

Reproducing Languages, Translating Bodies

Approaches to Speech, Translation and Cultural Identity
in Early European Sound Film

Anna Sofia Rossholm



Stockholm University

© Anna Sofia Rossholm, Stockholm 2006

Cover image: Publicity still from *Generalen* (Paramount, 1931)

ISSN 1653-4859

ISBN 91-85445-50-9

Printed in Sweden by US-AB, Stockholm 2006

Distributor: Almqvist & Wiksell International, Stockholm

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 11 |
| Purpose of the Study..... | 12 |
| Object of Analysis | 13 |
| Theoretical Perspectives and Delimitations..... | 14 |
| Discursive Levels..... | 15 |
| European Film and Cultural Identities..... | 16 |
| Early Sound Film in a Modernity Context..... | 17 |
| Versions and Intermediality: Film as Text and Event | 18 |
| “Heteroglossia”, Translation and Media | 20 |
| Outline and Chapter Preview | 20 |
| “Heteroglossia” of Speech and Sound Universalism | 23 |
| Theoretical and Historical Perspectives on Speech and Sound Recording | 23 |
| “I am talking into a microphone”..... | 23 |
| Framing Speech Reproduction | 24 |
| Real Voices and Language | 27 |
| Two Forces of Power..... | 27 |
| Body versus Language | 29 |
| The Language of Sound..... | 31 |
| Sound and Writing | 31 |
| Pure Sounds and Language Norms..... | 33 |
| The Utopia of a Universal Language..... | 36 |
| Transposition versus Translation | 37 |
| Media Transposition and Decoding..... | 37 |
| “Untranslatability” and Speech Simulation | 41 |
| Sound Practice and Speech Representation..... | 45 |
| Speech Heteroglossia in Time and Space | 45 |
| Struggle of Power | 47 |
| Language(s) of Sound Film: the Regional, the Multilingual and Hollywood English..... | 51 |
| The Fall of the Tower of Babel | 51 |
| Film Universalism and Cultural Differentiation | 51 |
| “Sounds of the World”: Sound Film versus Talking Picture | 53 |
| Speech as Regional and Social Signifier..... | 56 |
| Non-verbal Voices | 56 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Speech as Voice and Diction | 58 |
| “These people have an accent the way others have a black skin” | 61 |
| Multilingual Representations | 64 |
| Internationalism and Polyglossia | 64 |
| Translation and Communication in Bi-lingual Films..... | 66 |
| Europeanism as Differentiation | 68 |
| Hollywood English..... | 70 |
| Americanism and Sound Film | 70 |
| Vernacular American Speech | 71 |
| American Language and Power..... | 74 |
| Sound, Image and Writing: Hybrid Talkies and Figures of Transposition..... | 77 |
| Filmic Speech Representation | 77 |
| Perspectives on Versions and Intermedia..... | 78 |
| Intertitles and Sound | 80 |
| Criticism of “Silent” Speech..... | 80 |
| Intertitles as Graphics | 82 |
| Part-talkies and Silent Versions as Hybrids | 83 |
| Writing and Sound as Figures, Motifs and Themes | 88 |
| Writing and “Spaceless” Voices: <i>Prix de beauté</i> and <i>The Phantom of the Opera</i> .. | 88 |
| Figures of Media Transposition..... | 92 |
| Translation as (A)synchronisation: Titling and Dubbing | 98 |
| Approaches to Film Translation..... | 98 |
| Double Language in Film Translation | 99 |
| Synchronisation in Classical Cinema | 101 |
| Translation in Early Sound Film | 105 |
| Media Materialisation and Synchronisation as Liveness | 105 |
| Differentiation of Translation Techniques..... | 107 |
| Aspects of Cultural Representation..... | 110 |
| Translators as “Near-equivalence” | 112 |
| Media Transposition in Dubbing Techniques | 113 |
| Inscription/Simulation, Voice/Body, Unification/Separation | 115 |
| Example: <i>M – le maudit</i> | 117 |
| Translating Bodies and Imaginary Geographies: Polyglot Stardom | 120 |
| Multiple Language Version Film | 120 |
| Production Background: Joinville, Babelsberg and Elstree | 121 |
| Framing Language Versions..... | 122 |
| MLV as Representation of Transnational Identity..... | 125 |
| Homogenisation or Differentiation?..... | 125 |
| MLVs as Allegories of Imaginary Geographies | 128 |
| MLV-stardom | 131 |
| Intersections of Versions and Star Images..... | 131 |
| MLV Star Types | 132 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Version Production as Star Image: Lilian Harvey | 134 |
| Foreign Accents and Polyglot Voices | 139 |
| Film, Theatre and Translation of the Local: <i>Marius</i> in Sweden | 144 |
| Translating the Modern | 144 |
| Joinville – A Sausage Factory..... | 144 |
| <i>Marius</i> as Vernacular Modernism | 145 |
| The Swedish Versions | 147 |
| Production Background | 149 |
| <i>Marius</i> – Untranslatable but Exportable | 151 |
| Between “Dramaten” and the Talkies | 152 |
| Between the Oscars Theatre and an Imaginary “Far-away” | 156 |
| Marseille as Real Location or No-Man’s-Land..... | 158 |
| Conclusions..... | 162 |

Introduction

The DVD market and films available on the internet have turned film translation into a heterogeneous phenomenon of varying quality. My worst personal experience of this was in Paris when I saw the German film, *Kebab Connection* (Annu Saol, 2005), a comedy about Turkish immigrants in Hamburg. The film was on DVD, dubbed into *Turkish* with French subtitles, written in haste on what I assume was a Turkish keyboard. Expressions such as “bien sûr” were spelled “bın şür”, and the dubbing ruined the language mixing as an important feature of the story, originally spoken in German, Turkish and Greek. This is an example of how contemporary digital culture has had an impact on film translation. Films can be projected in various media versions and anyone who has access to a computer can be a translator.

Today’s situation has parallels to the “fall of the Tower of Babel” during the period of conversion from silent to sound film in the late 1920s. The lack of translation standards, the large number of film versions and the possibility for an individual exhibitor to choose translation techniques, dominated the years of early sound film. As in the late 1920s, we now witness a period of transition. Today’s translation practice is embodied in a transnational media culture, in which different language versions (not just of film) are accessible to all through global communication.

It is telling that the polyglot character of *Kebab Connection* was replaced by a mix of translated languages. The French subtitles with traces of Turkish (and the Turkish dubbing replacing German, Turkish and Greek) represents transnational processes on several levels, the level of translation, as well as the level of cultural differentiation in the fictional story. It might seem as if these levels stand in conflict (since the Turkish dubbing removed the multilingual speech in the film), but I would prefer to see them as interrelated. *Kebab Connection* is only one of many “immigrant films” which feature the multilingual as an effective means of describing cultural identities. One can speak of a multilingual trend in contemporary cinema. The French *L’Auberge espagnole* (Cédric Klapisch, 2002) uses polyglot representation to illustrate a European multilingual culture, and a film such as *The World* (Zhang Ke Jia, 2004) depicts global labour exploitation by featuring workers who speak Mandarin, Shanxi and Russian. This trend of polyglot or multilingual film is notable also in films where the globally powerful English language is combined with other languages. The film, *The Interpreter* (Sydney Pollack, 2005), uses the fictional African language “Ku”, a creation

which adopts aspects of Bantu languages spoken in Eastern and Southern Africa. A similar construction is seen in Steven Spielberg's *The Terminal* (2004), in which Tom Hanks, impersonating a tourist from the fictional country Krakozhia, speaks Bulgarian, while all written documentation from this made-up country is in Russian. In these cases, the linguistic amalgam naturally gives a strange impression to audiences understanding the represented languages (or traces of languages). Multilingual representation displaces and generates a malleable character of "foreign" and "native". It reveals that speech representation inevitably delivers *meaning* to the members of the audience who understand the spoken language, while it represents *sounds* to those who do not.

The multilingual might be seen as a reflection of contemporary accessibility to language versions, today, as well as during the period of transition to sound. In the early 1930s, the multilingual was a common meta-filmic feature depicting the end of the "Esperanto" of silent film by the introduction of speech. It was also, as today, a means of reflecting issues such as Americanisation, exoticism, Europeanism or cultural homogenisation, topics frequently debated in Europe during the 1920s and 1930s. If early sound film has been increasingly discussed in contemporary film research, it is probably because this period can help us deal with today's problems of media diversity and crisis of cinematic culture. This dissertation is an attempt to study this period further by considering multilingual and translation issues in interaction with a context of media diversity.

Purpose of the Study

This study discusses and analyses the conceptualisation of recorded/filmed speech, translation, and cultural identity in film discourses in early sound film. I primarily focus on the French/German context; films and discourses on film are theorised in a broader context of filmic speech representation. My points of departure are three dichotomies: 1. "universal language" vs. "linguistic diversity", 2. "media transposition" vs. "language translation", and 3 "speech as words" vs. "speech as body" (in terms of ethnicity, gender, etc.). An important aspect in order to discuss these topics is the problem of "versions", both different translated versions, and versions in different media of speech representation.

The study begins with a theoretical and historical introduction, in which I develop the topic of the representation of speech in reproduction media focusing on early sound technology and language theories predominantly from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The five subsequent chapters discuss various topics from the era of early sound film: "speech discourses" in chapter two, film speech as a multimedia issue in chapter three, the various means of translating, and the cultural and media technological implica-

tions of film translation in chapters four, five and six. Chapter four offers a general discussion on film translation in the period of the coming of sound with a focus on dubbing, subtitles and inter-titling. The two last chapters deal exclusively with the multiple language version film, a translation practice based on re-making the same script in different languages.

The purpose of the study, generally speaking, is to frame media, translation and speech representation from a number of theoretical perspectives in order to highlight how these issues are interrelated. Translation and version making in the early sound film have rarely been theorised in previous research (with a few significant exceptions that I will return to) and the different modes of translation have often been regarded as distinct isolated phenomena. Moreover, film theoretical studies about translation approach these issues from a-historical or transhistorical perspectives. By correlating theory with a historical focus, I aim to contextualise issues beyond translation as a language issue and shed new light on topics that previously have been referred to as details (such as polyglot film, the foreign accent and stars' language acquisition) or as phenomena considered to be unrelated to "cinematic quality" (such as "filmed theatre").

Object of Analysis

The empirical basis for the analysis consists primarily of a sample selection of French, German and Swedish fiction films and press material from the period approximately 1929-1933. Rather than an empirical approach based on systematic examination of a limited material, I emphasise examples and cases from different contexts. The study partly, but not exclusively, relies on new press material. I also use examples from previous research which I contextualise and reframe from theoretical perspectives chosen to highlight an overall discussion. The focus is on films (as "texts"), reception of films, stars and in particular the different versions in which the films are made: sound and silent versions, different language versions, either by the use of dubbing or subtitling, or the practice of multiple-language-version (MLV) film. I have chosen a mixed selection of avant-garde and broad entertainment film with an emphasis, however, on the popular context.

The press material is both related to the reception of specific films and broader topics such as subtitling, dubbing or the accents of foreign stars. In particular, I emphasise trans-cultural reception, for example, the European reception of American "talkies" or the French reception of German stars. The press material consists of both popular film magazines such as *Pour Vous*, *Cinémonde* or *Mein Film*, or trade press, primarily *La cinématographie française*. I also consulted *Variety* (in relation to topics which are more general and not linked to the specifically European context), and the British *Kine Weekly* and *Bioscope*. In the last chapter, in which I make a case

study of a Swedish language version, I utilised Swedish daily press and popular film magazines. Apart from the press material, I also discuss film theoretical interventions from this period as an important discourse in order to conceptualise film speech and translation, linked to both analysis and popular or industrial press material. Of particular interest is Béla Balázs inquiry on “speech physiognomy” which merges sound technology with issues dealing with sound as “racial” or social “types”.

The empirical material is emphasised differently in each chapter. In chapter six, which is a case study, the arguments are primarily based on press material. In other chapters, the selection of articles is more limited and serves as illustrations of “allegorical” readings of more “textual” aspects of film (such as multilingual film or the use of writing in sound film). The discussion on dubbing and titling (chapter four) contains representative examples of issues that are debated in this period related to my overall discussion.

