmed by Maté, which also appears in *Close Up*, illustrates the style of *chiaroscuro*.[84] Although the term *chiaroscuro* is not used interchangeably with *sfumato*, it does pertain to the latter's play of light and shadow.[85] The key distinction is that whereas *sfumato* renders forms in more sculptural/rounded shapes, *chiaroscuro* infuses subject matter with sharper precision and more prominent definition in the details.[86] The high-angle extreme long shot taken atop a platform showing Chopin's entrance into the derelict factory demonstrates aspects of both *chiaroscuro* and *sfumato*. Chopin steps through the wide

doorway in silhouette. *Chiaroscuro* lighting is detectable when examining the harsh contrast that forms between Chopin's all-black figure surrounded by the blend of soft whites and grays adorning the walls and ground. In the same picture, though, *sfumato* is also prevalent due to the dearth of any distinguishable facial features. This is an illustrated example of Leonardo's *spedizione*. The camera lens is so far away from Chopin that the only thing her face shares a likeness with is a black mask.

VAMPYR'S THEATRICAL RECEPTION AND VERSION HISTORY

Perhaps no other work in Dreyer's filmography has been more mutilated than *Vampyr*. It is imperative to distinguish between the myriad versions of *Vampyr* in order to make an educated guess about which ones are true and authentic to the first theatrical showings and which ones are counterfeit copies. David Bordwell, who began studying Dreyer's films in the early 1970s, notes that "wretchedly mutilated prints [of *Vampyr*] in circulation" through the years became a lingering problem plaguing the film's public exhibition and reception.[87] In a pale effort to present a "fully restored" version of *Vampyr*, for instance, some film archivists have taken extant nitrate and safety duplicate prints and tried to amalgamate footage from two or three versions. Consequently, the trial-and-error has resulted in a scattershot narrative where elements of the film appear mismatched with each other.[88]

Vampyr was produced and released in a market saturated with horror films such as *Dracula* (Tod Browning, 1931) and *Frankenstein* (James Whale, 1931). Dreyer's film premiered May 6, 1932 at Berlin's UFA-Theater Kurfürstendamm with a *métrage* of 2,271

meters (7,450 feet) long.[89] While critics lauded the film, audience reaction was mixed. De Gunzburg, who attended a public showing, says that patrons screamed and booed at the screen.[90] *Film-Kurier*, Germany's weekly film magazine, reported that Dreyer went back to the editing room to cut some scenes shortly after the first two screenings.[91] More than four months later, *Vampyr*'s Paris premiere at Studio Raspail met with similar derision although certain groups of people showed up repeatedly to the cinema out of fascination.[92] Conversely, the film enjoyed a much warmer reception in Dreyer's home country. *Vampyr* played for three weeks at Copenhagen's Metropol-Teatret where it sold 25,000 tickets over the first two weeks.[93]

In 1934, New York-based distributor Arthur Ziehm's General Foreign Sales Corporation acquired the US rights to *Vampyr*. Ziehm retitled Dreyer's film *Not Against Flesh*, which he screened for local critics in a sixty-three-minute cut as opposed to the director's cut shown in Berlin at a reported eighty-three minutes.[94] An anonymous critic for *The Film Daily* gave the English-dubbed version a highly favorable review, as opposed to some of the scathing European reviews:

> [T]he manuscript [scrolling intertitles] clearly explain[s] the plot…Here is a subject that will be received with acclaim by all the intelligentsia and the highbrows, as well as those appreciative of the artistic in motion pictures. It also should exercise a wide appeal to the masses, for it tells a highly dramatic story of a vampire casting its dire spell over a little French

> village...Photographic treatment is splendid. Director Dreyer's directorial handling lifts this into a class by itself.[95]

Film Daily's critique is particularly valuable since no complete prints of the English version are known to exist.

While some film journalists appreciated the unique photographic aspects of *Vampyr*, many others discounted their value. After he saw *Vampyr* in Berlin, *New York Times* film critic C. Hooper Trask stated bluntly: "in many ways it was one of the worst films I have ever attended."[96] Although Trask expresses sympathy for the minimal production equipment Dreyer had at his disposal, he belittles the film's resulting aesthetic: "[T]he photography was always underexposed, evidently with the idea of being ghostly. It succeeded only in looking muddy."[97]

More than three decades after its German, French, and US premieres, *Vampyr* was greeted with the same kind of bafflement in the UK as its European counterparts when the British Federation of Film Societies (BFFS) unveiled a 16mm print to patrons. Film critic Charles Fox, who was present at a screening, attested that a majority of the audience refused to embrace Dreyer's work.[98] According to Fox, a film like *Vampyr* presents English citizens with acute difficulties since British culture in the arts lacked a supernatural genre in which pure evil lurks (at least up to the mid-1950s).[99] Apparently, audience members had trouble accepting with any seriousness the blood-sucking scene in the forest as a turning point in the story.[100] Another problem that inhibited viewers' enjoyment at the BFFS's Viewing Session was the syntactic and semantic errors displayed on the title cards. The National Film Archive

print contained misspelled words, jumbled idioms, and banal phrases that caused unintentional guffaws.[101]

Fellow film critic John Cutts, who saw *Vampyr* thrice at public and private screenings, witnessed similar reactions by the audience, including walkouts during one showing.[102] The grammatical and technical errors interrupted the flow of Dreyer's *découpage* (montage of images) and disrupted his use of atmosphere and *sfumato*.[103] Unwelcome interferences to the film's narrative construction and photographic integrity ruin any suspension of disbelief the audience maintains.[104] Fox and Cutts advise film societies to run *Vampyr* through the projector twice in one evening for their members. This arrangement is worthwhile because it gets any levity a spectator may experience on the first viewing out of the way. A second viewing could permit the audience to disregard the unwanted intrusions and just focus on the film itself.[105]

During one of *Vampyr*'s theatrical showings in the US, an unspecified distributor retitled Dreyer's picture *Castle of Doom*, edited the film substantially, and added gaudy voice-over narration.[106] Bordwell recalls that out of three or so versions of the film he saw, the *Castle of Doom* rehash was "by far the worst."[107] A disapproving view about *Vampyr*'s prints was expressed elsewhere. For instance, at a May 1955 screening organized by the Group for Film Study (GFS) in New York, *Cinemages* editor Gideon Bachman forewarned potential patrons that because *Vampyr*'s distributor, Film Classics Exchange, prevented GFS from previewing a print of the film, the quality of the print may be bad.[108] Film journalist William K. Everson did preview the print in advance and gave viewers the caveat: "[this] is

not quite the film that was originally shot by Dreyer; probably it is a version that he would rather that you *didn't* see."[109] Everson points out that the distributor trimmed the film, affecting its mood and pacing: "No complete sequences are gone, but many episodes are drastically shortened, fragments lopped off the beginnings and ends of scenes, many apparently disconnected shots deleted entire."[110] Also omitted were many of the specially photographed shots Dreyer took of pages from the fictitious book, *Vampyre* (a.k.a. *The Book of the Vampires*), from which the characters Gray and the chatelaine's servant read from in order to learn the history of the female vampire and how to vanquish her. The book "allowed the audience ample time to read the full contents of the open pages - *if* they could understand the language."[111] By this last clause, Everson means that the language printed on the pages might have been in German, French, or Danish, depending upon the print.

In October 1964, the cluttered status of *Vampyr*'s print dilemma seemed to improve when New York film producer/distributor/collector Raymond Rohauer (1924–1987) acquired all rights to the film from the original producer, Baron Nicholas de Gunzburg.[112] Rohauer pledged to put a halt to the circulation of bootleg copies being shown at film societies.[113] He specified that the badly mutilated versions impaired the original intentions of Dreyer and de Gunzburg.[114] Rohauer undertook a widespread search for complete negatives of the film across Europe. He discovered various prints with different edits conserved in the Cinémathèque Française (Paris), British Film Institute (London) and Cineteca (Milan).[115] Rohauer assembled a relatively longer but still incomplete ten-reel version of *Vampyr* that included new English subtitles translated by Herman G. Weinberg.[116] The Rohauer/Weinberg

version first screened at European film museums before it went into commercial distribution at art theatres in Paris, London and, New York.[117]

This new compilation print marked an improvement over previous versions but it was not without its flaws. Bordwell, for instance, analyzed it and noted the absence of several crucial shots and scenes.[118] Moreover, for a 1982 Dreyer retrospective at UCLA's Melnitz Theater, a "poor print" was shown that made the images appear too static.[119] This copy of the film, however, was not likely Rohauer's. Ib Monty, then-curator of the Danish Film Museum (DFM), was involved in the retrospective and possibly loaned the UCLA Film Archives all archival DFM prints of Dreyer's films.[120] Rohauer's print remains available from the organization (likely the Cohen Film Collection: The Rohauer Library) that currently runs his estate.[121]

When *Vampyr* was shown across the country during the Museum of Modern Art's nationwide Dreyer retrospective in the spring and summer of 1989, there were encouraging signs pointing to the recovery of its image properties. For example, the Art Institute of Chicago makes special note of the "luminous gray tones" Maté captured in accenting the film's mysterious settings.[122] One archivist describes the atmospheric effects that the camera generates: "[P]eople glide through walls, shadows have no owners…characters, like sounds dissolve with no explanation into the wild play of light and shadow."[123]

In the late nineties, a joint collaboration to restore *Vampyr* was forged by the Franco-German television network ZDF/ARTE, the Berlin Kinemathek, and the Cineteca del Comune di Bologna. They drew from numerous extant prints in several European archives to

forge a composite print based on the German version.[124] Up until this point, prints of *Vampyr* held in New York by the George Eastman House and the film distribution company, Audio Film Center, were considered among the best and most complete.[125] However, those two prints did not match due to the transposition of some scenes and shots.[126] Another problem was that Audio Films and the Eastman House likely did not often loan out their prints of *Vampyr* to film archives and cinema revival houses. Thus, a majority of cinéphiles were only seeing mediocre or substandard copies of the film.

While the 1998 restoration of *Vampyr* coordinated by Koerber required a lot of technical work, it is seemingly quite similar to the May 1958 print of the film that the Experimental Cinema Group screened at the University of Colorado, Boulder campus. Both versions, though separated by thirty years, are virtually identical in length: around 466 shots, 1,941 meters (6,368 feet), and a runtime of 70 minutes when projected at 24 fps.[127] (Some copies run for 65 minutes and 11 seconds.[128]) Every reel is missing between 20 and 30 meters (or around 65 and 98 feet) of footage.[129] So altogether, about 330 meters (1,082 feet) are still missing compared to the length on the censorship cards.[130] One film festival programmer touted that the Koerber version showcased "a re-discovery of the soft shadows and ghostly light (achieved by reflecting a light off a gauze back into the lens) which give the film its unique visual quality, together with a proper experience of the creaky, but strongly atmospheric, post-synchronized sound which Dreyer added to the film."[131]

THREE DIFFERENT VERSIONS AND VISIONS OF *VAMPYR* ON DVD

To date, there are three DVD editions of *Vampyr* released by Image Entertainment, Eureka Entertainment, and the Criterion Collection that offer different versions and different visions of the way the film looks. Both Image and Criterion extinguish *Vampyr*'s *sfumato* and despoil its aura through distinct methods articulated below. While Eureka and Criterion both utilize the Koerber restoration as a basis for their image transfers, the results are widely disparate. Eureka's Masters of Cinema edition retains any aura that Dreyer's *sfumato* imagery still had left on the filmstrip. Although the Eureka reveals a higher frequency of scratches and damage marks than the Criterion, the former took a "less is more" approach than the latter did in adapting *Vampyr* to a digital optical disc. The Eureka stands out in bold contrast to the visual renderings Image Entertainment and Criterion give the film.

In 1991, Image Entertainment released *Vampyr* on LaserDisc and then reissued essentially the same video presentation on DVD seven years later. The back of the LD sleeve states that the transfer is "mastered from Carl Dreyer's personal print."[132] This version likely derives from a copy of the film that Dreyer worked on in the Nordisk Film laboratory in the early thirties. According to Casper Tybjerg, Dreyer added all-new cards with Danish intertitles.[133] Due to high printing costs, Dreyer could only afford to place an abstract image of a spider's web in the background of the title-card.[134] In the German version, the intertitles' backdrop contain various images of an hourglass, a Christian cross, et al. Image's analog-to-digital transfer of Dreyer's print represents an ironic reversal of the Danish *auteur*'s vision. The back of the DVD mislabels the film's original aspect ratio as 1.33:1. The video

presentation badly misaligns the film's correct ratio of 1.19:1. The film's original ratio is "pillarboxed" on 16x9 televisions so that the left and right sides of the image are not horizontally stretched but untampered with by adding black mattes on each side.

Film Preservation Associates' David Shepard, who produced *Vampyr* for LD and DVD, says that he regularly transfers a silent film with a 6 percent "windowbox" effect.[135] Windowboxing signifies that a film's original ratio undergoes both pillarboxing and letterboxing. The combination of the two means that the cinematic image is placed in the middle of the screen with black bars circumventing the four sides. Home video producers like Shepard often use windowboxing to prevent TVs from "overscanning" the picture. Overscan refers to 20 percent of the image that has been relegated to the outside of a TV's screen dimensions.[136] The image is not permanently "lost" but has been pushed aside during the DVD presentation in order to maintain geometric accuracy.[137] A viewer can avert the overscan effect by pressing the "zoom out" (i.e., underscan) button on the remote control which should bring back the film's original framing as encoded on the DVD.[138] The print that Shepard and Image had to work with would have been better suited with overscan enabled during the digital workflow. Instead, their rendition of *Vampyr* suffers from too much of the windowbox effect. The film's framings appear diminutive even on large computer monitors and big projection screens. The black borders appear to engulf the image by shrinking it to the dead center of the screen. The film looks so small that it would hardly be viewable on a video assist (VA), a little monitor that a director and cinematographer watch after each take. Image's resizing of the image relates to examples of re-mediation that

Benjamin broaches in his piece, “Little History of Photography [1931]”. Benjamin laments that magazine illustrators are taking original photographs and re-compositing them through the techniques of miniaturization and diminution.[139]

To reduce the image even further, Image custom-made forty-four English subtitles that are translated from the film’s German dialogue. The subtitles are superimposed over a thick black band that covers the bottom third of the screen. Image’s videodisc authors tried to recreate the Gothic Revival milieu in which the film purportedly takes place by transfiguring Blackletter into a white Gothic script. While this Old English calligraphy is rendered in a large font, the words are difficult to read. The subtitles are often hard to discern because of the curly letters and ornate typefaces. A technical reason that Image implemented this practice was to cover up the Danish subtitles burned onto the print. However, the video distributor’s positioning of the subtitles proved unconvincing even to viewers seeing the film for the first time. During one bit of dialogue, the Danish subtitles wobble up and down so that they are visible beneath the black band. Image also tried so hard to mask all of the Danish lettering that it ended up overextending the dialogue by adding multiple em dashes (or even a 3 em dash) to a line. A lack of strict quality-control on the disc producer’s part becomes apparent when one of the em dashes falls outside of the black border. The predominance of the Gothic letters belies the fact that Image’s subtitles are largely incomplete. Image displays twenty-nine fewer subtitled passages in comparison to the Cineteca/Kinemathek version supervised by Koerber, which contains seventy-three subtitles.[140]

The supplementation of huge Gothic characters on the screen image grossly inflates the role of speech in the film. *Vampyr* represented a transitional film for Dreyer in which the director could summon his repertoire of silent cinema techniques and add eerie off-screen sound effects. Moreover, I concur with film historian Tony Rayns that the film "relies very little on its dialogue to construct meaning [by keeping it to an absolute minimum] and to construct drama."[141] Although Dreyer sought successfully to record three different languages for overseas markets, the manner in which his actors delivered their lines was not especially important to him. At this point in his career, phonetic elements such as enunciation and pitch were not a high priority to Dreyer. Film archivists use phrases like the film is "almost without dialogue" or it contains only "limited dialogue."[142] One archivist even records that *Vampyr* comprises "virtually no dialogue."[143] Another archivist handwrote in cursive that *Vampyr* would be presented "in German [without] titles but [those are] not needed. We have synopsis of German text."[144] Overall, the Gothic subtitles crop the image and mar the film's stylish use of *sfumato*. Sometimes, the black bands take up the bottom and lower edges of the image. The cropping produces a thin widescreen picture that reverses the film's original square box image and removes pertinent details from the frame.

The Criterion Collection's 2008 presentation of *Vampyr* also extracts *sfumato* from the film's *mise-en-scène,* but differently from the Image discs. When Criterion's lab workers transferred the film's 35mm print into a digital intermediate (DI), they engaged in a process of electronically retouching the cinematic image, which is known as Digital Noise Reduction (DNR). DNR either diminishes or eradicates the appearance of film grain particles.[145]

Applying DNR can also rid the image of high-frequency information, resulting in a softer picture and leaving only a modicum of fine object detail.[146] DNR is the equivalent of art restorers' removal of dirt and darkened varnishes from Renaissance paintings. Indeed the contemporary practice of a DVD production company like Criterion eliminating grain from individual frames of *Vampyr* is analogous to art restorers taking away darkened varnishes and tinted coverings from Leonardo's *Virgin of the Rocks* at the National Gallery in London during the early 1960s.[147] So Dreyer's films and Leonardo's paintings have both fell victim to controversial practices that some believe have blemished their works.

Although Criterion and Eureka each employed Lee Kline as its telecine supervisor, they hired out either a different telecine colorist or a different technical authoring firm. Eureka appointed International Broadcast Facilities (IBF), an HD post-production house, to author, encode, and perform quality-control tasks on the Masters of Cinema DVD of *Vampyr*.[148] Criterion enlisted Jørgen Christensen from Copenhagen's Digital Film Lab to carry out the digital image grading of *Vampyr*'s black-and-white photography.[149] Christensen worked from a 35mm fine-grain master positive that he placed onto a Spirit 2K DataCine scanner for *Vampyr*'s HD digital transfer.[150] For the restoration phase, Christensen and his coworkers utilized the Digital Restoration System (DRS) developed by Mathematical Technologies Incorporated (MTI).

MTI's algorithm eliminated thousands of instances of dirt, debris, and scratches from the print of *Vampyr*.[151] While this sounds like DRS cleaned up many defects, it ended up smoothing over too much of the image. Christensen likely applied the "Reduce Grain" option

on the DRS suite.[152] This is another way of saying that Christensen used DNR. While Christensen did not colorize the movie, he clearly boosted the contrast levels of the interior scenes. This is a vital and substantial alteration to the film given that 85 percent of *Vampyr* takes place indoors.[153] (Dreyer used more than forty settings for the whole film.[154]) Criterion transforms the indoor scenes so that they resemble the more traditional lighting conditions of a classical Hollywood studio picture. More precisely, Criterion situates the light scheme in the middle of low-key and high-key lighting. In other words, it boasts a solid contrast of light and dark where the pitch levels are balanced. Criterion loses the subtle shades of gray and the faint edges that are noticeable on the Eureka disc. The character of Gray's suit shows a deep black that tends to obscure any traces of *sfumato* in the rest of the frame. The raised contrast levels strip away the film's unnerving mood and break up the tension between Gray and the evil doctor. The film loses the mysterious allure of awaiting Gisèle's fate that is omnipresent on the Eureka disc.

Peter Swaab, who reviewed both the Criterion and Eureka editions, seems partisan to the former since his article includes a dozen frame grabs from only that DVD.[155] Because the Eureka and Criterion both utilize the Koerber restoration as a basis for their image transfers, Swaab commits the logical fallacy that the two essentially display the same picture quality. "*Vampyr* remains a great and mysterious film, and now the mystery can be clearly seen as part of the film and not a question about the status of the print."[156] Swaab hence fails to recognize any differences, making him uncritical of the post-processing Criterion made to *Vampyr*'s image.

REFLECTIONS ON CHAPTER'S ANALYSIS OF *VAMPYR*

The preceding analysis of two different incarnations of *Vampyr*, as well as Eureka's faithful rendition of the film, reinforces Bolter and his co-authors' (2006) intriguing argument that Benjamin forecasted not the end of aura, but rather envisioned it in a persistent crisis.[157] Benjamin prophesized that perhaps new media technologies (e.g., Image's subtitling system, Criterion's DNR) would challenge the existence of aura but other technologies (e.g., the version Koerber made with aid of computer, IBF's careful handling of it for Eureka) would emerge to reaffirm the experience of aura. Dreyer's abstruse editing and his depiction of the supernatural in *Vampyr* add a different wrinkle to the "aura" of continuity editing and transparency in Old Hollywood. Bolter, et al. observe that Benjamin would attest to an audience's loss of aura when the mobile camera is placed in close proximity to the onscreen characters.[158] The sense of immediacy that the audience feels in relationship to the screen is too close and requires greater distance to absorb the aura, Benjamin would argue. *Vampyr* superficially appears as an anti-realist film but its *sfumato* style and disjointed editing are key ingredients that make up its own realism. *Vampyr* is the kind of work Benjamin would embrace because it keeps its aura in a distant world that the viewer can contemplate from afar.

Criterion and Image became business partners in 2005. If they decide to upgrade *Vampyr* to Blu-ray, they could implement a specific feature of AVC. This stands for Advanced Video Coding, a popular digital video codec utilized by Blu-ray disc authors.[159] Criterion and Image could adapt a post-process known as Film Grain Technology (FGT),

which supplies customized coding tools in the efficient treatment of film grain.[160] The now-defunct HD DVD-Video, which is still used by home theater owners, first adapted FGT but Blu-ray did not retain the feature after it won the format war.[161] AVC's specifications contain a uniform mechanism for transmitting film grain particles in the form of a supplemental enhancement information (SEI) message. This enables encoders to detect the film grain, filter it out, and then restore its original attributes. In the post-processing phase, HD-DVD decodes all the data and sends the information to the picture. FGT is a useful feature because it produces a high-quality picture that simulates the director's intended look of the film. Criterion and Image could integrate FGT or a feature that produces the equivalent effect on its DRS to allow the film's *sfumato* and thick textures to rematerialize. Before they transfer *Vampyr* to Blu-ray, Criterion and Image could go back to the master of the Koerber version they were initially given. If the 35mm print contains the same DNR that was applied to the DVD, then it does not have "reversibility." Reversibility means that any changes made can be undone. The *sfumato* and aura of the film could be greatly accented in HD as opposed to standard definition video since a Blu-ray picture generates five to six times more pixels than a DVD picture.[162]

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

Vampyr represents essentially the last film made by Dreyer to undergo substantial re-mediation. This brings us to the concluding section, which will first recap each chapter. Chapter One supplied the theoretical and methodological bases on re-mediation, authorship, and film restoration technologies. The purpose of including a discussion of the colorization

controversy from the eighties was to create a corollary for forms of new media that retrofit and refashion older ones.

Chapter Two was vastest in scope and merits additional space to unpack its findings. The chapter employed a structural model of authorship that synthesized ideas about the author or the *auteur* from the first chapter. It covered Dreyer's duties and responsibilities at Nordisk where he began to learn his craft. It averred that although *The President* shows budding signs of an *auteur*, the film represents an apprentice work for the young Dreyer. The second part of the chapter analyzed the production history of *Leaves from Satan's Book* through letters exchanged between Dreyer and his superiors at Nordisk that were either original or new translations for this dissertation. The purpose was to show how *Leaves* violates the studio's edict by breaking several production rules and narrative conventions. It asserted that *Leaves* marks the birth of Dreyer as an *auteur* and is the first film where he really found himself. It also addressed one of the problems that *Leaves* has suffered over time: i.e., the near unanimity in which every film critic, scholar, and historian have compared it unfavorably to D. W. Griffith's epic *Intolerance* (1916). It concluded that the critical community and Griffith's film usurped Dreyer's authorship from the film. This section documented how and why *Leaves* has been labeled a slavish imitation of *Intolerance*. It explained why the films are dissimilar in many areas. The purpose here was to establish a discursive mode for why scholars need to rethink, more broadly, the ways that film history could be rewritten. The last part of the chapter surveyed *Love One Another*, which in several respects coalesces the technical advancements Dreyer made in the other two pictures. It

compared the rediscovery of this rarely seen film with Foucault's "grocery lists" of Nietzsche's unpublished works in that both filmmaker and philosopher carve out previously unrealized modes of authorship.

Chapter Three explored aspects of reconstruction and genre in four films. Each work's restorations exemplifies Wallmüller's classification of a *reconstruction* whereby narrative elements are reassembled through an "editorial restoration" that seeks to rebuild a particular version of the work.[163] One section sought to rectify *Michael*'s (1924) place by fitting it in with the pantheon of German classics in the *Kammerspiel*-film genre. The goal of this chapter was to highlight the discursified status of Dreyer's genre films.

Chapter Four examined the history of versions *The Passion of Joan of Arc* has produced in the pre-electronic and digital eras. It concentrated on the changing roles authors took on when they had control of prints of the film. It argued that composer Einhorn deserves to share the same stage with Dreyer as a co-author through his opera/oratorio, *Voices of Light*. *Vampyr* was covered in depth and summarized earlier in the chapter. Overall, the contribution of this dissertation to the scholarship on digital media studies has been to construct a new perceptual lens for examining issues of authorship and re-mediation. Scholars can use this study of Dreyer heuristically as an illustrative template for examining other silent cinema *auteurs* and their digitized works.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF TEACHING DREYER'S FILMS

Dreyer's films can be employed as valuable pedagogical tools because they offer fertile and varied options for use in the classroom. In the area of re-mediation, for instance,

there are different ways that each film can be taught. A lecture on Joseph Conrad's and Ford Madox Ford's device of *progression d'effet* could precede a screening and discussion of *Leaves from Satan's Book*. The class could read journal articles and book chapters on this device's use as a narrative strategy in literary works and other arts. One thing that *Leaves* and *Intolerance* have in common is that their rhythmic editing and montage are dependent on *progression d'effet*. *Intolerance* and *Leaves* could be paired as a "double bill." The lecture could articulate that videodisc authors engage in a practice known as lexiconning, which affects the total running time of a film as much as six to seven percent.[164] The properly projected print of *Leaves* included on the DFI DVD could be shown first. Prior to discussing the film, excerpts from the Grapevine Video and Image Entertainment DVDs could be played so students could pick out aesthetic and pacing differences. The goal of this exercise could be for them to explain how the rhythm of the film and Dreyer's visual compositions are affected, judging from the film's transfer and encoding on the three discs.

A before-and-after comparison of different versions could also be the pattern for teaching *Vampyr*. The class could peruse literature on Leonardo's *sfumato* and Benjamin's aura that are suitable for an undergraduate reading level. The Masters of Cinema DVD of *Vampyr* could be screened, followed by selected excerpts from the Image and Criterion discs that best demonstrate instances of re-mediation. The goal would be that students could detect scenes that show the film's transparency versus other scenes that reveal it to be in a state of hypermediacy.

Because so many versions of *The Passion of Joan of Arc* exist, a comparative analysis of various clips from them could be presented to students for them to parse out. However, a more effective way could be to first screen the entire film without any sound using the Danish version on the Eureka Blu-ray. Then, show the Oslo print on the Criterion DVD with the Einhorn score playing on the sound track. After the second screening, students could be asked to voice their opinion if and why they prefer to watch *Passion* sans sound or with music. They could be given discussion questions about how music either contributes or detracts from the story. Additionally, they could be queried about how music is used to establish setting, the mood of scenes, and as a Wagnerian leitmotif for identifying a protagonist or antagonist as well as a group of characters (e.g., the prelates, British army, etc.).

Teaching other Dreyer films from the silent era could go in another direction. *Michael*, *The Parson's Widow*, *Once Upon a Time*, and *The Bride of Glomdal* could be grouped together in a genre unit devoted to the *Kammerspiel*-film and the *lyrical film*. Students could read appropriate chapters from a standard textbook (e.g., Barry Keith Grant's multivolume *Film Genre Reader*) before watching the movies. Clips of German Expressionist and Scandanavian films from the 1920s could be played so students are aware of the influences that shaped Dreyer's cinematic worldview. Students could also conduct a genre analysis, paying particular attention to the codes and conventions of each work.

Literature on title cards, intertitles, and subtitles could be assigned to students to give them an idea about exhibition practices during the silent and early sound era. This reading

material could also be useful for a class to give background on how title designing has re-mediated all of Dreyer's films on consumer media formats. Students could be asked to identify the kind of title on the screen and explain its function within the filmic narrative. For two or more versions of the same film, students could examine a graphical comparison between a set of titles in an identical place within the story and try to decide which one(s) show evidence of re-mediation.