Theoretical Perspectives and Delimitations

One of the main purposes of this study is to combine different theoretical discussions in order to conceptualise the relations between speech, translation and cultural identity in film. Media theory is combined with semiotics, cultural studies, language and translation theory, Mikhail Bakhtin is discussed alongside Friedrich Kittler or Nelson Goodman, Miriam Hansen alongside Richard Dyer, Thomas Elsaesser, Rick Altman or James Lastra. Mirroring the processes of translation and transposition analysed in this study, the different perspectives often serve to explain or highlight the same phenomenon, to “translate” a film or a review in theoretical terms or “transpose” one theoretical perspective onto another.

There is no overall theoretical model, which means that the various sources combine a form of bricolage. I single out key concepts which operate functionally in order to highlight or conceptualise different topics. Kittler’s juxtaposition of translation and media transposition, for example, is useful for my understanding of translation as a media issue. This does not, however, mean that I share Kittler’s belief in technology as the overall basis for all cultural activity. Due to the interdisciplinary character of this study (dealing with translation, language, sound technology, film history, ethnicity, etc.), a multitude of theoretical approaches is necessary. My emphasis lies on *relations* and *combinations* of the various dimensions of “sound film”. For example, instead of analysing speech representation and translation as separated phenomena, I focus on how the cinematic representation of speech interferes with the discussions and practices of translation.

Theoretical considerations will be discussed extensively in chapter one, and also in relation to the different topics in each chapter. I provide a brief survey in this introduction to highlight key concepts and issues.

Discursive Levels

The various empirical sources, the combination of avant-garde and popular film, of film theoretical writing from the period, in combination with press material from fan magazines, etc., emerge from a discursive approach to film history, i.e. an ambition to show how “heterogenous discourses”, to borrow Michel Foucault’s expression, define a specific phenomenon.¹ The approach also follows a discursive logic in the sense that I attach larger cultural significance to specific topics. I read films as “allegories” of a “modernity” context (not in the exact sense as Tom Gunning, though, since film analysis is not my main focus),² and I read reception of polyglot stardom as a signifier of a larger context of ethnicity and voice representation. There are, of course, many aspects or contextual levels which could have been taken into account. The production context of “patent wars” between sound systems or other important industrial issues are, for example, only discussed as background information. The technological manuals aimed at sound technicians are used as secondary empirical material.

My choice of material that targets the audiences (cinephiles or mass audience) naturally influences the result. Even if the technological development of microphones, etc., or production contexts are important, this study focuses on how these technological or industrial discourses take part in a public cinema culture. The texts which are analysed are therefore primarily films and press material. It is also important to note that the reception material is limited to official “readings”, to what was written by journalists in different cultural spheres. Reception is, in cultural studies, often discussed in terms of “resistance” to or in “negotiation”³ with the text. In my reading, such a “negotiation” is located between film and press material, or between different kinds of writing about the films. However, I neither speculate on alternative “unwritten” readings nor discuss reception in terms of actual spectatorship (as cognitive or social activity). The choices of films also naturally influence the results of my analysis. The emphasis on fiction film rather than non-fiction delimits the context to an entertainment or an “art” sphere.

When I began researching this project, I was predominantly interested in analysing canonical films, for example, early sound film classics like René Clair’s *Sous les toits de Paris* (1929) or Josef von Sternberg’s *Der blaue Engel* (1930). With the ambition to write about film history from a less conventional perspective, I soon began to look for alternative film material. This search resulted in an interest in unusual versions of films, such as the Swedish version of Marcel Pagnol’s *Marius* (1931), *Längtan till havet* (John W. Brunius, 1931). Instead of replacing the former material with the latter, I have chosen to merge comments on early sound film classics (that will serve as examples of “speech discourses”), with analyses of less known material. Besides the fact that a presumed reader has probably seen the classic films and can easily follow the discussions, the combination of films which have

their natural place in the conventional film canon and films which are either unknown or have been dismissed as films without interest, I wish to establish a “dialogue” on a historiographical level, emphasising the various ways in which the seemingly uninteresting material highlights the same issues as the “great classics”.

European Film and Cultural Identities

European cinema has been discussed in terms of international relations in recent research.⁴ This is a trend which disrupts traditional approaches to European cinema, traditionally approached either from a national perspective (German film from a Nazi or Weimar perspective or French film from a specific national stylistic perspective, etc.), or by analysis of specific “auteurs”.⁵ These approaches have been questioned by research focusing on national cinema in terms of reception rather than production (for example, by defining “German cinema” as the films screened rather than produced in Germany) as well as by emphasising the co-productions and transnational relations between European countries or between Europe and Hollywood.⁶ The European as transnational is particularly striking in the period of the introduction of sound, with the transnational networks of “Film Europe” (or “Cinema Europe”)⁷ and the popularity of the German sound films all over Europe. Even if my focus lies on media theoretical issues, reception and on the film as “text” rather than production, the pan-European production networks form an important background context for this study. My aim is to investigate the transnational further with a focus on speech as ethnic signifier and translation as means of conceptualising “Europe” as multilingual and in terms of ethnic differentiation.

National identity has during the last decades been discussed in terms of constructions and imaginaries rather than “mirrors” of a “mentality” or actual historical events⁸ (which follows a re-conceptualisation of cultural identity, theorised as either an exotic “imaginative geography”⁹ or “imagined community”¹⁰). Elsaesser’s discussion on national and European identity in terms of “historical imaginary” is particularly interesting from this perspective, since this concept frames how “the distinct properties of the cinematic medium” enables films to “address the spectator as a national subject”.¹¹ A similar approach is taken by Jean-Michel Frodon, who theorises construction of national identity as cinematic “projection”, meaning that the construction of national “imagined community” lies in the filmic disposition. (According to Frodon, cinema and nation has a common “nature”, which is the “projection”.¹²) The cinematic “dispositif” as a means of constructing or “projecting” cultural identity will in my reading be combined with other sources, such as the articles in fan magazines, which also take part in the construction of as historical or geographic “imaginary”. Moreover, in contrast to most previous research which mainly focuses on the visual expression of film, I

will stress the audible and emphasise how the voice partakes in a construction of cultural difference and transnationalism.

As noted above, my analysis is primarily riveted to cultural constructions other than national identity, which for my purposes are more important during this period. I will show how films evoke either regional, European, global or “universal” cultural identities. All these identities are mythical utopias or imaginaries blended with historical reality. Since the utopia of “universalism” is opposed to cultural differentiation as such (which turns “universal cultural identity” into a contradiction in terms), it embodies a paradox: universalism is a construction that can be perceived as a reflection of an actual cultural homogenisation due to globalisation. Universalism is, however, also a utopian imagination of hoping to overcome language barriers and eradicate cultural differences. Both “European” and “universal” imaginaries serve to unite different cultural identities by creating an imaginary overcoming cultural differentiation. Such ideas fuel cultural projects and aesthetics, either the “Film Europe” movement as pan-European, mainly a French-German network in concurrence with Hollywood, or utopias of understanding film as a universal language in the silent era. When it comes to the regional identity evoked primarily by speech as signifier of the regional, a discourse of regional exoticism interacts with a “vernacular modernism” in Miriam Hansen’s use of the term, that is a process in which global mass cultural products are anchored and inflected by a specific regional context.¹³ To this I link a discussion of film voice and ethnicity; by tracing the emphasis on accents in the early sound era to sound technology from the nineteenth century, sound archives and ethnological and linguistic research, I stress the relation between film voices and constructions (or de-constructions) of regional, social or “European” identity correlated with a discourse of “whiteness” in Richard Dyer’s sense of the term.¹⁴

Early Sound Film in a Modernity Context

The early sound film period and its historiography have been extensively discussed; of late, the interest in this period has been reinforced and many issues have been revised and reframed. James Lastra, Charles O’Brien, Martin Barnier and Corinna Müller, to name the most prominent examples, have approached the conversion to sound from different national perspectives, addressing previously unknown issues such as intermedial sound technology or exhibition.¹⁵ These studies are, naturally, significant sources for my work, even if they approach this period from a primarily industrial point of view and even though translation is not emphasised as a main issue. More important, for my purpose, is scholarship on multiple language version production which occurs in a number of anthologies, most notable are recent editions of *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*.¹⁶ Nataša Ćurovičová, Leonardo Quaresima, and Joseph Garncarz, among others, have initiated

research on multiple language version production, previously regarded as film history curiosa. Anthologies and articles on these topics are ongoing, continuing research in which this study participates, and to which I have also contributed with a version of chapter six of this study in the 2006 edition of *Cinegraph Babylon in FilmEuropa*.¹⁷

The recent development of digitalisation and the booming DVD market, which has allowed for different editions of films with different language versions on the same disc, has opened up an interest in hybrid film forms and the making of foreign versions. The increasing number of DVD-classics containing several versions¹⁸ is evidence of a direct link between the DVD market and earlier production of film versions. What has been considered to be a historically isolated phenomenon has thus emerged as an object of study in order to conceptualise a broader historical field of film versions.

In my reading, the period of the introduction of sound is understood both as an isolated period with specific problems due to historical conditions and as a period revealing aspects of modernity in a broader perspective. For this purpose, I engage with different theoretical sources. Firstly, I look upon this period as a period of “crisis”, to use Rick Altman’s term, a period with certain characteristics that reflect other crises (such as the contemporary situation of digitalisation and the early cinema period).¹⁹ This stands in opposition to the conception of the transition to sound as a continuity of silent classical story telling, and more popular discourses on the transition period as a step towards something radically different from the silent film.²⁰ Altman links the crisis in sound film transition to other crises, besides reading “film” in the period of crisis as other media. This is combined with a more apparatus-oriented media archaeological point of view, in which sound theory and practice of the early sound period is traced to sound technology of the late nineteenth century.

Lastra’s writings on sound film and sound technology prior to sound film are useful for my analysis; following Lastra, I make a parallel between the intermedial dimension of writing and sound technology in the late nineteenth century and the period of the coming of sound. While Lastra uses the dichotomy of inscription versus simulation of body movements from early sound apparatus as a means to conceptualise technological development and perception in the early sound era, I aim to broaden the relation between text and sound to the problems of translation which also involves cultural practices and ethnic identity.

Versions and Intermediality: Film as Text and Event

I address film versions both as an important aspect of the early sound period and as a point of departure for a discussion of speech representation in film. One of characteristics of a (film) historical “crisis” in Altman’s interpretation of history is the “multiple identity” of film media.²¹ *The Jazz Singer*

(Alan Crosland, 1927) as a “work” between film and gramophone is the most conspicuous example of how a crisis in film history is a crisis involving the very definition of “film”.²² In this study I link the multiple identity to translation and cultural identity. Translation is per se a version, which can be dubbed, subtitled or produced in multiple language versions. The intermedial relation between, for instance, theatre and film versions of the same script is another kind of version making, which became more common with the introduction of sound.

The “word” as a reproducible sign which can be reproduced in different texts without losing its original value - in Nelson Goodman’s words, an “allographic” sign – opens up media differentiation with the word as the common ground.²³ Against this allographic dimension stands the materiality of media. The combination of the replaceable and the irreplaceable and unique constitutes the characteristics of the media and film versions in this period. My aim is to integrate the idea of versions into the topic of sound film’s “multiple identity”. Speech in early sound film is represented by sound recordings, moving images, and written titles. This is in particular the case for the so-called part talkies, which mixed silent and sound film, or sound and silent versions of the same film. This multimedia dimension of speech representation also serves as an understanding of how recorded speech is conceptualised; the concept of “version” is thus extended to a theoretical framework of understanding speech representation in film as such.

There has been an important theoretical shift of the understanding of sound film in academic writing, visible in the differences between the two most influential anthologies on sound film, *Cinema/Sound* from 1980²⁴ and *Sound Theory, Sound Practice* from 1992 (both edited by Rick Altman). In the later anthology, Altman revises the textual perspective on film in the former and proclaims an understanding of film as historical “event”, i.e. part of a technological and cultural context.²⁵

In this study, I combine the textual perspective with a conception of film as event. The version problematic is the key to the combination between textual and contextual analysis. By working with versions in the early sound period, the interdependence between film as historical event and film as text becomes obvious. The singularity of each version in relation to other versions is a purely textual category; the act of comparing involves close reading and an emphasis on detail. The significance of the differences and similarities between versions, however, emerges only by contextualisation. Comparing versions without studying the surrounding historical context yields a purely descriptive (or speculative) result of differences and similarities between the versions. This combination of details and context applies to interpreting any film; versions, however, must inevitably be studied from a perspective combining textuality with contextualisation.