LIMITATIONS

One limitation was that I was unable to secure any funding to travel to Copenhagen and visit the Danish Film Institute, home of the Carl Theodor Dreyer Archive and the Dreyer Study Center. These house the filmmaker's original scripts, work papers, photos, research material, newspaper clippings, a book collection, and more than 4,000 letters.[165] (The materials are in Danish, English, French, and German.) I also would have conducted face-to-face interviews with the DFI's curator, archivists, and lab technicians who facilitate the restoration of Dreyer's films. Furthermore, I have several additional primary and secondary sources on the early history of Nordisk Film and various genres that the studio specialized in which await translation. These materials could bolster and enhance my discussion of the film company in Chapter Two. In particular, some could help expand my analysis of Nordisk melodrama to include other genres while others could provide more insights into production rules. Additionally, *L'Avant Scène Cinéma*, a French film magazine, published two special issues on *Passion* containing writings that appeared when the film originally premiered in

Copenhagen and Paris. Translations of this rare material could shed more light on initial critical reception and audience reactions.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Chapter One suggested that amendments could be made to the Film Integrity Act of 1987, which covers copyright protection for artists. A revised version of FIA could improve on the original by requiring that video distributors request licensing the rights to an original film from a living producer, director, cinematographer, editor, or major actor. The process could go beyond extending a mere formality or blessing from the filmmaker to use his/her film as a derivative work. There could be nomenclature written into a contract agreement between the two parties stipulating the official enlistment and participation of the filmmaker, who could have a say about the elements that go into the final product. In addition, the original colorist or individual responsible for grading the picture could be brought in to supervise a new transfer. If all important cast and crew members are deceased, living relatives could be notified about any new version and asked to give their consent.

Additionally, movie studios and production companies need to be more transparent with the public about specific film elements and technical tools that go into a restoration. Speaking at an international conference on film and new media in 2002, Koerber lamented that "cinéphile DVDs" generally contained a dearth of documentation about sources consulted for the transfer of the film or any annotations on the editing strategies employed.[166] The situation has improved moderately in the intervening thirteen years with more specialized distribution firms providing sources of specific prints on their DVD and Blu-ray

releases of silent movies, foreign films, indies, and cult films. However, very few of the Hollywood "majors" (i.e., Sony Pictures, Metro-Goldwyn Mayer, Paramount Pictures, 20th Century Fox, Universal Studios, and Warner Bros) provides any concrete information on restoration in press releases, ad slicks, or on their disc covers. If a studio restores an older film but is unable to bring in any of the original creators for input, it could adopt a practice that Criterion instituted in their preparation of the Criterion DVD of *Passion*. Isa Clubb, Criterion's producer, polled several Dreyer scholars about which frame rate they believed that the film should be projected.[167] Numbers varied but most thought that it should be run at either 22 fps or 24 fps.[168] Criterion eventually settled on the latter. Studios could invest some funds in hiring a published scholar of the film's producer, director, or actor. That individual could supply historical knowledge and technical expertise, which could be applied to the film's restoration. Other scholars that could be employed include genre experts and those who specialize in a particular national cinema or film movement.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Social media discussions about technical considerations that go into new editions of Dreyer's films are abundant. A researcher could study Dreyer-related messages on CriterionForum.org and compile a data set about specific wishes and preferences that cinéastes have about items (e.g., alternate versions, recorded scores, bonus materials, et al.) that they want to go into a Blu-ray or DVD special edition of the film. A new forum thread is usually created immediately after an announcement about a forthcoming release goes viral. A researcher could then examine the final technical specifications and extra features included

on the disc (which often are not finalized in the press release) and weigh those against cinéastes' pre-release wishes to see if there is any correlation between word of mouth and a studio's production decisions. One central question to pose: Is there anyone working for or affiliated with the studio that reads these forums and gauges consumer interest?

A future study could also assess recent trends in cinematic re-mediation. For example, one re-mediated practice consists of the post-conversion of relatively older films such as *Top Gun* (Tony Scott, 1986), *The Last Emperor* (Bernardo Bertolucci, 1987), *Predator* (John McTiernan, 1987), and *Titanic* (James Cameron, 1997) into new 3D Blu-ray presentations. None of these titles was initially conceived in 3D so a study could examine the aesthetic differences between how each was composed in two-dimensional images compared with the re-compositing effects wrought on the original shots. A close shot-by-shot comparison of selected scenes could illumine specific visual patterns with how the choreography of the action is done in 2D versus 3D.

Notes to CHAPTER 5

1 The quote derives from a revised and expanded version (by seven manuscript pages) of the first eponymous essay. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version," in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Harry Zohn, vol. 3, 1935–38 (Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 104–05. Originally published as "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit" in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1989).

2 Ibid., 104.

3 Cited in Jean Drum and Dale D. Drum, *My Only Great Passion: The Life and Films of Carl Th. Dreyer*, Scarecrow Filmmakers Series 68 (Lanham, MD, and London: Scarecrow Press, 2000), 151.

4 Ebbe Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, trans. Marianne Helweg, British Film Institute New Index Series 1 (London: British Film Institute, 1950), 27; Martin Koerber, "Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer's VAMPYR (1932)," October 28, 2001, 1, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId =31428.

5 Diogo Queiros-Conde, "The Turbulent Structure of *Sfumato* within *Mona Lisa*," *Leonardo* 37, no. 3 (June 2004): p. 228 n. 2.

6 Roger Manvell, "Revaluations—6," *Sight and Sound* 19, no. 8 (December 1950): 339.

7 Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version," 105.

8 Martin Koerber, "Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer's *Vampyr*," in Vampyr *Booklet* (Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008), 24.

9 Peter Swaab, "'Un Film Vampirisé': Dreyer's *Vampyr*," *Film Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (Summer 2009): 56, doi:10.1525/fq.2009.62.4.56.

10 Walter Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire," in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1955), 190.

11 Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version," 105.

12 “Vampyr (1932),” *The Criterion Collection*, https://www.criterion.com/films/661-vampyr.

13 Jay David Bolter et al., “New Media and the Permanent Crisis of Aura,” *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 12, no. 1 (February 2006): 32, 33, doi:10.1177/1354856506061550.

14 Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version,” 103.

15 Ibid.

16 Bolter et al., “New Media and the Permanent Crisis of Aura,” 21 (Abstract).

17 Ibid.

18 Koerber, “Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” 24, 29.

19 Ibid., 29.

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Cami Nelson, “From *Sfumato* to Transarchitectures and Osmose: Leonardo da Vinci’s Virtual Reality,” *Leonardo* 42, no. 3 (June 2009): 259–64.

24 Philippe Walter, “Chemical Analysis and Painted Colours: The Mystery of Leonardo’s *Sfumato*,” *European Review* 21, no. 2 (May 2013): 175–89, doi:10.1017/S1062798712000348.

25 Ibid., 181–85.

26 Nina Auerbach, “My Vampire, My Friend: The Intimacy Dracula Destroyed,” in *Blood Read: The Vampire as Metaphor in Contemporary Culture*, ed. Joan Gordon and Veronica Hollinger (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), 12.

27 David Rudkin, *Vampyr*, BFI Film Classics (London: British Film Institute, 2005), 21.

28 “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” *Close Up* 8, no. 1 (March 1931): 50.

29 Will H. Rockett, “Landscape and Manscape: Reflection & Distortion in Horror Films,” *Post Script* 3, no. 1 (Fall 1983): 22.

30 “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” 50.

31 Lisbeth Richter Larsen, “Vampyr - Shoot,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010, para. 2, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Vampyr/Shoot.aspx; Herman G. Weinberg and Gretchen Weinberg, “Vampyr - An Interview with Baron de Gunzburg,” *Film Culture*, no. 32 (Spring 1964): 57.

32 Rudkin, *Vampyr*, 27.

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid.

35 “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” 50.

36 Victor Skaarup quoted from an undated, uncredited Danish newspaper clipping. Cited in Lisbeth Richter Larsen, “Vampyr - Reception,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, October 3, 2010, para. 1, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Vampyr/Reception.aspx.

37 Quoted in ibid., para. 3.

38 Noël Carroll, “Notes on Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” *Persistence of Vision*, no. 8 (1990): 11.

39 Ibid., 8.

40 As suggested by David Bordwell in *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981), 110.

41 Cited in ibid., 93. The retardation delays showing the whole appearance of the vampire.

42 Peter Cowie, *Eighty Years of Cinema*, Rev. and Enl. (South Brunswick, NJ, and New York: Barnes, 1977), 88.

43 Walter Benjamin, “The Formula in Which the Dialectical Structure of Film Finds Expression [1935],” in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*, ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings, trans. Edmund Jephcott, vol. 3, 1935–38 (Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 94.

44 Ibid.

45 Noël Burch, "Carl Theodore Dreyer: The Major Phase," in *In and Out of Synch: The Awakening of a Cine-Dreamer*, by Noël Burch, trans. Tom Milne and Ben Brewster (Aldershot, UK: Scolar Press, 1991), 78.

46 Ibid., 76–79.

47 Janis Bell, "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective," in *Leonardo da Vinci and the Ethics of Style*, ed. Claire J. Farago (Manchester, UK, and New York: Manchester University Press, 2008), 161.

48 Alexander Nagel, "Leonardo and *Sfumato*," *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 24 (Autumn 1993): 7–8.

49 Kathleen Kuiper, ed., *Painters of the Renaissance*, The Renaissance (New York: Britannica Educational Publishing and Rosen Educational Services, 2013), 18.

50 Cited in Alexander Nagel, "Leonardo and *Sfumato*," *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 24 (Autumn 1993): 7, n. 2.

51 The official definition of *sfumare* read: "To unify colors. This is what painters do, after having put the color in its place on the canvas or panel, in order to remove all crudeness of the brushstrokes, sweetly blending the highlight with the middle tone or the middle tone with the dark, so that the transition from one to the other is made in such gradations that even from close by the painting appears soft and delicate without brushstrokes. The same thing that happens in painting also occurs in drawing when the draftsman rubs the pencil strokes with paper, tinder, or suchlike to blend them so well among themselves and with the white of the paper that the edge of the mark looks precisely like smoke that dissolves in air." Quoted in Bell, "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective," 181.

52 Nagel, "Leonardo and *Sfumato*," 7, n. 5.

53 Edward J. Olszewski, "How Leonardo Invented *Sfumato*," *Source: Notes in the History of Art* 31, no. 1 (Fall 2011): 5. See also Daniel Arasse, *Vermeer, Faith in Painting*, trans. Terry Grabar (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 73–74.

54 Bell, "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective," 162–63.

55 Nagel, "Leonardo and *Sfumato*," 7.

56 Bell, "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective," 163.

57 Ibid., 164.

58 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 29–30.

59 John Cutts, "Great Films of the Century — No. 7: Vampyr," *Films and Filming*, no. 3 (December 1960): 19.

60 Jørgen Roos, *Carl Th. Dreyer*, DVD (Region 2 PAL), Spine # 25, The Masters of Cinema (Copenhagen: Statens filmcentral and Danske filminstitut, 2008).

61 Dreyer interviewed in Jørgen Roos, *Carl Th. Dreyer*, DVD (Region 2 PAL), Spine # 25, The Masters of Cinema Series (Copenhagen: Statens filmcentral and Danske filminstitut, 1966).

62 John Cutts, "Great Films of the Century — No. 7: *Vampyr*," *Films and Filming*, no. 3 (December 1960): 19.

63 There is evidence that Dreyer considered a visual style consisting of haze or mist. In both the original uncensored shooting script and completed screenplay, the opening scene's exposition reads: "The landscape is bathed in a gray, dim twilight; every object has a tinge of unreality." Carl Theodor Dreyer and Christen Jul, "*Vampyr*: The Screenplay," in *Writing* Vampyr, trans. Oliver Stallybrass and Nicholas Elliott, 1st DVD Ed. (Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008), 3; "*Vampyr* (*Vampire*)," in *Four Screenplays*, ed. Ole Storm, trans. Oliver Stallybrass (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970), 79. The original Danish program booklet on *Vampyr* captures the scene's milieu along similar lines: "An ominous atmosphere pervades the old inn, and in the moonlit night, light and shadow, voices and faces appear to take on a hidden significance." Gloria Film, "*Vampyr* Danish Film Programme [March 27, 1933]," in *Vampyr* ("*The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray*"), trans. Trond S. Trondsen, The Masters of Cinema Series (London: Eureka Video, 2008), 7.

64 Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire," 190.

65 Ibid.

66 Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire."

67 Herbert G. Luft, "Rudolph Maté Photographed Dreyer's 'Passion of Joan of Arc' and Became a Director on His Own," *Films in Review*, no. 8 (1964): 483.

68 Ibid., 482.

69 Ibid.

70 In a 1964 interview, Baron Nicolas de Gunzburg repudiates Dreyer's efforts to create a faux reproduction of mist and fog: "All the effects were completely natural…Dreyer didn't use any gauze or other things in front of the camera lens at all." Weinberg and Weinberg, "Vampyr - An Interview with Baron de Gunzburg," 58. However, although he was on location for nearly the entire shoot, de Gunzburg was not intimately familiar with Dreyer and Maté's collaborative experiments. De Gunzburg concedes that he lacked technical knowledge of Maté's camera effects. Ibid. Some of de Gunzberg's sketchy recollections thus should not be trusted. In multiple interviews, Dreyer and Maté bring greater veracity and consistency to their detailed accounts of *Vampyr*'s shoot. See also Dreyer's similar recollections of discovering the aesthetic in Michel Delahaye, "Between Heaven And Hell: Interview with Carl Dreyer," trans. Rose Kaplin, *Cahiers Du Cinéma in English*, no. 4 (1966): 16.

71 David Bordwell, "VAMPYR," ed. Myron Meisel, *Focus! Chicago's Film Journal*, no. 7 (Spring 1972): 2; Curtis Harrington, "Ghoulies and Ghosties," *Monthly Film Bulletin* 21, no. 4 (June 1952): 160; Later reprinted, also as "Ghoulies and Ghosties," *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1952): 191–202, doi:10.2307/1209799.

72 Cutts, "Great Films of the Century — No. 7: Vampyr," 19; Luft, "Rudolph Maté Photographed Dreyer's 'Passion of Joan of Arc' and Became a Director on His Own," 482.

73 "The Strange Adventure of David Gray," 50.

74 Neergaard, *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director's Work*, 30.

75 Casper Tybjerg, "Distinguished Compositions : The Use of Paintings as Visual Models in Danish Silent Films," *Engeki Eizo*, 2010 Annual Report, 1, no. 1 (March 2012): 88–89.

76 Bell, "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective," 176.

77 *See* Michael Koller, "Vampyr: The Strange Adventure of David Gray," *Metro*, no. 119 (1999): 100.

78 Stan Brakhage, *The Brakhage Lectures: Georges Méliès, David Wark Griffith, Carl Theodore Dreyer, Sergei Eisenstein*, ed. Ian Robertson (Chicago, IL: The GoodLion, 1972), 71.

79 “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” 50.

80 Ibid., 47.

81 Helmut Ruhemann, “Leonardo’s Use of *Sfumato*,” *British Journal of Aesthetics* 1, no. 4 (September 1961): 234; “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” 47.

82 “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” 49.

83 Thomas G. Aylesworth, *Monsters from the Movies*, The Weird and Horrible Library (Philadelphia, PA, and New York: Lippincott, 1972), 103. Cf. other discussions of the supernatural in the film: Cowie, *Eighty Years of Cinema*, 88; Bryan Senn, “The Enigma of ‘Vampyr,’” *Midnight Marquee*, no. 49 (Summer 1995): 7–8.

84 “The Strange Adventure of David Gray,” 51.

85 Kuiper, *Painters of the Renaissance*, 18.

86 Constance A. Pedoto, *Painting Literature: Dostoevsky, Kafka, Pirandello, and García Márquez in Living Color* (Lanham, MD, and London: University Press of America, 1993), 10.

87 Bordwell, “VAMPYR,” 2.

88 Koerber, “Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” 24.

89 Jane Ehrlich, “Vampyr, Ou L’Etrange Aventure de David Gray,” ed. Tom Pendergast and Sara Pendergast, *International Dictionary of Films and Filmmakers*, 4th Ed. Films Series Vol. 1 (Detroit, MI: St. James Press, 2000), 1270. According to the censorship card B31508, the original print underwent two cuts: 15 meters (49 feet) were trimmed of Gray and the old valet driving the stake into Chopin’s body; the abridgment of 39 meters (about 128 feet) reduced the suffering of the doctor’s death. Koerber, “Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” 27. The Berlin censor insisted upon taking out close-ups of the doctor at his moment of terror. Listen to Tony Rayns, 1:08:10 into his “Full-Length Audio Commentary,” *Vampyr (“The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray”)*, DVD (Region 2 PAL), Spine # 25, The Masters of Cinema (London: Eureka Video, 2008).

90 Weinberg and Weinberg, “Vampyr - An Interview with Baron de Gunzburg,” 59.

91 Cited in Martin Koerber, “Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” in Vampyr *Booklet* (Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008), 28. One deleted sequence (only a few stills survive) shows Chopin unleash a pack of dogs to chase a shepherd boy scurrying to a small derelict house. Dreyer probably eliminated this because it bore too close of a resemblance to a similar scene in Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897) where a pack of wolves surrounds and almost kills Jonathan Harker outside of Count Dracula’s castle. Another possibility is that Dreyer feared he might face a copyright battle with Stoker’s widow, Florence, over the scene’s origins. Florence Stoker contributed to the bankruptcy of the German film company Prana-Film GmbH after she sued over *Nosferatu* (F.W. Murnau, 1922). Morten Egholm, “Vampyr - Based on - Sheridan Le Fanu: In a Glass Darkly,” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, May 22, 2010, para. 8, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Vampyr/Based-on.aspx. See also a discussion and photographic enlargement of the missing sequence in William K. Everson, *Classics of the Horror Film*, 1st ed. (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1974), 62–69.

92 De Gunzburg in Weinberg and Weinberg, “Vampyr - An Interview with Baron de Gunzburg,” 59.

93 Larsen, “Vampyr - Reception,” para. 5.

94 “Not Against Flesh,” *The Film Daily*, August 14, 1934, sec. Reviews, 6; Ehrlich, “Vampyr, Ou L’Etrange Aventure de David Gray,” 1270.

95 Unsigned review of “Not Against Flesh,” 6.

96 C. Hooper Trask, “Berlin’s New Pictures,” *New York Times*, July 31, 1932, sec. 9: Screen, X3.

97 Ibid.

98 Charles Fox, “Vampyr,” *Film (London)* 1, no. 10 (November 1956): 20.

99 Ibid.

100 Ibid.

101 Ibid.

102 Cutts, “Great Films of the Century — No. 7: Vampyr,” 43.

103 Ibid.

104 Fox, “Vampyr,” 20; Cutts, “Great Films of the Century — No. 7: Vampyr,” 43.

105 Fox, “Vampyr,” 20; Cutts, “Great Films of the Century — No. 7: Vampyr,” 43.

106 William K. Everson, *Classics of the Horror Film*, 1st ed. (Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1974), 63.

107 Bordwell, “Focus!,” 2.

108 “VAMPYR,” *Cinemages*, no. 4 (May 1, 1955): 20.

109 Everson, ibid. Emphasis original.

110 Ibid.

111 Ibid.

112 “Restore Carl Dreyer 1931 ‘Vampyr’; Rohauer Intends To Stop Bootleg Copies,” *Variety*, October 28, 1964, sec. Pictures, 16, Variety Archives.

113 Ibid.

114 Ibid.

115 Ibid.

116 Ibid.

117 Ibid.

118 *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*, xi.

119 Kevin Thomas, “Movie Reviews: 2 Dreyer Films in Retrospective,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 9, 1982, sec. Part VI: Calendar, 3.

120 Monty is acknowledged by the UCLA Film Archives in their souvenir program of *La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc*, which was part of the same Dreyer retrospective. See Christopher Adcock and Dale Ann Stieber, “La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc *Souvenir Program*,” Los Angeles International Film Exposition (Los Angeles, CA: Wadsworth Theatre, May 27–29, 1983), 2, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32120.

121 Koerber, “Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” 26.

122 Art Institute of Chicago, “The Changing Vampire [*Vampyr* Program Notes]” (Film Center Gazette, August 15, 1989), n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31412.

123 “Vampyr Program Notes,” April 1989, n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31410.

124 Clyde Jeavons, “Vampyr Program Notes” (London Film Festival, November 6, 1999), n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31408.

125 Bordwell, “VAMPYR,” 2–3.

126 Ibid., 2.

127 Curtis Harrington, “Vampyr Program Notes” (The Experimental Cinema Group, May 22, 1958), n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31422; J. L. Schefer, “Vampyr Program Notes” (Bologna Film Festival, 1999), 20, 20–21, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31426. One film festival lists the runtime of *Vampyr* at eighty-three minutes, which may have been the film’s original duration at the Berlin premiere. See Toronto International Film Festival, “Vampyr ‘Festival of Festivals’ [Program Notes]” (TIFF, September 7, 1983), University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, https://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31411.

128 Ehrlich, “Vampyr, Ou L’Etrange Aventure de David Gray,” 1270.

129 Koerber, “Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer’s *Vampyr*,” 27.

130 Schefer’s estimation of 200 meters (656 feet) of missing footage seems too low of a figure. See Schefer, “Vampyr Program Notes,” 21.

131 Jeavons, “Vampyr Program Notes,” n.p.

132 Carl Theodor Dreyer, *Carl Theodor Dreyer's Vampyr*, LaserDisc [CLV] (Chatsworth, CA: Image Entertainment, 1991).

133 *See* Tybjerg's visual essay on Dreyer's artistic and literary influences on the Criterion DVD.

134 Ibid.

135 David Shepard, "Silent Film in the Digital Age," in *Celluloid Goes Digital: Historical-Critical Editions of Films on DVD and the Internet*, ed. Martin Loiperdinger, vol. 12, Filmgeschichte International [International Film History] (Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2003), 24.

136 Trond S. Trondsen and Jan Bielawski, "Looking Beyond the Edge — A Look at TV Overscan," *Nostalghia.com*, June 21, 2009, para. 2, http://people.ucalgary.ca/~tstronds/nostalghia.com/TheTopics/Overscan.html.

137 Ibid.

138 Ibid., para. 3.

139 Walter Benjamin, "Little History of Photography," in *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith, trans. Edmund Jephcott and Kingsley Shorter, vol. 2, 1927–34, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), 507–30.

140 Carl Theodor Dreyer and Christen Jul, "*Vampyr* Intertitles," ed. Cineteca del Comune di Bologna and Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, October 28, 2001, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31417.

141 Listen to Rayns's commentary track at 3:46–3:58 and 4:21–4:25 on the Eureka disc.

142 "Vampyr Synopsis," n.d., 10, University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31423; Kit Parker, "Vampyr Distributor Material" (Kit Parker Films, 1979), n.p., University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31409.

143 "Vampyr Program Notes," n.p.

144 The brief synopsis summarizes the film in mostly pictorial and experiential terms: "The viewer needs to know only the legend of the vampire who lives on after death by sucking blood from young victims and who can only be destroyed by driving iron through her heart. These matters are explained in the book on vampirism, the text of which is given in Danish inserts. There is no plot to be understood: this film is purest nightmare, to which the viewer give himself up, as in sleep." "Vampyr Synopsis," 10.

145 Joshua Zyber, "How to Appreciate High Def.," *Home Theater* 15, no. 10 (October 2008): 37.

146 Ibid.

147 Bell, "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective," 161–62.

148 Eureka Video, "DVD Credits," in Vampyr ("The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray") *Booklet*, Spine # 25, The Masters of Cinema (London: Eureka Video, 2008), 78; International Broadcast Facilities, "Blu-Ray and DVD Authoring Services London | IBF," *Ibf | International Broadcast Facilities*, n.d., http://www .ibf.co.uk/#!blu-ray--dvd-authoring/c12zj.

149 Criterion Collection, "About the Transfer," in Vampyr *Booklet*, Spine # 437 (Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008), 42.

150 Ibid.

151 Ibid.

152 "DRSTM NOVA," *MTI Film*, n.d., http://www.mtifilm.com/drs-nova-overview/.

153 "The Strange Adventure of David Gray," 50.

154 Ibid.

155 *See* Swaab, "'Un Film Vampirisé,'" 59, 61.

156 Ibid., 56.

157 Bolter et al., "New Media and the Permanent Crisis of Aura," 22.

158 Ibid., 26.

159 Jim Taylor et al., *Blu-Ray Disc Demystified* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009), G–4.

160 Jim Taylor, Mark R. Johnson, and Charles G. Crawford, *DVD Demystified*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006), 9–73.

161 Ibid.

162 Taylor et al., Blu-Ray Disc Demystified, 8–5.

163 Julia Wallmüller, "Criteria for the Use of Digital Technology in Moving Image Restoration," *The Moving Image* 7, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 79, doi:10.1353/mov.2007.0032.

164 David A. Honicky, "Film Labelling as a Cure for Colorization [and Other Alterations]: A Band-Aid for a Hatchet Job," *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 12, no. 2 (1994): 411.

165 Danish Film Institute, "Carl Th. Dreyer - Dreyer's Archive," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, accessed August 10, 2015, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/DreyersArchive.aspx; Birgit Granhøj Dam, "Carl Th. Dreyer - About the Collection," *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, November 26, 2010, http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/DreyersArchive/About-the-collection.aspx.

166 Martin Koerber, "Inside and Outside the Bubble: Archival Standards and the DVD Market," in *Celluloid Goes Digital: Historical-Critical Editions of Films on DVD and the Internet*, ed. Martin Loiperdinger, vol. 12, Filmgeschichte International [International Film History] (Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2003), 34.

167 Tammy Kinsey, "The Mysterious History and Restoration of Dreyer's *The Passion of Joan of Arc*," *The Moving Image* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 104.

168 Ibid.

REFERENCES

Aaronson, Charles S. “The Passion of Joan of Ar.” *Motion Picture (NY) Herald*. September 16, 1933, 39.

Abel, Richard. *French Cinema: The First Wave, 1915–1929*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.

“A Conversation with Richard Einhorn.” *Richard Einhorn Composer*, January 10, 2011. http://www.richardeinhorn.com/vol/volrichardInterview.html.

Adcock, Christopher, and Dale Ann Stieber. “La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc *Souvenir Program*.” Los Angeles International Film Exposition. Los Angeles, CA: Wadsworth Theatre, May 27–29, 1983. 1–9. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId =32120.

Adrian Utley & Will Gregory’s new score for the 1928 film, The Passion of Joan of Arc. “The Passion of Joan of Arc @ ATP’s I’ll Be You Mirror, Alexanda Palace.” YouTube video, 1:30, posted by Nick Hider, July 24, 2011. https://www.youtube.com /watch?v=_r8iS1hT0qk&index=15&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhz Dy.

Anderson, Gillian. *Music for Silent Films, 1894–1929: A Guide*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1988.

Andrew, Geoff. *The Film Handbook*. G. K. Hall Performing Arts Handbooks. Boston, MA: G. K. Hall, 1990.

Apperley, Thomas H. “Genre and Game Studies: Toward a Critical Approach to Video Game Genres.” *Simulation & Gaming* 37, no. 1 (March 2006): 6–23. doi:10.1177 /1046878105282278.

Arasse, Daniel. *Vermeer, Faith in Painting*. Translated by Terry Grabar. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Arnott, Peter D. “The Lost Dimension of Greek Tragedy.” *Educational Theatre Journal* 11, no. 2 (May 1959): 99–102.

Artaud, Antonin. “Interview for *Cinémonde* (1929).” In *Antonin Artaud, Selected Writings*, edited by Susan Sontag, translated by Helen Weaver, 182–85. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1976.

Art Institute of Chicago. “The Changing Vampire [*Vampyr* Program Notes].” Film Center Gazette, August 15, 1989. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31412.

Attempt to colorize part of a silent cinema classic. “La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc Colorized in After Effects (alternate Versions).” YouTube video, :26, posted by “VASILISG841,” September 18, 2011. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qYltN_SDGks&list =PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=10.

Auerbach, Nina. “My Vampire, My Friend: The Intimacy Dracula Destroyed.” In *Blood Read: The Vampire as Metaphor in Contemporary Culture*, edited by Joan Gordon and Veronica Hollinger, 11–16. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.

Austrian Film Museum. “Carl Theodor Dreyer.” *Filmmuseum - Scope*, November 4, 2011. http://www.filmmuseum.at/en/film_program/program_archive.

Aylesworth, Thomas G. *Monsters from the Movies*. The Weird and Horrible Library. Philadelphia, PA, and New York: Lippincott, 1972.

Bader, Elise K. “A Film of a Different Color: Copyright and the Colorization of Black and White Films.” *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 5 (1986): 497–543.

Bakels, Thomas. “THE FILM AND THE RESTORATION.” In The Loves of Pharaoh *Booklet*, 1–2. Munich: ALPHA-OMEGA digital GmbH, 2011.

Barrett, John. *DVD: Disc of All Trades*. DVD. DVD to Accompany *DVD Demystified, Third Edition*. Washington, D.C.: Television Production Services, 2000.

Barry, Iris. “*The Passion of Joan of Arc*.” Program Notes. The Film in Germany and the Film in France: Transition to Sound. New York: The Museum of Modern Art Film Library, 1940. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http: //www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32122.

Barthes, Roland. *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Bazin, André. “La politique des auteurs.” In *The New Wave: Critical Landmarks*, edited by Peter John Graham, 137–55. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968.

Beaver, Frank E. *On Film: A History of the Motion Picture*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Bell, Janis. "*Sfumato* and Acuity Perspective." In *Leonardo da Vinci and the Ethics of Style*, edited by Claire J. Farago, 161–88. Manchester, UK, and New York: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Benjamin, Walter. "Little History of Photography [1931]." Vol. 2, *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings (1927–34)*, 507–30. Edited by Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland, and Gary Smith. Translated by Edmund Jephcott and Harry Zohn. 4 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

———. "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire." In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, 157–202. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1955.

———. "The Formula in Which the Dialectical Structure of Film Finds Expression [1935]." Vol. 3, *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings (1935–38)*, 94–95. Edited by Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Translated by Edmund Jephcott. 4 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.