“Heteroglossia”, Translation and Media

Mikhail Bakhtin’s term “heteroglossia”, language diversity, stands in a dialogical relation to its opposite, the “monolingual”. This relation, which according to Bakhtin takes place in the field of literature, written and spoken language, can serve as an understanding of speech reproduction in film. The interaction between the monolingual and heteroglossia is reinforced by reproduction media; sound media generates a number of “speech genres” by reproducing spoken rather than written words. Modern media, however, is also conceptualised as a universal language beyond language and cultural differentiation. The relation between the monolingual utopias is thus linked to the function of reproduction media as such.

Robert Stam proposes a Bakhtinian reading of film in *Subversive Pleasure*.²⁶ In contrast to Stam’s general approach with an emphasis on “heteroglossia” and “polyglossia”, my historical focus on early sound film generates a stronger emphasis on the “monolingual” in interaction with “heteroglossia”. This interaction will also be related to the dichotomy between translation and transposition as described by Friedrich Kittler in *Discourse Networks 1800/1900*. Modern media generates a discourse of concurrence of different means of registration, in a process by which one media is turned into another. This process undermines the classical conception of translation in which two languages are represented in one medium. Translation is both the opposite to universalism (since two languages are involved) and a variation of the myth of the universal language (since translation is about overcoming language differences). The problem of media transposition and language translation is therefore inextricably linked to heteroglossia versus the monolingual.

Outline and Chapter Preview

“Heteroglossia” of Speech and Sound Universalism

In the first chapter, the theoretical problems of speech representation and media are discussed in relation to early sound technology. I will link ideas on languages (primarily Bakhtin’s theory) to theories on sound and media technology. The chapter serves as a historical background and a theoretical probing of the topics that are dealt with in subsequent chapters.

Language(s) of Sound Film: the Regional, the Multilingual and Hollywood English

In the second chapter, I outline three “speech discourses” in the early sound era which function as variations of filmic representations of “the universal language of sound”: 1, regional dialects, 2, the multilingual, and 3, the (Hollywood) American idiom. A selection of films which clearly illustrate these

discourses are contextualised in film theoretical writing on sound and speech (in relation to universalism, regionalism, transculturalism and Americanisation). Consequently, this chapter functions as a background to the issues of version making and translation in subsequent chapters.

Sound, Images and Writing: Hybrid Talkies and Figures of Transposition

In the third chapter, I discuss the multimedia dimension of film. Speech is here not only considered as a sound issue, but represented in moving images, sound and writing. By tracing the resistance to sound to writings about intertitles and close-ups on silent speech, I discuss the means of representing speech in different media in part-talkies and the sound and silent versions. In addition, media transposition as part of speech representation will be discussed as a thematic and stylistic feature by examples from both avant-garde and popular films.

Translation as (A)synchronisation: Titling and Dubbing

In the fourth chapter, media transposition and speech representation in different media is discussed as an issue of translation. Here, I outline the problem of translation in relation to, and in conflict with, media transposition. The emphasis lies in the plurality of translation practices in this period, even if I focus primarily on the various forms of translation by titling (intertitling and subtitling as the most important ones), dubbing and post-synchronisation.

Translating Bodies and Imaginary Geographies: Polyglot Stardom

In the final two chapters, chapters five and six, the practice of multiple language version is analysed. Chapter five deals primarily with polyglot stardom, and the case of the UFA star Lilian Harvey. The use of polyglot stars links translation to the phenomenon of stardom. Film versions and reception, in particular the French reception of the German star, are analysed in order to conceptualise the relation between voice, body, translation and cultural identity.

Film, Theatre and Translation of the Local: Marius in Sweden

The last chapter is a case study of the Swedish version of the Paramount film, *Marius* (Alexander Korda and Marcel Pagnol, 1931), *Längtan till havet* (John. W. Brunius, 1931). Speech as regional signifier as well as the vicissitudes of cultural adaptation here interferes with translation. In this process, other media and arts are discussed, primarily the relation between film and theatre versions of the same drama, but also the relation between records (music or drama) and film.

Concerning film titles, in order to avoid confusion of which version I am referring to, I will write all film titles in their original language. Conse-

quently, when I write about a specific language version, I will use the title of that version. When I write about a film in more general terms, that is, without referring to one of the versions, I use the title of what is perceived as the “original” version (even if in many cases, I argue that there is no original version).

The “polyglossia” of my topic is reflected in my own research, since I work with written sources in four languages. I translate almost all quotes in German, French and Swedish into English with the original text in the footnotes. In order to avoid too many translations (most often between one foreign language into another), in several cases, I quote the whole phrase or section in the foot note in its original language, while I translate only a fragment in the body text. In other examples, I also quote from additional sources in the footnote, then again, only in its original language.

“Heteroglossia” of Speech and Sound Universalism

Theoretical and Historical Perspectives on Speech and Sound Recording

“I am talking into a microphone”

Vitaphone’s opening night in August 1927 began with a short sound film showing Will H. Hays introducing the sound system.²⁷ In this film, Hays explains what he is doing, talking into the microphone and being filmed, and the technology behind the performance. This is one of many information and advertisement films made for the new media of sound film, produced for different sound systems during the later half of the 1920s. This seemingly simple film illustrates the complexity of representing speech in film. Firstly, the film shows the act of performative speech: the spoken words become true and meaningful only in the act of saying them. They thus illustrate the ambiguous position of filmic speech: speech is both an expression of an intelligible message and a kind of physical gesture; a gesture that is an act of saying as well as an act of recording, and therefore a representation of the body as well as an expression of the soundtrack. After Hays has explained how the machine functions, he starts blowing into the microphone and says: “I’m blowing, do you *feel* it? Do you *feel* that I’m blowing?” As if sound would generate a tactile or even olfactory experience, as if the adding of one sense, hearing, would simultaneously generate others. The aim to reach out physically to the audience through a microphone is a significant example of how the addition of sound reinforces the dimension of “the real” embodied in filmic expression and in “the myth of total cinema”, to use André Bazin’s expression.²⁸

Representation of speech cannot be studied without considering the social position of the speaker. The acts of speaking and recording speech are means of power and control; the accent, inevitably connected to the sound reproduction of speech, conveys a social, ethnic and geographic dimension of the word. It is significant that the message in the Vitaphone film is delivered by

a man with power and authority, the president of MPPDA.²⁹ Hays is enlisted to promote American technology and an American sound system; he does so by delivering his message spoken in (some kind of) middle class American English. This social and geographical dimension is part of the representation whether it is voluntarily emphasised or not. The fact that regional and social features could remain undetectable due to the poor quality of reproduction only reinforces this aspect for when the voice is clearly reproduced the accent is noticeable.

Sound technology itself is “universal” in the sense that it is able to reproduce any language and all accents or dialects. The problem of language barriers and translation both disrupts and reinforces the universalism of sound language. The fact that Hays speaks English, while the promotional films of the German sound system Tobis-Klangfilm would contain the same kind of message in German, illustrates a relation embodied in the discourse of film speech between language, voice and sound technology. The sonic dimension of speech reinforces the technology as sound reproduction rather than intelligible words or messages, besides depicting linguistic diversity beyond the differences between languages, i.e. differences between dialects, etc.

The various implications of speech representation in this short film is an example of how early sound film allegorises the development of the medium and the position of the transition to sound in film history. As a film made in order to promote a new sound technology, the Vitaphone film stages the coming of sound as a momentous historical event. We all know that it is just as impossible to single out the first sound film as the first film, and just as insignificant for a deeper understanding of film history. What, however, is important is that technological changes in film history are allegorised in films and discourses on film as if cinema constantly reinvents itself,³⁰ which is particularly striking in a period of crisis such as the conversion to sound. The “fetishism of the first time”,³¹ to use Jean-Louis Comolli’s expression, is part of a process in which films and discourses on film are promulgating myths revealing actual historical processes.

Framing Speech Reproduction

Early sound film stands in an analogous relation to other periods of “emergence”, and, as often argued, the parallels to film and sound technologies in the late nineteenth century are particularly enlightening since this period constitutes an intensified modernity discourse in which issues of modern man’s encounter with media are framed.³² Concerning sound reproduction, Thomas Alva Edison’s article from 1878 in which the inventor listed ten ways in which his newly invented phonograph “was to benefit mankind”, might serve as point of departure for further inquiry of the relation between sound technology and speech representation.³³ Edison predicted that the phonograph would replace written letters, books and other texts. By storing

voice samples, the phonographic recording would also function as technological “memory”. Akin to amateur photography, sound recording was predicted to be preserved as “family records” for future generations. From my perspective, there are three relevant aspects in this description of the future use of the phonograph. Firstly, sound recording is compared with other media. It is placed in both an analogue relation and in a position of concurrence with both writing and photography. Secondly, speech reproduction is foregrounded over reproduction of other sounds and music. Eight out of ten points address speech reproduction, only two music, while none concern the reproduction of other sounds.³⁴ Thirdly, Edison describes the phonograph as a revolutionary invention that will change the media landscape completely. In Edison’s prediction, the ability to record speech does not only represent a major step in the development of sound technology, a continuation of the technology of telephony, telegraphy or registration of sound waves. More is at stake in his view: the technology would change modern man’s use of the written word, and, in the end, change the conditions of all communication.

The ideas in Edison’s visionary list are not historically isolated. They are determined by fantasies of future inventions as well as actual sound technological practices from the decades preceeding the invention of the phonograph. Writings on sound technology in language studies and writings on pre-phonographic sound technological inventions deal with various topics on the relations between sound technology, media and language. Writings on issues which are not directly linked to sound technology, such as language theory and the utopian search of a universal language, carry out traces of the sound technological discourse that dominated the period of the late nineteenth century. As shown by scholars such as James Lastra and Giusy Pisano, these kinds of descriptions are crucial for understanding the early sound film era.³⁵ By using the context of the late nineteenth century as a contextual background, I will discuss the connections and divergences between language and sound media, as well as the topics bearing on speech representation, translation and cultural identity that will be dealt with in subsequent chapters. Theoretical approaches to speech representation, in film theory and literary theory, are highlighted by examples early sound recording, as well as these theories are discussed as overall concepts to frame speech recording. This chapter is hence a survey of research from various perspectives, and an attempt to trace the issues of early sound film addressed in this study to earlier discourses. It is both a theoretical discussion and a historical background to the representation of speech in the era of the early sound film.

I primarily conceptualise and contextualise the relation between, on the one hand, a conception of media as a “language” and, on the other hand, actual spoken languages represented in media. Ella Shohat and Robert Stam considered the problem of speech representation to be in conflict with a semiotic conception of film as a language: “While contemporary theoretical work has concerned itself with film as language, little attention has been

directed to the role of language and language difference *within* film.”³⁶ Film speech has been a subordinated subject in film studies because of the various ideas of film as a specific visual “language”. This conflict is also present in ideas on sound technology, which has been conceptualised analogously to the film medium as a sonic “language” in contrast to verbal or written language. This conflict is, however, presented differently when it comes to sound reproduction. Contrary to writings on moving images, speech representation has always been an important topic in discussions and theories on sound technology. In contrast to moving images, sound recording technology is involved in a number of “vococentric” media,³⁷ in phonographic recordings, radio, sound film etc. Thus, when it comes to sound, the two conceptions of language interact with each other, and the conflict between them is exposed explicitly to a higher degree than in writings about film.

The point of departure in this chapter is the dichotomy between a utopian idea of a universal language versus diversity of languages, understood, that is, in terms of a Bakhtinian struggle between “heteroglossia” and the “monolingual”. Akin to Stam’s reading of film in terms of “polyglossia” and “heteroglossia”, I emphasise a plurality of sign systems and media diversity in relation to language differentiation.³⁸

The possibility to record (to store and reproduce) spoken voices lays the ground for a material “language” of sound beyond language differences. This language is perceived as a universal language, it includes all sounds and all oral utterances. On the other hand, sound reproduction technology also generates a diversity of individual voices beyond the homogeneity of conventional norms of language. Sound recording can be conceptualised between the juxtaposed homogenisation of mediation and the heterogeneity of different mediated voices. This juxtaposition can be traced both in language research, in which sound technology was used in order to study speech, and in collections of sound recordings in the early sound archives that were built in the early twentieth century. The catchall dichotomy “universalism” and “diversity” in turn generates others: sound versus language, writing versus orality, inscription versus simulation, media transposition versus translation, speech versus sound, etc. These polarities do not exclude each other; they are on the contrary dependent of each other. Therefore, my main focus is the interdependence between these seemingly opposite concepts and phenomena.