———. "The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version." Vol. 3, *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings (1935–38)*, 101–33. Edited by Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Translated by Edmund Jephcott and Harry Zohn. Cambridge, MA, and London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.

Berger, Arthur Asa. "Film Technology's Latest Frankenstein." *Society* 24, no. 4 (June 1987): 12–13.

Blade af Satans Bog. Nordisk Films Kompagni, n.d. Protocol XII,23. Nordisk Collection.

Blaisdell, George. “Looking In on Just a Few New Ones.” *International Photographer* 3, no. 9 (October 1931): 28–29.

Blu-ray.com “Webmaster.” “Gaumont Secures Funding to Restore Classic Films.” *Blu-Ray.com News*, March 23, 2012. http://www.blu-ray.com/news/?id=8423.

Boehnel, William. “Sound Film Greatly Aids Joan of Arc.” *New York World Telegram*. September 15, 1933.

Boland, Elena. “Contrasts Feature at Filmarte.” *Los Angeles Times*. September 16, 1929, A7.

Bolter, Jay David, and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 1999.

Bolter, Jay David, Blair MacIntyre, Maribeth Gandy, and Petra Schweitzer. “New Media and the Permanent Crisis of Aura.” *Convergence: The Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 12, no. 1 (February 2006): 21–39. doi:10.1177 /1354856506061550.

Bond, Kirk. “The World of Carl Dreyer.” *Film Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (Autumn 1965): 26–38. doi:10.1525/fq.1965.19.1.04a00050.

Bordwell, David. *Filmguide to* La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc. Vol. 1. Indiana University Press Filmguide Series 1. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1973.

———. *On the History of Film Style*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

———. *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981.

———. “VAMPYR.” Edited by Myron Meisel. *Focus! Chicago’s Film Journal*, no. 7 (Spring 1972): 2–3.

Borger, Lenny. “New Score for Dreyer’s ‘Joan;’ 4 Presentations Set for Classic.” *Variety*. January 6, 1988, sec. Pictures, 7, 27. Variety Archives.

Bosley, Rachael K. “The State of the Art: An Update.” *American Cinematographer* 89, no. 12 (December 2008): 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 84–85.

Bowser, Eileen. *The Films of Carl Dreyer*. New York: The Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art, 1964.

Brakhage, Stan. *The Brakhage Lectures: Georges Méliès, David Wark Griffith, Carl Theodore Dreyer, Sergei Eisenstein*. Edited by Ian Robertson. Chicago, IL: The GoodLion, 1972.

Breitbart, Eric. “*La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc*: A Classic Film Rises from the Ashes.” *Sightlines* (Fall 1986): 26–28.

Brownlow, Kevin. *The Parade’s Gone By...* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

Brunsting, Joshua. “Gaumont Announces First 25 Blu-Ray Restorations As Studio Canal And Lionsgate Re-Up Distribution Deal.” *CriterionCast*, May 24, 2012. http://criterioncast.com/news/gaumont-announces-first-25-blu-ray-restorations-as-studio-canal-and-lionsgate-re-up-distribution-deal.

Bullerjahn, Claudia, and Markus Güldenring. “An Empirical Investigation of Effects of Film Music Using Qualitative Content Analysis.” *Psychomusicology: A Journal of Research in Music Cognition* 13, no. 1–2 (Spring-Fall 1994): 99–118.

Burch, Noël. “Carl Theodore Dreyer: The Major Phase.” In *In and Out of Synch: The Awakening of a Cine-Dreamer*, by Noël Burch, 70–92. Translated by Tom Milne and Ben Brewster. Aldershot, UK: Scolar Press, 1991.

Buscombe, Edward. “Ideas of Authorship.” *Screen* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1973): 75–85.

Card, James. “Visit with Carl Th. Dreyer.” *Image* 2, no. 9 (December 1953): 61.

Carroll, Nathan. “Unwrapping Archives: DVD Restoration Demonstrations and the Marketing of Authenticity.” *The Velvet Light Trap: A Critical Journal of Film & Television*, no. 56 (Fall 2005): 18–31.

Carroll, Noël. “Notes on Dreyer’s *Vampyr*.” *Persistence of Vision*, no. 8 (1990): 4–14.

Caughie, John, ed. “Preface.” In *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*, 1–6. BFI Readers in Film Studies. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Chace Audio. “Variable Area.” Audio Post Production Knowledge Base. *TriggerTone*, n.d. http://www.triggertone.com/term/V%5Bslash%5DA.

Cherchi Usai, Paolo. “The Color of Nitrate: Some Factual Observations on Tinting and Toning Manuals for Silent Films.” *Image* 34, no. 1–2 (Spring/Summer 1991): 29–38.

Christensen, Thomas C. E-mail to Stephen Larson. “Frame Rates of DFI Dreyer DVDs,” April 30, 2013.

———. “Post-Production at Nordisk.” In *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, edited by Lisbeth Richter Larsen and Dan Nissen, 114–23. Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2006.

———. E-mail to Stephen Larson. “Restoration of Dreyer Films,” March 22, 2013.

———. Letter to Stephen Larson. “Questions about JEANNE D’ARC Prints,” January 6, 2015.

———. Letter to Stephen Larson. “SV: A Report on Image’s Leaves from Satan’s Book Edition,” May 3, 2005.

Cohn, Stuart. “Richard Einhorn.” *BOMB*, no. 57 (Fall 1996): 38–41.

Coppola, Francis Ford. *2001* Apocalypse Now Redux *Cannes Press Conference*. DVD (Region 2 PAL). Paris: Fox Pathé Europa, 2002.

Cowie, Peter. *Eighty Years of Cinema*. Rev. and Enl. South Brunswick, NJ, and New York: Barnes, 1977.

———. *Swedish Cinema*. The International Film Guide Series. New York: Barnes, 1966.

Criterion Collection. “About the Transfer.” In *Vampyr Booklet*, 42. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008.

Crowdus, Gary. “Providing a Film Archive for the Home Viewer: An Interview with Peter Becker of The Criterion Collection.” *Cineaste* 25, no. 1 (December 1999): 47–50.

Cutts, John. “Great Films of the Century — No. 7: Vampyr.” *Films and Filming*, no. 3 (December 1960): 17–19, 43.

Danish Film Institute. “Carl Th. Dreyer - Dreyer’s Archive.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*. Accessed August 10, 2015. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/DreyersArchive.aspx.

———. “Leaves from Satan’s Book.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*. Accessed December 5, 2013. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Blade-af-Satans-Bog.aspx.

———. "*Leaves from Satan's Book* Full Transcription List." TrustNordisk ApS, May 6, 2009. TrustNordisk. http://files.trustnordisk.com/files/ftpfiles/movies /NF152/public /flyer/leaves_from_satans_book_flyer_2.pdf.

de Jongh, Nicholas. "Dreyer's La Passion Found in Cellar." *The Guardian (London) Weekly*. May 5, 1985, 20. LexisNexis Academic.

de la Roziere, Comte. "Trial of Joan of Arc." *New York Times*. April 1, 1928, sec. 9: Amusements, X5.

Delahaye, Michel. "Between Heaven And Hell: Interview with Carl Dreyer." Translated by Rose Kaplin. *Cahiers Du Cinéma in English*, no. 4 (1966): 7–17.

Delteil, Joseph. *Jeanne d'Arc*. Paris: Grasset, 1925. Translated by Malcolm Cowley as *Joan of Arc* (New York: Minton, Balch, 1926).

Demtschyna, Michael. "Video Artefacts - Edge Enhancement." *Michael D's Region 4 DVD Info Page*, May 18, 2001. http://www.michaeldvd.com.au/Articles/VideoArtefacts /VideoArtefactsEdgeEnhancement.html.

———. "Video Artefacts - Film Artefacts." *Michael D's Region 4 DVD Info Page*, May 18, 2001. http://www.michaeldvd.com.au/Articles/VideoArtefacts/VideoArtefactsFilm Artefacts.html.

Doxtater, Amanda Elaine. "Pathos, Performance, Volition: Melodrama's Legacy in the Work of Carl Th. Dreyer." PhD Diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2012. ProQuest (1322974437).

Drew, William M. *D.W. Griffith's* Intolerance*: Its Genesis and Its Vision*. Jefferson, NC, and London: McFarland, 1986.

Dreyer, Carl Theodor. *Blade af Satans Bog* (*Leaves Out of the Book of Satan*). DVD (PAL). Danish Silent Classics. Copenhagen: Danske Filminstitut (Danish Film Institute), 2007.

———. *Carl Theodor Dreyer's Vampyr*. LaserDisc [CLV]. Chatsworth, CA: Image Entertainment, 1991.

———. *Die Gezeichneten* (*Love One Another*). Blu-ray. Copenhagen: Danske Filminstitut (Danish Film Institute), 2011.

———. "Dreyer's Reply (in BT)—About Playacting: On the Occasion of the Jannings Film (1936)." In *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Translation of Carl Th. Dreyer's Writings About the Film (Om Filmen)*, edited by Donald Skoller, 64–70. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973.

———. "Dreyer to Harald Frost, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), October 31, 1917." [Translated by Birgit Granhøj Dam, 2013.] Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2811. Danish Film Institute.

———. "Dreyer to Ole Olsen, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 25, 1919." [Translated by Birgit Granhøj Dam, 2013.] Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2835. Danish Film Institute.

———. “Dreyer to Wilhelm Stæhr, Frederiksberg (Copenhagen), March 23, 1919.” [Translated by Birgit Granhøj Dam, 2013.] Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2833. Danish Film Institute.

———. *Fire Film:* Jeanne d’Arc, Vampyr, Vredens Dag, Ordet. Edited by Ole Storm. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1964.

———. *Four Screenplays*. Edited by Ole Storm. Translated by Oliver Stallybrass. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.

———. “Korrespondance Mellem Carl Th. Dreyer Og Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913-24) [Correspondence between Carl Th. Dreyer and Nordisk Films Kompagni (1913-24)].” In *Kildemateriale Til En Biografi Om Carl Th. Dreyer* [Sources for a biography of Carl Th. Dreyer], edited by Martin Drouzy, [translated by Peter Schepelern, 2013], 31–60. Sekvens - Særrække. Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag, 1982.

———. *La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*). 35mm. British Film Institute, 1928.

———. *La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*). 35mm. British Film Institute, 1947.

———. “*La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*).” In *Four Screenplays*, edited by Ole Storm, translated by Oliver Stallybrass, 25–76. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.

———. *Leaves from Satan’s Book*. DVD (NTSC). Chatsworth, CA: Image Entertainment, 2005.

———. “*Leaves from Satan’s Book* Intertitles (Corrected Version).” Pacific Film Archive, April 1989. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31324.

———. *Leaves Out of the Book of Satan*. Film. Glenn Photo Supply; Reseda, CA, n.d.

———. Michael *(80th Anniversary Edition).* DVD (PAL). Spine # 3. The Masters of Cinema Series. London: Eureka Video, 2004.

———. “Photography in Danish Film (1940).” In *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Translation of Carl Th. Dreyer’s Writings About the Film (Om Filmen),* edited by Donald Skoller, 111–19. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973.

———. *Præsidenten* (*The President*). DVD (PAL). Danish Silent Classics. Copenhagen: Danske Filminstitut (Danish Film Institute), 2004.

———. “Prastankan Intertitles,” n.d. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail ?docId =31391.

———. “Preface.” In *The Story of Danish Film*, by Ebbe Neergaard, 3–5. translated by Elsa Gress. Denmark in Print and Pictures. Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab (The Danish Institute) for Information about Denmark and Cultural Cooperation with other Nations, 1963.

———. “Selvbiografisk Notat (1939) [Autobiographical note (1939)].” In *Kildemateriale Til En Biografi Om Carl Th. Dreyer* [Sources for a biography of Carl Th. Dreyer], edited by Martin Drouzy, [translated by Peter Schepelern, 2013], 61–68. Sekvens - Særrække. Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzels Forlag, 1982.

———. “Swedish Film (1920).” In *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Translation of Carl Th. Dreyer’s Writings About the Film (Om Filmen)*, edited by Donald Skoller, 21–29. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973.

———. *The Passion of Joan of Arc*. 16mm and 8mm, Drama. Film Classic Exchange, 1933. https://www.worldcat.org/title/passion-of-joan-of-arc/oclc/4410545?referer=br&ht=edition.

———. *The Passion of Joan of Arc*. Blu-ray (Region B). The Masters of Cinema Series. Spine # 50. London: Eureka Entertainment, 2012.

———. *The Passion of Joan of Arc*. DVD (NTSC). Spine #62. The Criterion Collection. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 1999.

———. “*The Passion of Joan of Arc* Intertitles.” Edited by Vincent Pinel. Translated by Maurice Drouzy. Cinémathèque Française, 1985. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32151.

———. *Vampyr*. DVD (NTSC). Spine # 437. The Criterion Collection. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008.

———. *Vampyr ("The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray").* DVD (Region 2 PAL). Spine # 25. The Masters of Cinema. London: Eureka Video, 1932.

Dreyer, Carl Theodor, and Christen Jul. "*Vampyr* Intertitles." Edited by Cineteca del Comune di Bologna and Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, October 28, 2001. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31417.

———. "Vampyr: The Screenplay." In *Writing* Vampyr, translated by Oliver Stallybrass and Nicholas Elliott, 1st DVD Ed., 1–94. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008.

———. "*Vampyr* (*Vampire*)." In *Four Screenplays*, edited by Ole Storm, translated by Oliver Stallybrass, 77–130. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.

"DRS™ NOVA." *MTI Film*, n.d. http://www.mtifilm.com/drs-nova-overview/.

Drum, Dale D. CARL TH. DREYER: Sixth Interview. Print, June 14, 1967. Available at http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/aboutdreyer/visual-style/my-only-great-passion.aspx.

Drum, Jean, and Dale D. Drum. *My Only Great Passion: The Life and Films of Carl Th. Dreyer*. Scarecrow Filmmakers Series 68. Lanham, MD, and London: Scarecrow Press, 2000.

Dyer, Richard. *White*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

[Eaton, Sarah.] *Carl Th. Dreyer*. Press Release. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, February 1989. MoMA: Press Release Archives. http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/6647/releases/MOMA_1989_0014_14.pdf?2010.

Egholm, Morten. “Jacob Breda Bull: The Bride of Glomdal.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, May 22, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Glomdalsbruden/Based-on.aspx.

———. “Leaves from Satan’s Book: Based on.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, May 21, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Blade-af-Satans-Bog/Based-on.aspx.

———. “The Bride of Glomdal (Norway, 1926).” In Love One Another / The Bride of Glomdal *Blu-Ray Booklet*, 13–16. Danish Silent Classics. Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2010.

———. “Vampyr - Based on - Sheridan Le Fanu: In a Glass Darkly.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, May 22, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Vampyr/Based-on.aspx.