The unitary principle of media inscription is here discussed in relation to diversity on two levels: firstly, on a concrete linguistic level by which dialects, sociolects, and spoken languages enter a public sphere by means of sound recording, and secondly, on the level of a differentiation of media inscription. Friedrich Kittler’s ideas are particularly illuminating for this, since Kittler links media separation to language diversity in translation, which destabilises the hegemony of literature.³⁹ The technologies of film, gramophone and typewriter generate a process of so called “media transposi-

tion". The processes of media transposition are by Kittler placed in opposition to language translation. This conflict highlights the relations between film media and translation which will be discussed in detail later in this study.

Real Voices and Language

Two Forces of Power

One of the main conflicts of language theory in the twentieth century has its drawback in linguistic approaches that presuppose a static, a-historical structure of language, and different attempts to reject such a view on language as nomenclature.⁴⁰ The latter view is resumed in Ferdinand de Saussure's famous phrase: "*in language itself, there are only differences*"⁴¹. Michael Bakhtin's critical theory places this dichotomy in an illuminating perspective. On the one hand, Bakhtin's dialogistic approach to language takes stand against universalism; just as Antonio Gramsci, he proclaims that the cultural relations of power are inseparable from language.⁴² On the other hand, however, he suggests that the universalistic ideas on language are present in the linguistic cultural sphere. Bakhtin thus places the universalism of language in a historical and cultural perspective.

In the essay, "The Discourse of the Novel", Bakhtin describes two "forces" of language politics and language aesthetics in conflict in a struggle of power: the "centripetal" and the "centrifugal" force. The former force constitutes a "unitary language", and the latter its opposite, linguistic diversity. The unitary language can be understood as a system of linguistic norms created as an attempt to homogenise the potential diversity and to control the so called "heteroglossia" of the text:

The victory of one reigning language (dialect) over the others, the supplanting of languages, their enslavement, the process of illuminating them with the True Word, the incorporation of barbarians and lower social strata into a unitary language of culture and truth, the canonisation of ideological systems, philology with its methods of studying and teaching dead languages, languages that were by the very fact "unities", Indo-European linguistics with its focus and attention, directed away from language plurality to a single proto-language – all this determined the content and power of "unitary language" in linguistic and stylistic thought, and determined its creative, style shaping role in the majority of the poetic genres that coalesced in the channel formed by those same centripetal forces of verbal ideological life.⁴³

Heteroglossia, a multitude of singular and cultural voices, stands against the unitary language. A heteroglossic text finds its sources in different linguistic discourses, in dialects with specific phonetic markers, in different sociolects, in different "professional" languages, or in linguistic differences between

generations, etc. A subcategory to “heteroglossia” is “polyglossia” which refers to different languages standing in a dialogue relation, for example Latin and European “vernacular” languages in the genre of “Latin parody”. Stam has pointed out that a subtitled film is a manifest example of polyglossia. In contrast to “the masking effect of silence” in silent film subtitles, with subtitles “the ‘foreign’ spectator became acutely conscious, [...], of being forced to see one language through another”.⁴⁴ The concept of polyglossia applies to all translations (or even, according to George Steiner’s extended definition of translation, of all spoken language).⁴⁵ The dialogue between foreign and native in a translated text will be discussed in later chapters dealing with the various modes of translation in the early sound era, i.e. intertiting, subtitling, dubbing, multiple language versions, etc. The two forcers do not exclude each other, but, on the contrary, interact and are dependent of each other, “the centripetal of the life of language, embodied in a ‘unitary language’, operate in the midst of heteroglossia”, Bakhtin claims, and continues: “alongside the centripetal forces, the centrifugal forces of language carry on their uninterrupted work; alongside the verbal-ideological centralization and unification, the uninterrupted processes of decentralization and disunification go forward”.⁴⁶ Bakhtin’s description of language, applied primarily on the “modern European novel”, is part of a discourse of modernity, and can serve our understanding of modern sound reproduction. It is significant that Bakhtin emphasises the voice in written language; he claims to “hear voices in everything and dialogical relations among them”.⁴⁷

When juxtaposing written and spoken language, the written word can be conceptualised as the “reining dialect” standing against what Bakhtin calls “speech genres”,⁴⁸ which disrupt the monolingual discourse of writing. Sound recording as a representation of the word emphasises the individual speaking situation, i.e. the materiality of the voice, the regional accent, the erotic dimension of the timbre, sociolects, speech differences of generations etc. All these different embodied “speech genres” stand in contrast to the abstraction of the written word. It is notable that it is in the era of early sound technology that the interest in “vulgar” (etymologically traced to “vernacular”) voices arose, for example, in naturalist literature or by the great interest in ethnological phonetics. With sound reproduction of speech, the accent becomes an inevitable feature (even the accents of so-called “neutral” speech).⁴⁹

On the other hand, the technology of sound recording also exposes the unitary principle, the “monolingual” dimension of language. To a certain extent, mediation as such can be seen as the unitary principle through which “the incorporation of barbarians and lower social strata” are transformed into a broader unitary language. With sound technology, the individual speech is transformed into the unitary language of *sound*. From that perspective, one could speak of an “alphabetisation” of media, that is, an understanding of media inscription as an alphabet in which different images or sounds are

“written” with the same “letters”. Since sound, photography and film are “languages” opposed to the verbal, reproduction media are described as an alternative “universal” alphabet beyond cultural differentiation, that is, a utopia of a “monolingual”, “reining dialect” uniting cultures and people.

James Lastra’s description of sound reproduction as a technology between on the one hand *simulation* and on the other *inscription* captures the double-edged relation to writing in the conception of sound reproduction.⁵⁰ Sound reproduction embodies a tension between simulation and inscription, being a technology that is both a reproduction of the organic processes of either the mouth or the ear, but also a technology of registration of graphic signs, that is of indexical writing. The Bakhtinian struggle of forces takes place between the singular, to the speaking body with a regional, class and gender identity, and the abstraction of the “True Word”. Consequently, the opposition between speech and writing in the era of sound reproduction is a dichotomy deconstructing itself from inside, since speech reproduction embodies the dichotomy of speech and writing within itself.

Body versus Language

The dichotomy between simulation and inscription concerning sound technology can be linked to theoretical approaches to sound in film (or in opposition to film). In contrast to both images and writing, sound is often understood as *body* rather than *representation* of a body, as a technology *producing* the “real” rather than *reproducing* it. In Kittler’s reading, the three technologies of phonography/gramophone, film and typewriter are linked to Lacanian categories: firstly, the “real” embodied in sound technology, secondly, the iconic mirror stage linked to the illusionary film media, and thirdly, the symbolic in writing.⁵¹ This seemingly media essentialist categorisation is not to be taken literally. It does, however, point out a tendency in the conceptualisation of sound in relation to other media and semiotic categories. In sound theory, there has been an ongoing discussion on whether sound reproduction is “body” or “language”, production or reproduction, in film studies as well as in theories on sound in relation to a conception of “language” prior to the sound film.

Sound film theory has since the 1920s involved discussions about the fundamental difference between sound and image. Most writings are based on the idea that sound is a (re)production of the “real”, while the image is a representation. The recording of a sound is still a sound, it belongs to the same category as the original, while the photographic image enters the realm of the imaginary, and therefore, from an aesthetic perspective, of art. For example, Béla Balázs states that “sound has no image”, meaning that “there is no difference in dimension between the original sound and the recorded or reproduced sound”.⁵² As described by Lastra in an analysis of sound film theory, this discussion on whether sound is indeed a mere reproduction of

the real, or if it can be understood as a kind of “image” or “language” continues in semiotic or apparatus oriented theory developed in modern film theory,⁵³ a case in point being Rick Altman’s two anthologies, *Cinema/Sound* and *Sound Theory Sound Practice*. Balázs’ statement “sound has no image” from the early 1930s is later almost literally repeated by Jean-Louis Baudry claiming that “one does not hear the image of a sound but the sound itself”.⁵⁴ In his famous discussion on “aural objects”, Christian Metz claims that “auditory aspects [...] undergo no appreciable loss in relation to the corresponding sound in the real world”.⁵⁵

In other texts these assumptions have been strongly criticized. Theorists such as Rick Altman, James Lastra, Alan Williams and Thomas Levin have discussed the relation between copy and original from different angles, showing in what way the apparatus, the sound montage or mixing create a different audible perception. According to these theorists, the invisibility, or inaudibility, of the apparatus is questioned, and film sound is understood either as language, image or technology. However, this criticism does not always take the opposite position regarding sound recording as an object of “real” perception. Instead, a shift of focus is made by stressing in what ways the apparatus creates an image of perception corresponding and interacting with the real perception of the spectator. Williams points out that “we accept the machine as an organism, and its ‘attitudes’ as our own”.⁵⁶ This means that film sound constructs a perspective of perception from which we hear the sounds. He also argues that *all* sounds are mediated, both recorded and non-recorded. By comparing the lack of fidelity between the original and the recorded symphony orchestra concert with a “good” or a “bad” seat in the concert hall, he points out that sound is mediated through space itself.⁵⁷ If that is the case, we are back where we started: there is no ontological difference between the perception of a recorded sound and an original sound, i.e. a sound that is mediated through the immediate physical space. In a discussion on the development towards close miking, Altman goes even further, arguing that the sonic space construction “represented a fundamental turnabout in human perception”.⁵⁸ According to Altman, film does not only create an analogous relation to perception, it also interacts with and changes perception as such (not the biological conditions for hearing, though, but the cultural practice of listening). This re-conceptualisation of sound as a technology of deconstruction between copy and original, body and language does not enter sound film theory by a post-modern “apparatus turn”. It is discussed earlier by theorists concerned with the conversion to sound. In the essay “The Acoustic Dimension”, Thomas Levin traces the idea of the difference between recorded sound and the original to Theodor Adorno’s writing on recorded film music.⁵⁹ Adorno ventures an insightful description not only of the difference between a recorded sound and the original as such, but also on how this difference can be linked to an understanding of sound re-

cording as “image”, that the reproduced sound entails point of view, perspective and flatness that is similar to the composition of the filmic image.⁶⁰

In the writings of Béla Balázs, there is a similar recognition of the changes of perception between film sound and the sounds we hear in our everyday life.⁶¹ It is clear that Balázs’ statement that “sound has no image” (followed by others: “sound has no shadows”, “sound cannot be isolated” etc., devices that define sound in negative terms, as something lacking the qualities of the image) is only a point of departure for a development of its antithetical counterpoint: a discussion on how the reproduction of sound could represent or embody perception differently. The conclusions are leading up to an analogy between eye/image and ear/sound. Balázs claims that “[o]ur ear will be identified with the membrane just as our eye is with the objective.”⁶² “Sound close ups”, “perspectives in sound” etc., would make us hear otherwise inaudible sounds and, like film images, represent a different perception of reality. In these writings, the idea of “fidelity” is replaced by an understanding of sound as “simulation”. The problem of fidelity deals with the relation between origin and reproduction, whereas simulation is about sound reproduction as construction of perception.

The Language of Sound

Sound and Writing

In contrast to other ancient alphabets, the Greek alphabet contains letters corresponding to vowel sounds, which creates a language system where the combination of letters generates a closer connection between writing and pronunciation. With the invention of vowels, the (so-called) origin of our culture did not only produce a kind of writing that was an imitation of spoken language, it even created a conception of language based on a synthesis of orality and literacy, of spoken and written language.⁶³ With the development of individual silent reading and later on book printing techniques, the unification between letters and utterances changed. Following Jacques Derrida, in western tradition, writing and speech are regarded as separated contrasts: speech is directly connected to the body, and therefore located in space and time, whereas writing is transposed and indirect. Speech is understood as the origin, the source, of writing, which renders writing into a *representation* of speech.⁶⁴

With sound reproduction in the nineteenth century, however, the relation between speech and writing changes and it is tempting to see a return to the “classical” synthesis between the two. Yet the synthesis between sound and writing in the era of sound reproduction is created under completely different conditions, conditions carrying the trace of the modern conception of language (based on printing techniques). Walter Ong calls the electronic age an

age of “secondary orality, the orality of telephones, radio and television, which depends on writing and print for its existence”.⁶⁵ This secondary orality replaces the dominance of writing after the invention of book-printing, but it is, in many ways, just another form of writing. Lastra points out that “the very term ‘phonography’ initially referred to a stenographic system designed by Isaac Pitman in 1837, which by transcribing sounds instead of words, was expected to offer a more direct, almost analogical form of writing”. This indicates that the etymological trace between *phonograph* and writing is significant from a media archaeological perspective.⁶⁶ Phonetic writing, stenographic coding, the use of phonographic wax rolls as written texts, are only a few examples of the understanding of sound transcription as writing.⁶⁷

Recorded speech is technologically and semiotically similar to writing in various ways. Just as writing, sound recording is a representation of the original speaking situation, it is a technology of transposition and (in the case of phonographic recording) storage of the uttered words. Consequently, it dislocates the words from the body and transfers it into a public unspecified sphere. Sound recording is also, just as film media or photography, often described as a “language” in its own right. Nineteenth century sound technology is often described as an “alphabet”, either literally as a prolongation of the phonetic universal alphabet, or metaphorically compared with ancient alphabets like the hieroglyphics. The registration of sound waves is also often compared to the writing process. The indexical inscription of recording places the hand movement and the process of recording in an analogous relation. From another perspective, the two forms of speech representation are also placed in a situation of concurrence, reproducing the traditional dichotomy between speech and writing.

At the turn of the century, by comparing sound media to hieroglyphic writing, there were many attempts to define sound technology as a new form of universal “alphabet” in contrast to written languages. The phonograph, it was argued, was, like hieroglyphics, perceived as a more likely candidate for the status of “universal language”.⁶⁸ Consequently, film, phono- and photographic media have always had an ambiguous relation to language. On the one hand, modern media have often been discussed as inscription, similar to drawing or writing: early descriptions of photography as images “drawn by sunlight itself”, and as “nature copying nature by nature’s hand”⁶⁹ were followed by film theories on film as a specific alphabet from the 1910s, like Vachel Lindsay’s theory on film and hieroglyphics.⁷⁰ Classic theoretical texts such as Eisenstein’s ideas on intellectual montage, or Christian Metz’ semiotic theories can be traced to this tradition. These very different ideas have one task in common: the specificity of filmic language is defined as being non-identical with verbal language, yet, compared to a language system, analogously to verbal or written language. This ambiguous approach to media reproduction is due to the fact that it is understood as a medium specific

language defined as the opposite of verbal language. This is even more conspicuous in relation to sound recording than to the film image, since both writing and speech recording, in contrast to the image, represent words.

As mentioned earlier, when Edison listed the benefits of the phonograph, the predicted use was primarily to replace writing. The most important functions of the phonograph would be letter dictation, “family records”, and preservation of languages.⁷¹ Since the focus on inscription as index undermines the conventional conception of language as symbolic signs, sound media are thus understood as both opposite to, and parallel to, language. Media inscription stands in a juxtaposed relation to the symbolic level of the word, but in an analogical relation to language as inscription.

This dual conception of language as both sounds and words is also found in language theory proper, for example, in Saussure’s division between “langue” and “parole” or in Roland Barthes’ writings about the “grain of the voice”.⁷² According to Barthes, this physical dimension of the voice, escaping the symbolic dimension of language, is also embodied in the dual structure of language itself, in the relation between consonants and vowels. Language as body stands in perpetual interaction with its opposite, with the symbolic and restrictive dimension of language. Consonants are on the side of the symbolic, “always prescribed as needing to be ‘articulated’, detached, emphasized *in order to fulfil the clarity of meaning*.” Vowels, on the other hand, encourage the listener to a sound without limits: “There lay the ‘truth’ of language – not its functionality (clarity, expressivity, communication)” but, instead of pure sound, a place where one can discover the body in the grain of the voice.⁷³ The phonograph and its precursors constituted a reintroduction of the physical oral conception of language, by which language is connected to a specific body and located in space and time. By regarding voice reproduction as primarily sonic, it functions as a contrast to writing. Sound reproduction, however, is also part of the discourse of writing: the disconnection between speech and the speaker, the graphic registrations of sound waves, etc., are devices that place sound technology in the realm of writing. Consequently, sound technology embodies the tension between the singular oral situation, and the unitary language system of writing.

Pure Sounds and Language Norms

In spite of the “vococentric” character of sound media practice, recordings of nature and animals, technological sound, of cars, airplanes and gun shots etc, played an important role in the conception of sound as a new and different “language”. Phonographic sound recordings of the early twentieth century, and avant-garde experiments and radio documentaries of the subsequent decades, represent the everyday sonic landscape. The representation of non-verbal sound reveals to a higher extent the “language” of pure sounds beyond the spoken word. This is most notable in avant-garde experiments

elaborating on acoustic perception or sound technology as production (rather than mimetic reproduction).⁷⁴ In his essay “The New Sprits of the Poets”, Guillaume Apollinaire describes prevalent futurist-like poetry as “whirring of an airplane”⁷⁵, and proposes instead a non-mimetic sonic art form, for instance, “noises artistically chosen and lyrically combined or juxtaposed.”⁷⁶ Most recordings of everyday life in sound experimentation or radio documentaries from the 1910s and the 1920s were, in contrast to the recording of the spoken voice, produced artificially with sound machines in studios.⁷⁷ (Will Gaisberg’s recording of the sounds of WWI from 1918 is one of the few exceptions. Gaisberg describes that “here the machine could well catch the finer sounds of the ‘singing’, the ‘whine’, and the ‘scream’ of the shells [...]”.)⁷⁸

Both mimetic and non-mimetic sound recording are on different levels opposed to the representation of the verbal. By focusing on non-mimetic noise or everyday sounds, artists avoided exposing the conflict between the two concepts of language, words and media inscription respectively. Dziga Vertov depicts the conflict between language and sound in the descriptions of his attempts from the 1910s to make a sound montage of “the world of hearing”. Vertov aimed to begin his sound montage project by writing down the sounds he wanted to record, but was unable to achieve this since the letters did not “correspond to the sounds of nature”.⁷⁹

Taking the idea of the phonograph as an apparatus of simulation into account, it is noticeable that the interest in non-verbal sounds is not necessarily perceived in contrast to the representation of the voice. Roland Gelatt describes how the audiences in early exhibitions of the Edison phonograph were particularly impressed by the phonograph’s ability to “talk in English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish, and Hebrew” and simultaneously “imitate the barking of dogs and the crowing of cocks”.⁸⁰

The representation of noises and non-verbal sounds function at some level as an extension of the conception of language and speech; the machine is perceived as a human body, a human body speaking a “universal language” of sound. In contrast to many earlier technologies developed in order to simulate human *speaking* organs, the phonograph was also a technology of *hearing* simulation, a technology beyond the limitation to sound produced by the human voice.⁸¹ It became an attraction in its own right that, according to Lastra, “not only could the phonograph ‘speak’, it could duplicate brass bands, opera, ‘artistic whistling’, ‘roosters crowing, ducks quarrelling, turkey’s gobbling’ and even babies crying.”⁸²

Lastra further traces the attraction of the phonograph’s ability to reproduce *any* sound to both telephony and phonetic linguistics. It is significant that the phonetician and the inventor of the universal phonetic alphabet, Alexander Melville Bell, the father of the famous inventor of the telephone, preferred using non-verbal sounds when he wanted to illustrate the abilities of his “visible speech” or “universal alphabet”, that is phonetic writing. Dur-

ing popular public performances of Bell's phonetic achievement, the young Alexander Graham Bell would help his father to illustrate the visible speech by reading the phonetic signs out loud in front of an amazed audience. Alexander Graham Bell notes: "It was just as easy for him to spell the sound of a cough, or a sneeze, or a click to a horse, as a sound that formed an element of human speech."⁸³ Here the attraction lies in the combination between the human voice and non-human sounds; it is this combination that demonstrates the universalism of phonetic language. This is an alphabet which, with Bell's words, was "capable of expressing the sounds of all languages in a single alphabet" with letters "instead of being arbitrary characters, were symbolic representations of the organs of speech and in the ways in which they are put together".⁸⁴ The universal language of sounds is later relayed from Alexander Melville Bell to his son, from linguistics to sound technology.⁸⁵ A parallel to the scientific performances of Bell the younger from the early sound film period was the use of human "sound effects" where a person could imitate noises, animal sounds, etc. was used in some early sound films. These "human sound tracks" were in the Hollywood studios partly an attraction in their own right (the initiated audience was aware of how the sounds had been recorded) and partly a practical way to record sound effects easily.⁸⁶

With the universal language of sound, the ideas about "pure language" and "pure dialects" change. The "high fidelity" conception of sound recording would put value on the *actual* rather than "correct" pronunciation. After having listened to a recording of a local singing performance performed by a peasant in a phonograph archive, a journalist wrote that "I cannot say that she is singing in tune, but she sure is singing in a local way!", which implicates that the falseness itself is more authentic, and consequently, "purer".⁸⁷ With sound recording, the norm of educated well-trained voices was replaced by a norm of sonic "high fidelity", i.e. a norm of authenticity. With sound registration, the dialects, the "patois", etymologically "incomprehensible vulgar gibberish", became more adequate examples of "pure" language than a standard language, perceived as sonically transparent. The Bell example evidences the juxtaposition between the word as symbol and the word as sound. The attraction of the alphabet of sounds, of phonetics, lies in its universalism in which the pureness of speech resides in the sonic quality of the expression.

Sound recording can, however, also serve the opposite purpose: the phonograph was initially an apparatus developed in order to *train* the voices of the deaf rather than to preserve actual speech; and the notion of changing, teaching and manipulating the voice is embodied in sound technology as an apparatus of organic simulation. From this perspective, sound technology also served the attempts of establishing a national language norm. It is obvious that radio, sound film, records, television and other sonic or audiovisual media have strongly added to a homogenisation of speech of national languages. Sound technology is also used extensively in order to teach foreign

languages, or to “correct” speech disorders by eliminating “unpleasant accents”, as preserving actual speech. It is important to stress, however, that the homogenisation of national language with sound technological means is primarily a homogenisation of *diction*, and thus of the sound quality of language. To some extent, the norm of diction follows the idea of language pureness as sound rather than verbal language.

Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion* from 1914 (a drama about the social and gender implications of phonetics) sheds light on this double-edged process of both establishing and destabilising a norm, outlined here in the relationship between the “pure” British and cockney accents. It is significant that even though the phonetician, Mr. Higgins, stresses the linguistic norm of which he speaks as the “correct” way, this pure accent can be studied, described, and learned according to the same principles as the dialect. His student Eliza’s change of speech from cockney to pure British English is a transformation of sound that can be read and analysed through phonetic principles. The phonetic dimension as such renders the norm into an object of sound on the same level as the exotic or primitive voices of “the other”. Mr. Higgins’ delighted disgust when confronted with “interesting accents” exposes the conflict between the idea of sound itself as language in its purest form and an idea of the popular dialect as a deformation of language as it should be spoken.

The Utopia of a Universal Language

The notion of pure sonic universalism, a “language” beyond cultural limitations, is inscribed in a long tradition; it takes part in the larger discourse of European academic or an intellectual tradition based on the utopia of the “Tower of Babel”.⁸⁸ The ancient utopia of a universal language had an increasing impact in different contexts at the second half of the nineteenth century, when a growing number of theories on the perfect universal language, either by tracing different languages back to a common mother tongue, or by creating artificial universal languages, for example, by creating a universal language based on musical tones.⁸⁹ Significantly, it was in the 1880s that artificial universal languages like Volapük and Esperanto were invented and were successful. From an additional perspective, the rising interest in the study of hieroglyphics in the nineteenth century (with or without explicit connections to modern media) takes part in the myth of the “perfect language”.⁹⁰

Without reducing all these forms of universal languages to the universal alphabet of phonetics and sound technology, it is noticeable that the purely sonic level of language functions as a means to reach the alleged universalism in many of those different languages. Esperanto uses a form of phonetic spelling with roman letters, with each letter corresponding to one sound, the argument in theories of one single language as the origin of all were often

based on sonic similarities between different languages. The musical models of universal languages have precursors throughout western history, but gained increasing popularity at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The musical languages are often, like the universal alphabet of phonetics, based on an idea of correspondences between letters and sounds. This is clearly illustrated by the universal languages which attracted most attention in the nineteenth century, François Sudre's "Solresol", presented in 1866 in *Langue musicale universelle*.⁹¹ Solresol is, as the book title indicates, based on a musical model as a new "alphabet" of language. According to Sudre's system, seven musical notes would represent an alphabet comprehensible to everybody, since they can be inscribed identically for every language.