Ehrlich, Jane. “Vampyr, Ou L’Etrange Aventure de David Gray.” Edited by Tom Pendergast and Sara Pendergast. *International Dictionary of Films and Filmmakers 4th Ed.* Films Series Vol. 1. Detroit, MI: St. James Press, 2000.

Einhorn, Richard. “LINER NOTES FROM THE SONY CLASSICAL RELEASE OF COMPOSER RICHARD EINHORN’S VOICES OF LIGHT.” *Richard Einhorn Composer*, January 10, 2011. http://www.richardeinhorn.com/vol/VOLLinerNotes.HTML.

———. *Voices of Light*. Netherlands Radio Choir and Netherlands Radio Philharmonic. Steven Mercurio. With Anonymous 4. Recorded at Music Station of the Netherlands Radio and Television, August 23–25, 1995. Sony Classical SK 62006, 1995, compact disc.

———. "VOICES OF LIGHT: LIBRETTO." *Richard Einhorn Composer*, June 17, 2008. http://www.richardeinhorn.com/vol/vol.libretto.pdf.

Eidsvik, Charles. "Demonstrating Film Influence." *Literature Film Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (Spring 1973): 113–21.

Eisner, Lotte H. *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt*. Translated by Roger Greaves. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Engberg, Marguerite. "Historien om den genfundne *Jeanne d'Arc* [The story of the recovered *Jeanne d'Arc*]." [Translated by Peter Schepelern, 2014.] *Kosmorama* 31, no. 171 (May 1985): 39–42.

———. "The Erotic Melodrama in Danish Silent Films 1910-1918." *Film History: An International Journal* 5, no. 1 (March 1993): 63–67. doi:10.2307/3815110.

———. "The Restoration of Silent Films Produced by Nordisk Films Kompagni." In *Preserve Then Show*, edited by Dan Nissen, Lisbeth Richter Larsen, Thomas C. Christensen, and Jesper Stub Johnsen, 152–57. Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2002. Available at http://www.dfi.dk/Filmhuset/Filmarkivet/Artikler-og-links.aspx.

Enticknap, Leo Douglas Graham. *Film Restoration: The Culture and Science of Audiovisual Heritage*. England and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Eureka Video. "DVD Credits." In Vampyr *(*"The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray"*) Booklet*, Spine # 25. The Masters of Cinema Series. London: Eureka Video, 2008.

Everson, William K. *Classics of the Horror Film*. 1st ed. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1974.

———. "VAMPYR." *Cinemages*, no. 4 (May 1, 1955): 20.

February 17 - March 5, 1989. Carl Th. Dreyer Bio and Film Schedule. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1989. MoMA: Press Release Archives. http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/6647/releases/MOMA_1989_0014_14.pdf?2010.

Forslund, Bengt. *Victor Sjöström: His Life and His Work*. Translated by Peter Cowie. New York: New York Zoetrope, 1988.

Fossati, Giovanna. *From Grain to Pixel: The Archival Life of Film in Transition*. Framing Film. Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, 113–38. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Fox, Charles. "Vampyr." *Film (London)* 1, no. 10 (November 1956): 20.

Franzos, Karl Emil. *Der Präsident*. Breslau, DE: Edward Trewendt, 1884. Translated by Miles Corbet as *The Chief Justice* (Heinemann's International Library, London: Heinemann, 1890).

"French Film News." *Variety*. June 1, 1927, sec. Pictures, 12, 54. Variety Archives.

"French Story First of Year on Little Bill." *The Washington Post*. September 8, 1929, A2.

Gale, Arthur L. "Critical Focusing." *Movie Makers* 4, no. 4 (April 1929): 253.

Gallagher, Tag. "Chains of Dreams: Carl Th. Dreyer." *Senses of Cinema* 45 (December 2007). http://www.sensesofcinema.com/2007/feature-articles/carl-dreyer/.

Gamerman, Amy. "The Man Who Gave 'Joan of Arc' Her Voice." *The Wall Street Journal*. January 23, 1996, Eastern edition, sec. Leisure & Arts, A12.

"Gaumont Will Withdraw Its Sound Version of Dreyer's 'Joan of Arc.'" *Variety*. June 28, 1989, sec. Film, 10. Variety Archives.

Gerstein, Evelyn. "Joan of Arc." *The New Republic* 58 (April 10, 1929): 228.

Gloria Film. *Vampyr* Danish Film Programme [March 27, 1933]." In *Vampyr* ("*The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray*"). Translated by Trond S. Tronsden. 6–13. The Masters of Cinema. London: Eureka Video, 2008.

Golden, Rachel May. "Polyphonies of Sound and Space: Motet, Montage, *Voices of Light*, and *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*." *Musical Quarterly* 96, no. 2 (Summer 2013): 296–330. doi:10.1093/musqtl/gdt013.

[Goldsmith, Linda.] *The Films of Carl Dreyer*. Press Release. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, September 24, 1964. MoMA: Press Release Archives. Available at http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/3302/releases/MOMA_1964_0089_1964-09-24_49 .pdf?2010.

Granhøj Dam, Birgit. “Carl Th. Dreyer - About the Collection.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, November 26, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/DreyersArchive/About-the-collection.aspx.

Griffith, D. W. *Intolerance*. Blu-ray. Cohen Film Collection. Columbus, OH / Port Washington, NY: Cohen Media Group / Entertainment One Film, 2013.

Grundmann, Roy. “Gay-Themed Films of the German Silent Era.” *Cineaste* 31, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 63–66.

Guerrasio, Guido, ed. La passione di Giovanna d’Arco*, di Carl Theodor Dreyer*. 1st ed. Vol. 2. 5 vols. Cineteca Domus. Milan: Editoriale Domus, 1945.

Hall, Mordaunt. “Poignant French Film.” *New York Times*. March 31, 1929, sec. 8, X7.

———. “The Screen: A Norwegian Story.” *New York Times*. April 8, 1929, 32.

———. “The Screen: Another German Contribution.” *New York Times*. December 15, 1926, sec. Hotels and Restaurants, 30.

Harrington, Curtis. “Ghoulies and Ghosties.” *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television* 7, no. 2 (Winter 1952): 191–202. doi:10.2307/1209799.

———. “Ghoulies and Ghosties.” *Monthly Film Bulletin* 21, no. 4 (June 1952): 157–61.

———. “Vampyr Program Notes.” The Experimental Cinema Group, May 22, 1958. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31422.

Hayward, Susan. *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*. 4th ed. Routledge Key Guides. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

Henry, Derrick. “Voices of Light.” *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*. October 25, 1996, sec. Classical Preview, 5P. LexisNexis Academic.

Herring, Carl. “The Movies.” *The London Mercury* 18 (August 1928): 424–26.

Holloway, Ronald. *Beyond the Image: Approaches to the Religious Dimension in the Cinema*. Geneva, CH: World Council of Churches in co-operation with Interfilm, 1977.

Honicky, David A. “Film Labelling as a Cure for Colorization [and Other Alterations]: A Band-Aid for a Hatchet Job.” *Cardozo Arts & Entertainment Law Journal* 12, no. 2 (1994): 409–30.

Horak, Jan-Christopher. “Carl Theodor Dreyer’s Die Gezeichneten (1922).” *UCLA Film & Television Archive*, December 2, 2011. http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/blogs/archival-spaces/2011/12/02/carl-theodor-dreyer%E2%80%99s-die-gezeichneten-1922.

Høyer, Edgard. “A Propos ‘Blade Af Satanas Bog’ [A propos ‘Leaves from Satana’s Book’].” [Translated by Peter Schepelern, 2013.] *Politiken*. January 9, 1921, 2.

Huff, Theodore. Intolerance*: The Film by David Wark Griffith; Shot-by-Shot Analysis*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1966.

Hukill, Traci. “An Arc Du Triomphe.” *Metro Santa (CA) Cruz*. August 1–7, 1996, sec. MetroGuide, 11–13. Available at http://www.metroactive.com/papers/cruz/08.01.96/joan-arc-9631.html

Idestam-Almquist, Bengt. *Classics of the Swedish Cinema: The Stiller & Sjöström Period*. Edited by Henning Österberg. Translated by James Harker. Stockholm: Swedish Institute, 1952.

International Broadcast Facilities. "Blu-Ray and DVD Authoring Services London | IBF." *Ibf | International Broadcast Facilities*, n.d. http://www.ibf.co.uk/#!blu-ray--dvd-authoring/c12zj.

"International Sound Track: Copenhagen." *Variety*. November 28, 1984, sec. International, 82. Variety Archives.

"International Sound Track: Rome." *Variety*. December 5, 1984, sec. International, 98. Variety Archives.

In The Nursery. "The Passion of Joan of Arc (Music by In The Nursery)." YouTube video, :23, posted by "satosato1," May 16, 2008. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h_F0iKbn_8I.

Jeavons, Clyde. "Vampyr Program Notes." London Film Festival, November 6, 1999. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31408.

Joan of Arc (American rock band). "Joan of Arc Presents Carl Theodor Dreyer's 'The Passion of Joan of Arc.'" YouTube video, 1:22:10, posted by David Vaipan, July 16, 2012. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CxJSGMK9yRE&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=1.

"'Joan of Arc' Film Entering Second Week." *The Washington Post*. September 15, 1929, A2.

"'Joan of Arc,' French Film Ready for Release." *The Film Daily*, April 1, 1928, 2.

Kau, Edvin. *Dreyers filmkunst*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989.

———. "Filmografi [Filmography]." In *Dreyers Filmkunst* [Dreyer's cinema], by Edvin Kau, 391–407. [Selected letters translated by Peter Schepelern, 2013.] Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989.

Kehr, Dave. "Northern Lights." *Film Comment* 21, no. 6 (December 1985): 73–75.

Keller, Keith. "Michaël." *Variety*, November 16, 1988, sec. Pictures: Archive, 28.

Kelman, Ken. "Dreyer." *Film Culture*, no. 35 (Winter 1964–65): 1–9.

Kendall, Tina. "The Still Life: DVD Stills Galleries and the Digital Uncanny." In *Framing Film: Cinema and the Visual Arts*, edited by Steven Allen and Laura Hubner, 113–26. Bristol, UK, and Chicago, IL: Intellect, 2012. Available at https://www.academia.edu/4306572/The_Still_Life_DVD_Stills_Galleries_and_the_Digital_Uncanny.

Kinsey, Tammy. "The Mysterious History and Restoration of Dreyer's *The Passion of Joan of Arc*." *The Moving Image* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 94–107.

Kirlian Camera. "Kirlian Camera-Heldenplatz-Carl Theodor Dreyer's The Passion Of Joan Of Arc (Part One)." YouTube video, 6:32, posted by Valerie Stephens, April 29, 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_IbiLdjepNA.

Kirchoff, Jeffrey S. J. "Beyond Remediation: Comic Book Captions and Silent Film Intertitles as the Same Genre." *Studies in Comics* 3, no. 1 (June 2012): 25–45. doi:10.1386/stic.3.1.25_1.

Kit Parker Films. "*Blade Af Satan's Bog* (Leaves from Satan's Book)," 1979. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31319.

Kitto, Humphrey Davy Findley. "The Greek Chorus." *Educational Theatre Journal* 8, no. 1 (March 1956): 1–8.

Klinger, Werner. "Analytical Treatise on the Dreyer Film, 'The Passion of Joan of Arc' with Appendix of a Constructive Critique." Translated by Christel Gang. *Experimental Cinema* 1, no. 1 (February 1930): 7–10.

Koerber, Martin. "Inside and Outside the Bubble: Archival Standards and the DVD Market." *Celluloid Goes Digital: Historical-Critical Editions of Films on DVD and the Internet*, edited by Martin Loiperdinger, 34–37. Vol. 12. Filmgeschichte International [International Film History]. Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2003.

———. "Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer's *Vampyr*." In Vampyr *Booklet*, 24–29. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008.

———. "Some Notes on the Restoration of Dreyer's VAMPYR (1932)," October 28, 2001. 1–5. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31428.

Koller, Michael. "The Bride of Glomdal." *Metro*, no. 111 (1997): 54–55.

———. "Vampyr: The Strange Adventure of David Gray." *Metro*, no. 119 (1999): 100.

Kracauer, Siegfried. *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1947.

Kreimeier, Klaus. *The Ufa Story: A History of Germany's Greatest Film Company, 1918-1945*. Translated by Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber. New York: Hill & Wang, 1996.

Kuiper, Kathleen, ed. *Painters of the Renaissance*. The Renaissance. New York: Britannica Educational Publishing and Rosen Educational Services, 2013.

Kula, Sam. *Appraising Moving Images: Assessing the Archival and Monetary Value of Film and Video Records*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2003.

Larsen, Lisbeth Richter. "Leaves from Satan's Book: Reception." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Blade-af-Satans-Bog/Reception.aspx.

———. "Master of the House: Reception." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Du-skal-aere-din-Hustru/Reception.aspx.

———. "Michael: Reception." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Michael/Reception.aspx.

———. "Michael: Shoot." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Michael/Shoot.aspx.

———. "Once Upon a Time: Reception." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Der-var-engang/Reception.aspx.

———. "The Bride of Glomdal: Shoot." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Glomdalsbruden/Shoot.aspx.

———. "The Parson's Widow: Reception." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Prästänkan/Reception.aspx.

———. “The Passion of Joan of Arc: Reception.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/La-Passion-de-Jeanne-dArc/Reception.aspx.

———. “The Passion of Joan of Arc: Shoot.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/La-Passion-de-Jeanne-dArc/Shoot.aspx.

———. “The President - Shoot.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, April 5, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Praesidenten/Shoot.aspx.

———. “Vampyr - Reception.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, October 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Vampyr/Reception.aspx.

———. “Vampyr - Shoot.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, June 3, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/Films/Vampyr/Shoot.aspx.

Larsen, Lisbeth Richter, and Dan Nissen. “100 Years of Nordisk Film.” In *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, edited by Lisbeth Richter Larsen and Dan Nissen, 8–51. Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2006.

Leibowitz, Flo. “Movie Colorization and the Expression of Mood.” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 49, no. 4 (Fall 1991): 363–65. doi:10.2307/431036.

Lenin Imports. “Film Poster - La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc (1928).” *{ Silent Film } Renée Maria Falconetti :: Biography and Gallery*, July 9, 2013. http://www.leninimports.com/renee_maria_falconetti_11a_e.jpg.

Lennig, Arthur. “Introduction.” In *Film Notes of Wisconsin Film Society*, edited by Arthur Lennig, 5–8. Madison, WI: Madison Books, 1960.

———. “*Leaves Out of the Book of Satan*.” Wisconsin Film Society, December 1, 1959. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31322.

———. “The Scandinavian Film: *Leaves from Satan’s Book*.” In *Film Notes of Wisconsin Film Society*, edited by Arthur Lennig, 91–97. Madison, WI: Madison Books, 1960.