The universalism of both musical language and the hieroglyphic alphabet is understood in opposition to verbal language; it was fuelled by the idea of creating a language based on either sounds and/or images rather than words. From this perspective, the myth of a universal language or alphabet interacts with the discourse of the universalism of modern media. Not only sound technology, but photography and film were conceptualised as a universal language.⁹² Different media were inscribed in the same utopia of universalism and often compared to hieroglyphics as an alternative non-arbitrary model of "writing". Lastra writes that "like the phonograph, it was argued, the hieroglyph's non-arbitrary or iconic aspects rendered it a more likely candidate for the status of 'universal language'".⁹³ Significantly, a hieroglyphic model of writing creates "a causal, or as C. S. Peirce might say, existential link between sign and object".⁹⁴ Media, understood as inscription, as index of the outside world, was positioned in contrast to a traditional understanding of "the culture of the word", of theatre and literature in particular. (The iconic dimension of hieroglyphics in this period is often discussed in relation of other sign systems, such as the symbolic and sonic dimensions of hieroglyphics.)

As argued by Miriam Hansen, with the growing impact of film in the 1910s and the 1920s, many ideas to universalism, as well as analogue with hieroglyphics, were transferred to discourses on film.⁹⁵ As will be discussed in the next chapter, speech representation in the period of the transition to sound can be conceptualised as an interaction between these discourses on the universalism of sound and film respectively.

Transposition versus Translation

Media Transposition and Decoding

As discussed above, the universalism of sound technology emerges in the purely material level of media inscription. The process of materialisation undermines the level of *understanding* and *meaning* of a spoken or written

utterance, and consequently the idea of a universal language as understood and spoken by everybody. The universal language as a means of communicating beyond cultural and linguistic barriers is replaced by a technological internationalism beyond the verbal.

Technological communication media such as the telegraph or the telephone are universal in the sense that they are means of global communication; the phonetic alphabet is a system of signs that “transposes” words of any language into specific signs; phonographic inscriptions transpose words into signals, but they do not make them more intelligible. Even Sudre’s “language musical universelle” does not overcome language barriers. Its universalism is based on transposition between sensuous levels of perception, between different art forms etc., and not as a linguistic system that could replace any other existing language as a means of communication. This is significant because it shows to what extent the re-conceptualisation of universalism by media technology changes the relation to language as a means of communication. When material *sounds* foregrounds *words*, interpretation and meaning are destabilised.

Following Kittler, sound technology and other reproduction media generate a discourse of media pluralism and media diversity that stand in discursive opposition to a discourse of hermeneutics. This is a discourse defined by hegemony of writing and literature, which unifies writing and speech by the *meaning* the utterances have in common. With a vocabulary borrowed from Lacan’s psychoanalysis, Kittler claims that with sound recording “writing ceased to be synonymous with the serial storage of data. The technological recording of the real entered into competition with the symbolic registration of the Symbolic.”⁹⁶ The so-called “discourse networks 1800” is based on hermeneutics and translation of meaning, the “discourse networks 1900” is based on media diversity, media materialisation and sensuous division. The media diversity makes transpositions movements between media possible; the processes of transposition refigure the relation between language and the global, the trans-national and the universal. Kittler writes:

A medium is a medium is medium. Therefore it cannot be translated. To transfer messages from one medium into another always evolves reshaping them to conform to new standards and materials. In a discourse network that requires an “awareness of the abysses which divide the one order of sense experience into the other”, transposition necessarily takes the place of translation.⁹⁷

A consequence of this argument is that the universalism of sound technology is embodied in its multimedia dimension. This multimedia dimension is linked to the separation of media which implies both that sound recording separates the voice from the body, and also that the registration of human experience and memory is inscribed and circulate between different media, in film, photography, phonographic recordings and writing.

For the following analysis it is important to stress that the division between sound, image and writing is also embodied within each specific media. By analogies between media or processes of transposition across different medial levels, the relation between image, writing and sound are all inscribed in each media. As discussed earlier, the phonographic inscriptions stand in an analogous relation to the movement of the writing or drawing hand; hence one of the first filmic apparatuses was called “*phonoscope*”⁹⁸. In 1888, Edison defined the future function of the cinematographer as an apparatus that “does for the eye what the phonograph had done for the ear”.⁹⁹ Before him, the French photographer, Nadar, had experimented with an “acoustic daguerreotype”.¹⁰⁰ Whether reproduction media are described in terms of analogies, juxtapositions, separation or unification, the different forms of media representation are always described in relation to each other.¹⁰¹ As will be discussed in chapter three, the combination of sound, images and writing in the hybrid silent/sound films throughout the transition to sound film, can be seen in the light of this discourse of media analogies and media separation.

When it comes to sound technology, the multimedia dimension preconditions the universalism as material inscription beyond meaning and interpretation. Sound reproduction, as a technology embodying a tension between inscription and simulation, is in itself a multimedia expression of sound, image and writing. In addition to the previously discussed idea of sound as a form of writing, there is a visual dimension embodied in sound technology, linking it to the image. The sound waves as inscriptions have a purely graphic quality, which turns sound not only into writing but also reveals its iconic dimension. To follow Edison’s expression, this means that the phonograph in itself “did” something not only “for the ear” but also “for the eye”. The visual inscriptions of sound waves are crucial for the technology and its uses. The combination of sounds and images in the early Edison sound films are, at some level, an extension of what sound technology was already about.

Following Kittler, “media transposition” is contrasted to the classical idea of hermeneutic as interpretation or translation of a specific significant content. Media transposition is rather a *material* transformation from one media into another. As a development of Marshall McLuhan’s theory of how an overheated medium is turning into another,¹⁰² Kittler shows how the transposition takes place between different media (such as sound recording and writing) or between levels of media inscription of one and the same medium (the indexical or graphic level versus the symbolic level of a written text).¹⁰³ By using the notion of media interpretation as decoding a “rebus” (in contrast to hermeneutic interpretation), writing can be seen both as a symbolic representation and a visual inscription of a sound. The rebus figure is found in different contexts, in technological media, psychoanalysis, and the science of psychophysics.¹⁰⁴ In contrast to classical hermeneutic interpretation, the rebus transposes or transforms the index, the trace, into a meaningful utter-

ance, that is, into a symbolic sign. The *meaning* is revealed in transposition from a material level into another. The large number of coded writings in the era of modern reproduction technology, whether it be the Morse code, phonetic writing or other stenographic codes, are all examples of writings following the logic of the rebus. The coded signs are transpositions of sounds into writing decoded into conventional writing, into the symbolic.

The telegraph is an enlightening example of a means of communication based on multimedia, coding and media transposition. It is a technology combining text and sound signals in a process of decoding. Writing is turned into signals, subsequently into a coded message that can be decoded into letters and intelligible words. The process of deciphering can be made from either the written strip or the sound. In early telegraphy, sounds were considered as a bi-product, but for the efficiency of the telegraphic correspondence, professional telegraphs learned to “read” the sounds without the written strip and decode the message only by listening.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, technological sound communication and media are about the movement of coding and decoding between levels of signification related to different media. The telegraph writes with visual signs transferred into sonic signals; in the telephone, the sound waves of speech are transferred into electric signals, subsequently transferred on the other side of the line into sound waves understood as spoken intelligible words. In the same way, the phonograph produces sound waves as inscriptions de-coded into graphic signs, which in their turn are transposed back into sound in the reproduction.

Overall “universal alphabets” can be understood according to the principles of media transposition and the de-coding of rebus. For instance, hieroglyphics are understood by researchers and academics in multi-medial terms. Since the nineteenth century (after the deciphering of the Rosetta stone), Egyptian signs have been understood not only as visual representations, ideograms, but, rather, as an interaction between the ideograms and the *phonograms*. The latter underlies the former and vice versa. The frequent parallels between ancient hieroglyphics and modern media are partly due to the rise of Egyptology and hieroglyphics studies in the nineteenth century. By the discovery of the structure of hieroglyphic signs, hieroglyphics became an example of the possibility of combining different sign systems within one single alphabet, which resurface in later critical theory. Hansen argues that the combination between figurative, symbolic and abstract in the same sign as a “paradigmatic break that re-newed the interest in hieroglyphics in contemporary critical theory, in particular since Jacques Derrida’s *Of Grammatology* (1967)”.¹⁰⁶ It is telling that in Lindsay’s reading, hieroglyphics function as a model for film-making because of the interaction between the symbolic and the iconic.¹⁰⁷ This demonstrates that the analogy between media and hieroglyphics is not only an attempt to find an image for an alphabet beyond the arbitrary word, but also a concern with establishing an equivalent in relation to media division.

The paradox of unification and division between levels of media inscription is also clearly notable in Sudre's musical universal language mentioned earlier. The inscriptions are signs of decoding between spoken words and musical notes. Here, the dimension of multimedia decoding goes even further, that this is a language that you cannot only sing and write down in notes; it is also decipherable in a specific stenographic system. It can be represented by the first seven Arabic numbers, and moreover, with the seven colours of the spectrum, or even by touching four fingers of the left hand with the index of the right hand. The transpositions between different sense impressions and media inscriptions generate, in Sudre's descriptions, a universal inscription system not only for all spoken languages, but also a language that can be understood by both deaf and blind people.

The "myth of total cinema", to use Bazin's expression, can be understood in the light of these utopias on the universal language as a sensuous rather than linguistic issue.¹⁰⁸ The myth of total cinema can be found in various theories on film and synaesthesia and sensuous correspondences, and a similar sensibility is revealed by ideas on the ability to simulate all senses with the filmic apparatus. For example, it is significant that in the late 1920s, discussions concerning the addition of sound are often related to speculations on colour, 3-dimensionality, or even of film as an olfactory medium.¹⁰⁹ With sound technology, the universal languages are based on movements between different levels and forms of media inscription, creating an "alphabet model" for reproduction media by which language is perceived as a medium and media as language. Instead of "meaning" and "content" as the uniting force between different texts, the alphabets of modern media transfer different media corresponding to different sensory channels onto one another.

"Untranslatability" and Speech Simulation

For Kittler, the universal language of sound media is linked to a discourse of "untranslatability". As media materiality undermines meaning and interpretation, the discourse dominated by film and sound media destabilises the practice of translation. Significantly, the problems of translation of film are related to media differentiation (for instance written subtitles in relation to speech) or body (by replacing the original speech by dubbing) rather than languages. As will be discussed in chapter four, film is a medium in which language translation is inscribed in the process of media transposition. Kittler discusses the problem of translation in order to examine *meaning* in the process of interpretation, and also to theorise the relation between the mother's voice/mother tongue and self identity in the Romantic tradition. Romantic translation practice and theory are always based on the translation of the foreign towards native, which establishes a hierarchic relation between the two.¹¹⁰ The "untranslatability" undermines the hierarchic relation between

the “mother tongue” and the translated language, and displaces the relation between “foreign” and “native”. This can be linked to sound technology as a means of reproducing *any* language, as a machine simulating a human body speaking without native language or mother tongue.

To some extent, “untranslatability” can be connected to a (post)modernist conception of translation, in which the translated work is either understood as an incarnation of “difference” or as a text revealing issues beyond the problem of language.¹¹¹ From George Steiner’s *After Babel*, one can speak of a “cultural turn” in translation studies, in which the idea of translation as a contextless language issue is questioned.¹¹² From this perspective it is the social and cultural *function* of the text which is taken into account and the cultural contexts which determine the reading and thus the translation.¹¹³ An extended definition of translation is particularly notable in the theoretical writings on film and translation, as in Stam’s and Shohat’s reading of how the heteroglossia of film (being a medium with various sign systems co-existing) generates a “polyglossia” of languages. Stam and Shohat go even further and state that “all film experience involves a kind of translation – from the images and sounds of the text into the internalised discourse of the spectator [...]”.¹¹⁴

A similar re-conceptualisation of translation is also found in writings from the 1920s and 1930s dealing with the problem of translation from a philosophical or sociological perspective, for example, Antonio Gramsci’s use of the concept of translation as a metaphor for cross-cultural social analysis,¹¹⁵ or, more importantly, Walter Benjamin’s ideas on translation as “pure language”. Benjamin’s essays “The Task of the Translator” and “On Language” evoke translation as a key issue for understanding language. These essays have been frequently discussed and commented upon by theorists of the “linguistic turn”, by, for instance, Paul De Man and Jacques Derrida.¹¹⁶ Benjamin’s texts have been seen as attempts to theorise the non-referentiality of text as such, since translation as understood by Benjamin evokes the idea of “pure language”. It is “pure language”, however, in opposition to an ideal or universal nomenclature language system. Benjamin writes that “all translation is only a somewhat provincial way of coming to terms with the foreignness of languages”.¹¹⁷ It is the dialogue between languages, the fragmented and unfinished which makes the translation “pure language”. The pureness also lies in the “non-original” quality, in the rejection of the text as an original work of “art”. This positions Benjamin’s theory in opposition to Romantic translation theory, with the soul of the artist as the necessary link between the original text and the translation, and undermines the hierarchical relation between “original” and “copy”.

Neither Benjamin nor Gramsci question translation as such; they do not advocate “untranslatability” and they both argue against language relativism. What is interesting in relation to media is the extension of the concept of translation towards an idea of transferring or transposing. As discussed by

Peter Ives, Gramsci, translation is synonymous with “transmission” or “transference”,¹¹⁸ and Benjamin uses the metaphor “translate the mute into the sonic” in order to describe “language as such” in relation to “the language of Man”.¹¹⁹ Following Kittler’s vocabulary, one could claim that Gramsci and Benjamin aim to undermine the juxtaposition between transposition and translation by integrating translation into the realm of transposition. From this perspective, it is worth noting that both Benjamin and Gramsci reject the classical idea of *meaning* and *content* as the common ground for an original text and its translation. Benjamin says that “any translation which intends to perform a transmitting function cannot transmit anything but information – hence something inessential”.¹²⁰ In Gramsci’s reading this re-conceptualisation of language enters the realm of politics and cultural struggle beyond language. Instead of translating words from one language into another, he suggests translation of *culture* (his main example is the “translation” of the October Revolution). “Translatability presupposes that a given stage of civilisation has ‘basically’ identical *cultural expression*, even if its *language is historically different*”, he argues.¹²¹ Translation is extended to culture, politics, senses, and figures of transferring, and consequently, to a certain extent, dislodged from the author and the original work.

In the discourse of sound technology, the unification of different speech manners, of different languages or dialects are transferred into one and the same language of sound. This is linked to the issue of foreign language learning and indirectly to the problem of translation. The technology is a means of not only preserving speech as it is spoken (in the collections made by linguistics and scientists), but also to train language skills, to change original accents and speech disorders. Shaw’s *Pygmalion* illustrates how (motherless) Eliza learns to lose her original “mother tongue”, her cockney English, by phonetic practice and with the help of different sound apparatus. It has often been argued that sound technology re-conceptualises the relation between body, self and speech, and that it disconnects the body from the speaker and creates a technology of simulation. This can be linked to Benjamin’s modernist conception of translation, where the translation as “pure language” severs from direct connection with the “artist”, and thus the speaking/writing “self”.

Throughout the history of sound reproduction, and in particular in the late nineteenth century, the different inventions of sound transposition and sound storage stand in a metonymical relation to our hearing or speaking organs. From Wolfgang von Kempelen’s famous speaking machine from the mid-eighteenth century, constructed as a mechanical reproduction of human lungs and larynx, over pre-phonographic simulations of hearing, such as Bell’s so-called “ear phonograph”, constructed from real human auditory organs, to Edison’s phonograph a machine that would register or “hear” sounds as an ear, create a discourse of sound technology as simulation.¹²²

This is related to the recording's dual ability of both saving and modulating speech. Apparatus like the phonograph and the phonoscope were, for instance, developed in collaboration with language learning for deaf people.¹²³ Georges Demenÿ developed the "phonoscope", a technology of moving images on a disc as an apparatus for lip reading. In these early examples of moving images, we see Demenÿ himself pronounce the words "Je vous aime" and "Vive la France" in order to teach the deaf to read lips and also to speak. Even if the phonoscope is not a sound recording technology, it could be seen as a form of "sound film" apparatus. The speech act performed by the deaf substitutes the sound track.¹²⁴ If, as Derrida claims, self consciousness is "hearing oneself speak",¹²⁵ sound technology both provides that experience and undermines it. On the one hand, hearing yourself speaking on a record is about externalising the self and perceiving the self as an object, and on the other hand, the simulation of speech creates speech without hearing, and consequently without consciousness. The process of simulation interferes with the practice of learning languages. The possibility to learn something "phonetically", which would be a consequence of language learning by repeating phrases on a disc, places the speaker in an analogous relation to the sound apparatus. Just as the phonograph and the gramophone impersonate speech disconnected from human consciousness, the phonetic speaker can be perceived as a mechanised body.

In popular magazines during the early years of the phonograph, the interaction between speech simulation and language differentiation is a common topic; numerous articles refer to the fashionable language schools (for example, La Sorbonne) and their new methods of training accents with records. In cartoons, one finds images showing the phonograph as a replacement for a speaker who is lacking knowledge in foreign languages. For example, a cartoon in a French early phonograph magazine shows an English tourist with a phonograph placed in front of his mouth. The machine is asking for directions in perfect French.¹²⁶ Another picture shows a Parisian "cosmopolitan" prostitute performing her profession behind a curtain; a phonograph placed in front of the curtain, passionately declaring her love in three languages.¹²⁷ These cartoons refer implicitly to a discourse of filmic translation; they are comical images of both dubbing and acting in foreign languages. As will be discussed in chapter five, polyglot stardom of the early sound film, the use of stars who acted in foreign film versions without actually understanding the foreign languages they spoke in, can be discussed in terms of speech simulation. Polyglot acting in multiple language version film is thus an instance of when the mechanically learned *phonetic speech* is used as a technique of translation.

Sound Practice and Speech Representation

Speech Heteroglossia in Time and Space

Cultural institutions such as archives and research centres, partake in the interaction and struggle of language power between universalism and linguistic diversity discussed above. For instance, the diversity of speech enters the public sphere by the emerging collections of phonographic recordings in archives established in several European cities at the beginning of the twentieth century. In the phonogram archives of Berlin and Vienna, or in “Les archives de la parole” in Paris, spoken or music records were collected. To some extent, the sound recording, being a medium for preserving “words” rather than images would quickly gain a socially high status compared to film or photography. In an initial state, the main purposes were to preserve either “famous voices” of the time, voices of writers, scientists, intellectuals or artists, or to collect samples of disappearing regional dialects or foreign languages. It was considered to be a scientific and national concern to save dialects, or to collect “primitive” oral languages. The archives were closely linked to the practical use of both phonetics and ethnology and to the rise of phonetics as one of the more important fields of linguistics in the late nineteenth century.

During the decades at the turn of the century, dialects or low class sociolects also became popular in a cultural sphere. Naturalist writing with local diction, regional recordings as public attractions were followed by popular theatre exploiting accents as stereotypes and radio programs about exotic dialects. The introduction of sound film, when the popularity of regional accents is strongly reinforced, can be seen as the summit of this tradition. The archives function as “heteroglossia” texts on a concrete level: dialects, sociolects, languages of different generations, etc., are collected into one single space. On the one hand, they represent a democratisation of speech in contrast to writing, since the aim is to preserve *spoken* language. It is significant that the words of “famous men”, that is men (and even some women) of letters, are registered side by side with local peasants speaking in their regional accents or colonized “natives” talking in their “primitive” languages. Linguist Ferdinand Brunot declared that the purpose was to preserve “les patois”, the regional dialects disappearing in this era of urbanisation and globalisation, alongside the aim to preserve the voices of people like Guillaume Apollinaire, Sigmund Freud or Alfred Dreyfus. He therefore advocated a deconstruction of hierarchies between written and spoken discourses. This deconstruction of writing and speech, and the democratisation of “speech genres”, is linked to the universalism of phonographic registration as an apparatus treating all languages equally.

The democratisation of speech representation by the elimination of hierarchies generates a re-conceptualisation of oral speech genres. It is signifi-

cant that Apollinaire predicted that the film and the phonograph would be the new media of poetry.¹²⁸ Following Apollinaire, alongside the democratisation of “the word” by the representation of a diversity of “speech genres”, there is a de-sacralisation of writing by the transposition of “poetry” into other media.

These processes of democratisation, however, expose a new hierarchy; a hierarchy between speech and recording technology, between the recorded peasants or natives and linguistics or ethnology as science, or between the singular voice and the structure of the archive. The archive is a concrete example of how the uniting universal force of oppression works within the diversity and multitude of languages. Consequently, the archive as a uniting space creates a unitary principle around which the multitude of voices are organised. The archive as an institution of power and sound recording as a technology of power interact with a revolutionary democratisation of speech embodied in the conception of the voice as diction or body rather than words. Following Michel Foucault’s ideas on museums, libraries and archives as “heterotopias”, that is, spaces in which “all other real sites that can be found within the culture, are simultaneously represented, contested and inverted”,¹²⁹ sound archives would represent both oppression and democratisation of speech and language itself. The archive collection is thus a space uniting geographic and social levels of culture. Even more importantly, the archive also unites time layers; with Foucault’s words, the museums, libraries and archives are “heterotopias of indefinitely accumulating time”.¹³⁰

This notion has a specific signification when it comes to sound recording. Sound reproduction as both trace of a specific moment (like photography) and a “high fidelity” reproduction of that moment, makes the process of “accumulating time” more complex concerning sound archives rather than in museums, libraries and photo or film collections. If photography embodies the past, sound recording opens the way for a conceptualisation of the present as history. It is notable that one of Edison’s ten ways in which his phonographic invention was to “benefit mankind” in the future was to register “the last words of dying persons”.¹³¹ The attraction of recording the voice of a dying person goes beyond the documenting the past; it is also an image of the present. Sound technology as a means to store “real” voices and capture the present moment of the speech act places itself in both the future and the past. Many early recordings were thought of as traces of the past for future generations; “Messages for the future” was one of the important speech recording “genres” in the early phonograph era.¹³²

The simultaneous representation of present, future and past embodied in sound recordings of the voice enables ideas of recording the past. After one of the first French exhibitions of Edison’s invention, an enthusiastic journalist merges language universalism and universalism in time: “This marvellous instrument speaks all languages. The prince Taieb-bey spoke to it in Arab, Mistral in Provençal: the phonograph repeated their conversation with all

vocal inflections and the accent of each of their interlocutors.” Soon, predicted the writer, “it will make dead people talk”.¹³³ This function was not only crucial for the archive and collectors, but also for the people who were recorded. According to the collectors of recorded voices from the Vienna archive, it was the argument that the voices would “be immortal” that persuaded most hostile people.¹³⁴ The recording of dialects is not only about saving dialects for the future, it is also perceived as a means of entering the past. Astonished by a song sung in patois at “Les archives de la parole”, a French journalist reported that this recording will “take you back to ancient times” as if the dialect itself contained a dimension of the pre-modern period, of vestiges that had escaped modern urbanisation.¹³⁵

The diversity of collected items in the sound archives is a diversity of speech representation with an extension both in space and time; the archival space unites both regions and countries as well as the present, past and future. The conservation of dialects and “native” languages fuses these dimensions, while urbanisation, colonialism and industrialisation threaten regional dialects and languages. In many articles about early phonography, we can sense a fascination of the combination between the old and pre-modern speech and the modern apparatus. In a French report from the 1920s about the use of records as a means to conserve Indian legends, the writer notes that “several of the recorded legends are very strange, because they are interrupted by archaic words, imitations of animal noises, screams of old and young”.¹³⁶ The animal noises, the screams etc. are related to a classic idea of the development of language from primitive sound to language.