Leondopoulos, Jordan. *Still the Moving World:* Intolerance*, Modernism, and* Heart of Darkness. Vol. 7. Literature and the Visual Arts: New Foundations. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

“List of Countries for Distribution of Blade af Satans Bog.” Nordisk Films Kompagni, n.d. Protocol XII,39. Nordisk Collection.

List of Exhibitions and Special Events - Current and Future. Press Release. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, September 1, 1952. MoMA: Press Release Archives. http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/1639/releases/MOMA_1952_0061_56.pdf?2010.

Locher, Jens. *Hvorledes Skriver Man En Film?* [How does one write a film?]. [Translated by Lesley-Ann Brown, 2013.] Copenhagen: V. Pios Bohandel — Povl Branner, 1916.

Longaker, Mark. “Music, Film as Passionate as Inspiration, Joan of Arc.” *The Washington Times*. July 28, 1996, Final edition, sec. Arts, D1.

Lubitsch, Ernst. *Das Weib des Pharao* (The Loves of Pharaoh). Blu-ray. Germany: ALPHA-OMEGA digital GmbH, 2011.

Luft, Herbert G. “Rudolph Maté Photographed Dreyer’s ‘Passion of Joan of Arc’ and Became a Director on His Own.” *Films in Review*, no. 8 (1964): 480–90.

Luke, Timothy W. “Reel Rehab: The Political Economy of Colorization.” *Art Papers* 11, no. 2 (April 1987): 70–72.

Mackey, Margaret. *Literacies Across Media: Playing the Text*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

“Magical History Tour – ‘Kammerspielfilm.’” *Arsenal – Institute for Film and Video Art*, January 2012. http://www.arsenal-berlin.de/en/arsenal-cinema/current-program/single/article/3151/2803.html.

Mallapragada, Madhavi. “Desktop Deities: Hindu Temples, Online Cultures and the Politics of Remediation.” *South Asian Popular Culture* 8, no. 2 (July 2010): 109–21. doi:10.1080/14746681003797955.

Manvell, Roger. “Revaluations—6.” *Sight and Sound* 19, no. 8 (December 1950): 337–39.

———. *The Film and the Public*. Pelican Books A334. Harmondsworth, Middlesex (UK): Penguin Books, 1955.

Margolis, Nadia. *Joan of Arc in History, Literature, and Film: A Select, Annotated Bibliography*. Vol. 1224. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities. New York: Garland, 1990.

———. “Trial by Passion: Philology, Film, and Ideology in the Portrayal of Joan of Arc (1900–1930).” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 27, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 445–93.

“Master of the House.” *The Criterion Collection*, 2014. https://www.criterion.com/films/27804-master-of-the-house.

Mattock, Lindsay Kistler. “From Film Restoration to Digital Emulation: The Archival Code of Ethics in the Age of Digital Reproduction.” *Journal of Information Ethics* 19, no. 1 (Spring 2010): 74–85. doi:10.3172/JIE.19.1.74.

Megahey, Noel. “Michael | DVD Video Review | Film @ The Digital Fix.” *The Digital Fix*, November 17, 2004. http://film.thedigitalfix.com/content/id/13329/michael.html.

Merolla, Daniela. “Filming African Creation Myths.” *Religion and the Arts* 13, no. 4 (November 2009): 521–33. doi:10.1163/107992609X12524941450082.

M’Gowen, Roscoe. “Censor Must a Slipped Up in Letting ‘Chained’ Loose.” *Daily (NY) News*. December 16, 1926, 42.

“Michael | Eureka!” *Catalogue | The Masters of Cinema Series*, 2004. www.eurekavideo.co.uk/moc/catalogue/michael.

Milne, Tom. *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer*. The International Film Guide Series. New York: Barnes, 1971.

Monty, Ib. “Carl Th. Dreyer - a Biography.” In *Carl Th. Dreyer: Danish Film Director, 1889–1968*, edited by Søren Dyssegaard, 5–6, 8. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen: Presentation Books, 1969.

———. “Life with Nitrate.” In *This Film Is Dangerous: A Celebration of Nitrate Film*, edited by Roger Smither and Catherine A. Surowiec, 7–10. Brussels, Belgium: International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF), 2002.

———. *Portrait of Carl Th. Dreyer*. Copenhagen: Danish Government Film Foundation, 1967.

Mottram, Ron. “The Great Northern Film Company: Nordisk Film in the American Motion Picture Market.” *Film History: An International Journal* 2, no. 1 (Winter 1988): 71–86. doi:10.2307/3814950.

Nagel, Alexander. “Leonardo and *Sfumato*.” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*, no. 24 (Autumn 1993): 7–20.

Nash, Mark. “Carl Dreyer.” Program Notes. London: National Film Theatre, October 1977. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31444.

———. *Dreyer*. London: British Film Institute, 1977.

———. “Joan Complete: A Dreyer Discovery.” *Sight and Sound* 54, no. 3 (Summer 1985): 157–58.

Neergaard, Ebbe. *Carl Dreyer, a Film Director’s Work*. Translated by Marianne Helweg. British Film Institute New Index Series 1. London: British Film Institute, 1950.

———. “The Rise, the Fall, and the Rise of Danish Film.” *Hollywood Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (Spring 1950): 217–32. doi:10.2307/1209393.

———. *The Story of Danish Film*. Translated by Elsa Gress. Denmark in Print and Pictures. Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab (The Danish Institute) for Information about Denmark and Cultural Cooperation with other Nations, 1963.

Nelkin, Dorothy. "Show and Sell." *Society* 24, no. 4 (June 1987): 16–18.

Nelson, Cami. "From *Sfumato* to Transarchitectures and Osmose: Leonardo da Vinci's Virtual Reality." *Leonardo* 42, no. 3 (June 2009): 259–64.

Nissen, Dan. "Biography - Extended." *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, August 11, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/aboutdreyer/biography/biography---extended.aspx.

Nordisk Film International Sales. "*Leaves from Satan's Book* Dialog List." TrustNordisk ApS, November 11, 2009. http://files.trustnordisk.com/files/ftpfiles/movies/NF152/private/Dialoglist_Org_Leaves_From_Satans_Book.pdf.

"Not Against Flesh." *The Film Daily*. August 14, 1934, sec. Reviews, 6.

Olbricht, Erika Mae. "Constructing the Dead Author: Postmodernism's Rhetoric of Death." In *Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, 66–78. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 146. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Olsen, Ole. *Filmens Eventyr og mit eget* [The adventure of film and my own]. [Selected excerpts translated by Peter Schepelern, 2013.] Copenhagen: Jespersen og Pios Forlag, 1940.

———. “Olsen to Dreyer, Nordisk Film (Copenhagen), March 24, 1919.” [Translated by Birgit Granhøj Dam, 2013.] Carl Th. Dreyer Collection, shelf no. 2834. Danish Film Institute.

Olszewski, Edward J. “How Leonardo Invented *Sfumato*.” *Source: Notes in the History of Art* 31, no. 1 (Fall 2011): 4–9.

Orgelfinger, Gail. “Carl Dreyer’s Passion Play in *Jeanne d’Arc* and *Jesus*.” *Film & History: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Film and Television Studies*, Film & History CD-ROM Annual, 2003, 1–32.

Pacific Film Archive. “*Blade Af Satans Bog* Program Note,” [1989] University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu /cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31320.

———. “*Der Var Engang* Program Note,” n.d. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail ?docId=31375.

———. “*Glomdalsbruden* Program Note,” n.d. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail ?docId=31286.

———. “Jesus in the Cinema: ‘Leaves from Satan’s Notebook’ Program Note,” August 15 [?]. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http:// www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31325.

“Paris.” *Variety*. July 5, 1978, sec. International, 28. Variety Archives.

Paris, James Reid. *The Great French Films*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1983.

Parker, Kit. "Vampyr Distributor Material." Kit Parker Films, 1979. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31409.

P. B. W. "New Joan of Arc Film in Berlin." *The Christian Science Monitor*. December 24, 1928, Pacific edition, 8.

Pedoto, Constance A. *Painting Literature: Dostoevsky, Kafka, Pirandello, and García Márquez in Living Color*. Lanham, MD, and London: University Press of America, 1993.

Petrie, Graham. *Hollywood Destinies: European Directors in America, 1922–1931*. Rev. ed. Contemporary Film and Television Series. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2002.

Pierce, David. *The Survival of American Silent Feature Films: 1912–1929*. CLIR Publication 158. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources and The Library of Congress, 2013. Available at http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub158/pub158.pdf.

Pipolo, Anthony Thomas. "Carl Dreyer's *La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc*: A Comparison of Prints and a Formal Analysis." PhD Diss., New York University, 1981. ProQuest (303161866).

———. “The Spectre of JOAN OF ARC: Textual Variations in the Key Prints of Carl Dreyer’s Film.” *Film History: An International Journal* 2, no. 4 (December 1988): 301–24.

Podselver, Judith. “Motion Pictures in Denmark.” *Hollywood Quarterly* 3, no. 2 (Winter 1947–48): 195–99. doi:10.2307/1209369.

Poremba, Cindy. “Point and Shoot: Remediating Photography in Gamespace.” *Games and Culture: A Journal of Interactive Media* 2, no. 1 (January 2007): 49–58. doi:10.1177/1555412006295397.

Potamkin, Harry Alan. “The Passion of Jean D’Arc.” *National Board of Review Magazine* 4, no. 1 (January 1929): 7–9. Internet Archive.

Potter, Nicole. “Conversation with Richard Einhorn.” *Films in Review* 47, no. 3/4 (April 1996): 31–33.

Pratt, George C., ed. *Spellbound in Darkness: A History of the Silent Film*. Rev. ed. Greenwich, CT: New York Graphic Society, 1973.

Queensland Art Gallery, and Gallery of Modern Art. “Carl Theodor Dreyer.” *Past Cinema Programs*, December 3, 2011. http://www.qagoma.qld.gov.au/cinematheque/past_programs/2011/carl_theodor_dreyer.

Queiros-Conde, Diogo. “The Turbulent Structure of *Sfumato* within *Mona Lisa*.” *Leonardo* 37, no. 3 (June 2004): 223–28.

Rayns, Tony. “Full-Length Audio Commentary.” *Vampyr (“The Strange Adventure of Allan Gray”)*. DVD (Region 2 PAL). Spine # 25. The Masters of Cinema Series. London: Eureka Video, 2008.

Read, Paul, and Mark-Paul Meyer, eds. *Restoration of Motion Picture Film*. Butterworth-Heinemann Series in Conservation and Museology. Oxford and Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2000.

“Reissues Pay Off in Paris Houses.” *Variety*, March 12, 1952, 11. Variety Archives.

Remix of a famous silent movie [La Passion de Jeanne d’Arc]. “Trial of Joan of Arc ~ Remix.” YouTube video, 9:40, posted by Philippe Lejeune, June 27, 2012. https: //www.youtube.com/watch?v=iVIZb82_rIo&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=12.

“Restore Carl Dreyer 1931 ‘Vampyr’; Rohauer Intends To Stop Bootleg Copies.” *Variety*. October 28, 1964, sec. Pictures, 16. Variety Archives.

Rideout, Ernie. “Hearing Voices: Richard Einhorn Follows His Own.” *Keyboard* 22, no. 3 (March 1996): 60–62.

Rob Byrd’s guitar score. “The Passion of Joan of Arc- Rob Byrd.” YouTube video, 3:38, posted by “dustypony,” May 11, 2008. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v =OMiY8wrFNrA&index=14&list=PL8bUerIUR nxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy.

Rockett, Will H. “Landscape and Manscape: Reflection & Distortion in Horror Films.” *Post Script* 3, no. 1 (Fall 1983): 19–34.

Roos, Jørgen. *Carl Th. Dreyer*. DVD (Region 2 PAL). Spine # 25. The Masters of Cinema. Copenhagen: Statens filmcentral and Danske filminstitut, 2008.

Rosa Rio Hammond. "Dreyer's Joan of Arc with Rosa Rio Hammond Organ Score (60-Sec Clip)." YouTube video, 1:01, posted by "montrealfilmguy," December 30, 2014. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tGXkVNWoh10&list=PL8bUerIURnxQT8mvjFR8QIOnTH7gwhzDy&index=4.

Rudkin, David. *Vampyr*. BFI Film Classics. London: British Film Institute, 2005.

Ruhemann, Helmut. "Leonardo's Use of *Sfumato*." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 1, no. 4 (September 1961): 231–37.

Sadoul, Georges. *Dictionary of Films*. Edited and translated by Peter Morris. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

———. *French Film*. National Cinema Series. London: Falcon Press, 1953.

Sandberg, Mark B. "Mastering the House: Performative Inhabitation in Carl Th. Dreyer's *The Parson's Widow*." In *Northern Constellations: New Readings in Nordic Cinema,* edited by C. Claire Thomson, 23–42. Series A 26. Norwich, UK: Norvik Press, 2006.

———. "Pocket Movies: Souvenir Cinema Programmes and the Danish Silent Cinema." *Film History: An International Journal* 13, no. 1 (March 2001): 6–22. doi:10.2307/3815409.

Sarris, Andrew. "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962." *Film Culture*, no. 27 (Winter 1962–63): 1–8.

Schallert, Edwin. “The Tragic Ending of Jeane d’Arc.” *Los Angeles Times*. February 24, 1929, sec. Weekly Film Pictorial Section: The Pre-view, I8.

Schatz, Thomas. *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

Schedule of Exhibitions and Events. Press Release. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, January 1, 1957. MoMA: Press Release Archives. http://www.moma.org/pdfs/docs/press_archives/2142/releases/MOMA_1956_0123_114.pdf?2010.

Schefer, J. L. “Vampyr Program Notes.” Bologna Film Festival, 1999. 20–21. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31426.

Schiller, Suzanne Ilene. “Black and White and Brilliant: Protecting Black-and-White Films from Color-Recoding.” *Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal* 9, no. 3 (Spring 1987): 523–43.

Schrader, Paul. *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Schröder, Stephan Michael. “History Without Diegesis. *The Little Trumpeter* (1909) as an Example of a Danish Historical Film of the Early Silent Film Era.” In *Film as History / History as Film*, edited by Patrick Vonderau, 23–48. Vol. 21. Working Papers “Gemenskaper - Gemeinschaften.” Florence and Berlin: European University Institute, Florence, Italy; Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 1999. Available at http://www2.hu-berlin.de/skan /gemenskap/inhalt/publikationen/arbeitspapiere/ahe _21_sms.html.

———. “Screenwriting for Nordisk 1906–1918.” In *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, edited by Lisbeth Richter Larsen and Dan Nissen, 96–113. Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2006.

———. “The Script Consultant.” *Carl Th. Dreyer - The Man and His Work*, August 11, 2010. http://english.carlthdreyer.dk/aboutdreyer/biography/the-script-consultant.aspx.

Schudson, Michael. “Colorization and Authenticity.” *Society* 24, no. 4 (June 1987): 18–19.

Segal, Lewis. “A Once-Silent Joan of Arc Now Hears ‘Voices.’” *Los Angeles Times*, August 19, 1995, sec. Entertainment. http://articles.latimes.com/1995-08-19/entertainment /ca-36863_1_silent-film.

Sellors, C. Paul. *Film Authorship: Auteurs and Other Myths*. Short Cuts 47. London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2010.

Senn, Bryan. “The Enigma of ‘Vampyr.’” *Midnight Marquee*, no. 49 (Summer 1995): 5–10.

Shaw, Russell. “Returning Quality to Classic Film.” *World & I* 9, no. 5 (May 1994): 184+.

Shepard, David. “Silent Film in the Digital Age.” In *Celluloid Goes Digital: Historical-Critical Editions of Films on DVD and the Internet*, edited by Martin Loiperdinger, 23–28. Vol. 12. Filmgeschichte International [International Film History]. Germany: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2003.

Silverman, Sime. “Passion of Joan of Arc.” *Variety*. April 10, 1929, sec. Film Reviews, 25.

Sinnott, John. “Michael : DVD Talk Review of the DVD Video.” *DVD Talk*, November 21, 2004. http://www.dvdtalk.com/reviews/13362/michael/.

Smith, Palmer. “Reel Reviews.” *The Evening (NY) World*. December 14, 1926, 28.

Smither, Roger, and Catherine A. Surowiec, eds. “A Calendar of Film Fires.” In *This Film Is Dangerous: A Celebration of Nitrate Film*, 429–53. Brussels, Belgium: International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF), 2002.

Societe Generale de Films. “*Announcing To The Screens Of America An Unusual Cinematographic Achievement*, ‘The Passion of Joan of Arc’; A CARL DREYER PRODUCTION *of* Societe Generale De Films; Paris, France.” *The Film Daily*, February 9, 1928.

———. “A Super Production *From France*: The PASSION *of* JOAN *of* ARC.” *Motion Picture News*, February 11, 1928.

———. “SOCIETE GENERALE DE FILMS *of* PARIS, FRANCE *Invite the Attention of Critical America to an Unusual Motion Picture*, ‘The PASSION of JOAN of ARC’, A CARL DREYER PRODUCTION; A Cinematographic Inspiration.” *Motion Picture News*, February 18, 1928.

"SRO Attendance at Odense Fest." *Variety*. August 14, 1985, sec. Pictures, 6, 22. Variety Archives.

Stanbrook, Alan. "Great Films of the Century —— No. 12: The Passion of Joan of Arc." *Films and Filming* 8 (June 1961): 11–13, 40–41.

Strong, William S. "Legal Shadings." *Society* 24, no. 4 (June 1987): 19–21.

Swaab, Peter. "'Un Film Vampirisé': Dreyer's *Vampyr*." *Film Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (Summer 2009): 56–62. doi:10.1525/fq.2009.62.4.56.

Taylor, Jim, Charles G. Crawford, Christen M. Armbrust, and Michael Zink. *Blu-Ray Disc Demystified*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2009.

Taylor, Jim, Mark R. Johnson, and Charles G. Crawford. *DVD Demystified*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006.

Teitel, Charles. "Chicago Boasts Top Film Critics, Part Of Solid Tradition." *Daily Variety*. January 21, 1983, 14, 53. Variety Archives.

"The Associated Students of Occidental College Present LA PASSION DE JEANNE D'ARC and VIVRE SA VIE," January 13, 1967. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32132.

"The Passion of Joan of Arc." *The Film Daily*, April 14, 1929, 12.

"The Passion of Joan of Arc." *The Film Daily*. September 9, 1933, 4.

"'The Passion of Joan of Arc' at Fine Arts." *Daily Boston Globe*. March 29, 1930, 5.

"'The Passion of Joan of Arc' Exhibitor Manual." Capital Film Exchange, 1933. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip .berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32154.

"'The Passion of Joan of Arc' Sherman S. Krellberg Distributor Materials," 1933. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip .berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32147.

"The Strange Adventure of David Gray." *Close Up* 8, no. 1 (March 1931): 47–51.

Thomas, Kevin. "Movie Reviews: 2 Dreyer Films in Retrospective." *Los Angeles Times*. August 9, 1982, sec. Part VI: Calendar, 3.

Thompson, Kristin, and David Bordwell. *Film History: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010.

Thomsen, Preben. "Working with Dreyer." In *Carl Th. Dreyer: Danish Film Director, 1889–1968*, edited by Søren Dyssegaard, 15–16, 18. Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen: Presentation Books, 1969.

Thomson, David. *The New Biographical Dictionary of Film*. 5th ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2010.

Thorsen, Isak. "Ole Olsen's Sense of Film." Translated by Lars Kaaber. *Journal of Scandanavian Cinema* 2, no. 1 (March 2012): 27–32. doi:10.1386/jsca.2.1.27_1.

———. "The Rise and Fall of the Polar Bear." In *100 Years of Nordisk Film*, edited by Lisbeth Richter Larsen and Dan Nissen, 52–71. Copenhagen: Danish Film Institute, 2006.

———. "'We Had to Be Careful.' The Self-Imposed Regulations, Alterations and Censorship Strategies of Nordisk Films Kompagni 1911-1928." *Scandinavian-Canadian Studies* 19 (2010): 112–26.

Tinée, Mae. "Trial, Burning of Joan of Arc Put on Screen." *Chicago Daily Tribune*. January 14, 1930, 31.

Toronto International Film Festival. "The Open Vault: Le Passion de Jeanne D'Arc [Program Notes]." TIFF, September 1985. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=32143.

———. "Vampyr 'Festival of Festivals' [Program Notes]." TIFF, September 7, 1983. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. https://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31411

Trask, C. Hooper. "Berlin's New Pictures." *New York Times*. July 31, 1932, sec. 9: Screen, X3.

Tronsden, Trond S., and Jan Bielawski. "Looking Beyond the Edge — A Look at TV Overscan." *Nostalghia.com*, June 21, 2009. http://people.ucalgary.ca/~tstronds/nostalghia.com/TheTopics/Overscan.html.

Truffaut, François. "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema." In *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, edited by Barry Keith Grant, 9–18. Malden, MA, and Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Turan, Kenneth. “Silent Films and Their Soaring Music Are Rediscovered.” *Los Angeles Times*. October 25, 2014. http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/movies/la-et-mn-on-film-kenny-silent-films-joan-of-arc-20141026-column.html#page=1.

Tybjerg, Casper. “An Art of Silence and Light: The Development of the Danish Film Drama to 1920.” PhD Diss., University of Copenhagen, 1996.

———. “Audio Essay.” *The Passion of Joan of Arc*. DVD (NTSC). Spine #62. The Criterion Collection. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 1999.

———. “Distinguished Compositions : The Use of Paintings as Visual Models in Danish Silent Films.” *Engeki Eizo*, 2010 Annual Report, 1, no. 1 (March 2012): 85–98.

———. “Dreyer and the National Film in Denmark.” *Film History* 13, no. 1 (March 2001): 23–36.

———. “Forms of the Intangible: Carl Th. Dreyer and the Concept of ‘Transcendental Style.’” *Northern Lights: Film & Media Studies Yearbook* 6, no. 1 (2008): 59–73.

———. “Full-Length Audio Commentary.” Michael *(80th Anniversary Edition)*. DVD (PAL). Spine # 3. The Masters of Cinema Series. London: Eureka Video, 2004.

———. “Red Satan: Carl Theodor Dreyer and the Bolshevik Threat.” In *Nordic Explorations: Film Before 1930*, edited by John Fullerton and Jan Olsson, 19–40. Stockholm Studies in Cinema. Sydney, Australia: John Libbey, 1999.

———. “Stunt-Stories: The Sensation Film Genre in Denmark.” In *Celebrating 1895: The Centenary of Cinema*, edited by John Fullerton, 145–51. Sydney, Australia: John Libbey, 1998.

———. “Two Passions – One Film?” In The Passion of Joan of Arc *Blu-Ray Book*, 67–73. The Masters of Cinema Series. Spine # 50. London: Eureka Entertainment, 2012.

———. *Visual Essay*. *Vampyr*. DVD (NTSC). Spine # 437. Disc 2: Supplements. The Criterion Collection. Irvington, NY: The Criterion Collection, 2008.

Tybjerg, Casper, and Thomas C. Christensen. “The Restoration of Dreyer’s *Der var engang*.” *Journal of Film Preservation* 67 (June 2004): 31–36.

University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. “Carl Theodor Dreyer.” *BAM/PFA - Film Programs*, November 5, 2010. http://bampfa.berkeley.edu/film/FN18859.

Usai, Paolo Cherchi. “The Conservation of Moving Images.” *Studies in Conservation* 55, no. 4 (December 2010): 250–57.

“Vampyr (1932).” *Criterion Collection, The*. Accessed August 4, 2015. https://www.criterion.com/films/661-vampyr.

“Vampyr Program Notes,” April 1989. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31410.

“Vampyr Synopsis,” n.d. 10. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://cinefiles.bampfa.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31423.

Van Ness, Wilhelmina. “Joseph Delteil: *The Passion of Joan of Arc*.” *Literature Film Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (Fall 1975): 292–98.

Vaughan, Dai. “Carl Dreyer and the Theme of Choice.” *Sight and Sound* 43, no. 3 (Summer 1974): 156–62.

[Vossische Zeitung]. “Joan of Arc Picture.” *New York Times*. January 20, 1929, sec. 8, X7.

Wallmüller, Julia. “Criteria for the Use of Digital Technology in Moving Image Restoration.” *The Moving Image* 7, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 78–91. doi:10.1353/mov.2007.0032.

Walsh, Peter. “IFI Blog: Carl Dreyer Season: The Early Films.” *IFI Blog*, March 30, 2012. http://irishfilminstitute.blogspot.com/2012/03/carl-dreyer-season-early-films.html.

Walter, Philippe. “Chemical Analysis and Painted Colours: The Mystery of Leonardo’s *Sfumato*.” *European Review* 21, no. 2 (May 2013): 175–89. doi:10.1017/S1062798712000348.

Weinberg, Herman G. “Dreyer’s Joan.” *Sight and Sound* 44, no. 3 (Summer 1975), sec. Correspondence: 197.

———. *Saint Cinema: Writings on Film, 1929–1970*. 2nd ed. New York: Dover Publications, 1973.

———, and Gretchen Weinberg. “Vampyr - An Interview with Baron de Gunzburg.” *Film Culture*, no. 32 (Spring 1964): 56–59.

Weiss, Marion Wolberg. “A Film By...” *The Independent* 21 (March 1998): 30–33.

Whitney, W. W. “Little Theater.” *The Washington Post*. September 9, 1929, sec. The New Week’s Bills, 14.

Wilkinson, Lynn. “Fragments of Det Var Engang.” Pacific Film Archive, n.d. University of California, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive. http://www.mip.berkeley.edu/cinefiles/DocDetail?docId=31374.

Wilson, Robert N. “Green and Other Colors.” *Society* 24, no. 4 (June 1987): 21–23.

Wood, Bret. “Leaves from Satan’s Book.” *Turner Classic Movies*, 2004. http://www.tcm.com/this-month/article/81392|0/Leaves-from-Satan-s-Book.html.

Wrigley, Nick. “Der Var Engang, Dfi Dvd.” *Carldreyer.com*, 2003. http://www.mastersofcinema.org/dreyer/resources/dervarengangdvd.htm.

———. “Dreyer’s *Michael* – 80 Years Old.” In Michael *DVD Booklet*, 13–15. The Masters of Cinema Series. Spine # 3. London: Eureka, 2004.

Young, James O. “In Defence of Colourization.” *British Journal of Aesthetics* 28, no. 4 (Autumn 1988): 368–72. doi:10.1093/bjaesthetics/28.4.368.

Zimmer, Mark. “dOc DVD Review: Michael (Mikael) (1924).” *digitallyOBSESSED!*, December 9, 2004. http://www.digitallyobsessed.com/displaylegacy.php?ID=6696.

Zyber, Joshua. “How to Appreciate High Def.” *Home Theater* 15, no. 10 (October 2008): 34–39.

APPENDIX

Transcriptions of Handwritten Letters from Carl Th. Dreyer's *Præsidenten* (*The President*)

APPENDIX

Transcriptions of Handwritten Letters from Carl Th. Dreyer's *Præsidenten* (*The President*)

Content	DVD (PAL) Time Code Reference
1. [To: Karl Victor] Although I do not curse you, but wish with all my heart that you do not sacrificed me and my daughter, whom I have named Victorine after you, in vain. -Hermine [letter displayed two different times]	0:17:34 – 0:17:47; 0:26:43 – 0:26:55
2. [To: Karl Victor] Dear Friend: I shall come to you in order to talk to you about the wretched Victorine Lippert, infanticide, whom I am to defend. Werner always applies the death penalty in such dread cases, as you know, and I therefore beseech you to take over the bench in this case. -Your devoted friend, Geery Berger	0:19:17 – 0:19:34
3. [Karl Victor to Hermine Lippert] Darling: I cannot marry you, although I love you, I cannot. An oath that I swore my father renders it impossible. Try to forget me, and believe me, an alliance between us would be our ruin.	0:26:03 – 0:26:19
4. [the Countess' son to his mother] Well, mother dear, now I have confessed to you. You must admit that she [Victorine] is at least as much to blame as I am, and I hope that you will sort things out as well as possible.	0:37:17 – 0:37:37
5. [mother Hermine to daughter Victorine] ...but if fate should ever lead you to your father, tell him that I have forgiven him.	0:47:58 – 0:48:05
6. [messenger to Karl Victor] The Minister of Justice has authorized me to inform you that you have been promoted to president of the residency town, and that you are to take up your post within four days. Accordingly, you will avoid having to carry out the death sentence passed upon the	0:52:17 – 0:52:37

Content	DVD (PAL) Time Code Reference
infanticide, Victorine Lippert, whose petition for clemency has been turned down.	
7. [To: Berger] I hereby inform you that your petition for clemency for the condemned infanticide, Victorine Lippert has been turned down. -O. Krause.	0:54:25 – 0:54:36
8. To his Excellency the Minister of Justice, I hereby tender my resignation. I am ailing, and under no circumstances am I able to undertake any task save that of my own recovery. -Your humble servant, Karl Victor von Sendigen	1:06:36 – 1:06:54
9. [To: Berger] I know that you cannot forgive me and I do not ask you to. Promise me but one thing: Do not give up hope that one day you will again consider me worthy of your respect. -Your friend, Karl Victor	1:10:18 – 1:10:34