Struggle of Power

As sound recording is primarily “vococentric”, it was developed in order to make speech intelligible. In Lastra’s reading, sound technology can be conceptualised in terms of a set of dichotomies which straddle the conflict between *sound* and *words*. Early sound technologies are constructed as technologies of both “inscription” and “simulation”. This can be linked to the use of sound technology which hovers between “high fidelity” and “intelligibility”.¹³⁷ According to Lastra, these conflicts are about technology and perception. They can also, however, be linked to an ideological struggle of power (as a part of the struggle between universalism versus speech heteroglossia). Whether sound reproduction is perceived as diction, voice or sound, or whether it is perceived as spoken *words* changes the relation of power in several ways. The act of speaking is an act of performing power as the speaker controls the delivered message.

When speech is recorded, there is a struggle of power between the recorder and the subject who speaks into the machine; and from an apparatus perspective, there is also a struggle of power between the technology of recording and the speaking subject. Both these relations are reflected by the

conflict between sounds and words. The voice of “the other” is either perceived as an object (of scientific study or of desire) or as spoken message. Society’s “unheard voices”, working-class accents, black singing voices, speech and songs of “primitive people”, peasants, or representations of the female voice are represented ambiguously with sound recording. On the one hand, phonograph, radio, microphones, gramophones, etc., introduce all these unheard voices into a public sphere. However, the hegemonic structure of power renders these voices into bodies or objects rather than messages with a potentially political content. This can further illuminate the complex and paradoxical relation between recording as a means of controlling the “floating” character of the voice, and the loss of control through the disconnection between voice and body by the recording situation.

Among the representations of the voices of class, ethnicity and gender, the vicissitudes of gender has been predominantly discussed in media theory. This is partly due to the fact that the “problem of women’s speech” is related to a psychoanalytic problematic, to a conflict between the “word” as a male ratio and the sound of the mother’s voice as a pre-oedipal “sonorous envelope”. This conflict between words, power and masculinity, on the one hand, and the voice as an object of desire and femininity, on the other, can also be linked to sound technology practice.¹³⁸ In the process of either controlling the female voice or preventing the woman from speaking, the sound apparatus plays an ambiguous role. Sound technology enables public speech and consequently becomes a tool of power and authority. Therefore, throughout the history of sound reproduction, the sound apparatus, microphones and phonographic recording of speech, have been argued to be unsuitable for women. As Amy Lawrence has pointed out, women were prevented from announcing news on the radio with arguments like “in no case does the female voice transmit as well as that of the man”, as a radio manager of the 1920s claimed; or, as it was written in a technical manual from 1929, the reproduction of the voice “fails to some extent to record when a sound is characterized by the presence of high harmonics”.¹³⁹ On the other hand, the ability to transfer or store the female voice through the apparatus is also a way of controlling the voice, and turn the potential message into pure technology or a desirable physical object. If women were prevented from reading news on the radio, other means of reproducing women’s voices were considered to be more suitable. For example, recorded songs performed by women were not perceived as a problem, as public singing takes part in the tradition of spectacle.

Most notable, the profession of telephone operators almost exclusively turned into a women’s profession. In writings about the telephone operator, the erotic or tender quality of the female voice was often stressed, qualities revealed by the mysterious “acousmatic” dimension of the telephone. “[T]he dulcet tone of feminine voices seem to exercise a soothing and calming effect on the masculine mind [...]”,¹⁴⁰ as an article on early telephone practices

observed. The mechanical dimension of telephone operators' speech undermines the position of authority of, for instance, a radio announcer.

There is a similar problematic regarding the representation of dialects and native oral languages. The collections of recorded voices of either colonised natives or peasants expose a field between ethnology, linguistics and entertainment organised according to the already-existing relations of power. In many articles about archives, the struggle between scientists as the ones who record and the recorded voices as the object of research is notable. The often illustrated encounter between science, technology and "ignorant natives" depicts the "education" of non-modernised cultures as part of modernisation, urbanisation and colonisation.

Comic strips about cannibals burning and eating the talking doll of Edison,¹⁴¹ scientific explanations as to why superstitious Indians fear the phonograph, or why Muslims refuse to recite the Koran into the recording machine, shed light on a discourse of struggle of power between the recorder and the recorded.¹⁴² The encounter between the "natives" and the phonograph stages what Michael Taussig calls "white man's fascination with the other's fascination of white man's magic".¹⁴³ According to these sources, hostile reactions were also experienced when recording peasants in western cultures. When Hans W. Pollak was recording Swedish farmers for the Vienna archive, he noted that the peasants thought of the tool as "magician" or "unchristian". As reported by the scientist, a woman refused to talk into the machine because she wanted "to keep her soul".¹⁴⁴

Such stories of ignorant natives and sound recording instruments are also recurrent motifs in classic ethnological documentaries. It is significant that when Robert J. Flaherty made his famous documentary, *Nanook of the North* (1922), he staged a scene when Nanook tries to eat a gramophone record. This reproduces an image of sensory hierarchies which is part of the imaginary of the encounter between natives and modern technology. Instead of *listening* Nanook *tastes* the record (like an infant would do).

The representation of natives as hostile, disrespectful or superstitious towards modern technology is partly based on a justified resistance towards the western scientists' aim to record tales and religious speech, and thereby gain power over the voice of "the other". It mainly, however, illustrates a western imaginary of cultural progression and how reproduction media partake in that progression.¹⁴⁵ The recorded voices move in various cultural spheres generating different significations. If anthropologists, ethnologists and linguistics have recorded voices as a part of a colonisation and modernisation project, contemporary research reuse the same recordings in order to deconstruct the project and listen to the recorded speech from the point of view of the "other".¹⁴⁶ This process of deconstruction is also embodied in the original recording situation, in the struggle of power between words and sound, between the recorder and the recorded. As the recording of speech embodies sound and speech, body and message, the same recording can be

“read” as an object of science, a representation of a specific disappearing culture, or a political message.

The conflict and interaction between language diversity and heteroglossia, between language translation and media transposition, between inscription and simulation, etc., is materialised in the cinematic culture of the period of the coming of sound film. The concepts introduced and contextualised in this chapter serve as a point of departure for the overall problem of speech representation by sound reproduction and film translation. In subsequent chapters, these concepts will be linked to other media contexts, such as the relation between film and theatre, sound film and star culture, or the problem of speech representation in silent film.

Language(s) of Sound Film: the Regional, the Multilingual and Hollywood English

The Fall of the Tower of Babel

Film Universalism and Cultural Differentiation

As discussed in the previous chapter, the utopia of universalism is inscribed in various discourses on sound technology in the nineteenth century. In the subsequent decades, primarily in the 1910s and the 1920s, this utopia is transferred to discourses on film. As frequently discussed, film universalism is revealed by ideas on the “Esperanto” of silent film¹⁴⁷ as a modern incarnation of the myth of “The Tower of Babel”.¹⁴⁸ The notion of film as a universal language takes many forms and is formulated in film industrial discourses, for example, by Carl Laemmle or D.W. Griffith,¹⁴⁹ in popular press and in early film theory, in Vachel Linday’s ideas on film and hieroglyphics and in Béla Balázs’ theory on how film as “the first international language” reveals the physiognomic origin of spoken language,¹⁵⁰ to cite the most important examples.

In one reading, universalism equalled Americanism and in another communism or Europeanism, in one modernism and avant-garde, and in another, commercialism. Dziga Vertov claimed that “a truly international absolute language of cinema” was “based on its total separation from the language of theatre and literature”.¹⁵¹ From this perspective, the notion of universalism is perceived in contrast to narrative (Hollywood) cinema. From a Hollywood perspective, on the other hand, classical narrative cinema was understood as a purveyor of universally transparent and universally intelligible images. As theorised by Miriam Hansen, this was in turn linked to the idea that Hollywood cinema would be envoy to universal values of democracy and the American dream.¹⁵² To quote D.W. Griffith, film “was to make all men brothers [...] because they would understand each other”.¹⁵³

Each interpretation undermines the universal values in the others. Consequently, the utopia of universalism is a matter of film politics and film culture, hinged on the historical processes of cultural differentiation. Universalism as a Eurocentric western concept, deconstructing itself from inside, depicts both sides of the myth of the Tower of Babel, the utopia of a perfect language and the barriers and obstacles preventing perfect communication.

The introduction of sound has always been described in contradictory terms when it comes to the conception of film as a universal language. This is due to the different interpretations of film and sound universalism, as well as the dual conception of sound as both words and sounds proper (as discussed in the previous chapter). From a larger film production perspective, the transition to sound is perceived as a step towards standardisation of film style, with Charles O'Brien's words, "a homogenizing process that quickly and significantly reduced the cinema's diversity of film styles and practices".¹⁵⁴

The stylistic homogenisation was the result of industrial changes and decisions concerning the many ways in which Hollywood standardised sound film production within a few years,¹⁵⁵ or how European companies, in particular the German company, UFA, developed from being director-controlled into a studio system much like the Hollywood studios.¹⁵⁶ This industrial and stylistic homogenisation co-exists, however, with an upsurge of domestic film production (for the domestic markets) in smaller countries.¹⁵⁷ The introduction of speech generated a higher demand of films spoken in the native language; linguistic diversity would here function as a means of disrupting the homogenising process. The early sound film period is also a period of struggle between the "European" and the "American", both on a cultural and industrial level. Hollywood's dominance was challenged by the "Film Europe" network and transnational co-productions,¹⁵⁸ enjoying success in the transitional period due to quota systems and by the rise of the German company Tobis-Klangfilm, which within a few years turned into a pan-European company with branches all over Europe.¹⁵⁹ European transnationalism was particularly striking in an avant-garde and cinephilia context. As described by Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener, "never before had there been such an exchange of films and ideas, so many industrious collaborations on institutional levels".¹⁶⁰

The question of whether conversion to sound is marked by continuity or disruption has been intensively debated in film scholarship.¹⁶¹ Without going into detail about the industrial controversies, one could state that the early years of sound film was both a period of uncertainty, experimentation and cultural diversity, and a period of homogenisation and standardisation which reinforced the "universal" model of story telling; a period in which the "Tower of Babel" both falls and is re-established.

This double conception of sound film and universalism is revealed in discourses on speech and sound. Most writings from the early sound film period accentuated the "Esperanto" of silent film which was threatened by the introduction of speech. In an initial phase, many sound films were produced without speech, only containing sound effects and music. This practice sought to maintain the filmic "language" as language in opposition to the verbal, or, more commonly, as a viable solution for exporting sound films before translation techniques were established. The great importance of the

universal is also shown in some extreme suggestions from film critics advocating the use of Esperanto or other artificially-constructed universal languages as the *lingua franca* for talking films.¹⁶² Different translation techniques - dubbing, multiple language version production, primarily - were described in utopian terms as a means of overcoming language differences and re-establishing filmic universalism, as well as a depiction of linguistic polyglossia, as texts exposing a dialogue between two languages.

In this chapter, I will intersect discourses on universalism and discourses on speech. Sound and dialogue will thus not only be discussed as means of communication, but also as a feature of *representations* of cultural identities. By an extensive use of exotic accents, early sound films exploited speech as a signifier of social or regional identities. The predication for accents both express linguistic and cultural differentiation, besides depicting speech as body rather than language. The many sound films which combine different languages also represent cross-cultural identities, such as European multilingual identity or even utopias of global communication. On several levels, speech thus partakes in a struggle of defining the complex relation of sound, film and cultural identity.

I aim to outline three “speech discourses” which in my interpretation are decisive for the conception of speech in the early sound era: 1, the regional dialect; 2, the multilingual; 3, (Hollywood) American English. All three discourses evoke the tension between sounds and words, differentiation and homogenisation as discussed in the previous chapter, and they all embody a certain resistance towards *the word* by foregrounding *sounds*. This is why I begin the analysis with some notes on the important distinction in this period between “sound film” and “talking pictures”. “Language” is here understood in its double guise both in a semiotic sense, as a means of expression and as verbal language. “Hollywood English” is a “language” in a literal conventional sense, apart from functioning as a trope for a more general conception of film speech as an artificial construction. I will focus on classical film examples from the early sound era, such as Walter Ruttmann’s *Melodie der Welt* (1929), the early films of Marcel Pagnol, René Clair’s *Sous les toits de Paris* and Josef von Sternberg’s *Der blaue Engel*, and connect these with film theoretical writing or film criticism from the period of the coming of sound. I will give special attention to the bi-lingual films *Allo Berlin? Ici Paris/Hallo hallo! Hier spricht Berlin!* (Julien Duvivier, 1932) and *Kameradschaft/La tragédie de la mine* (G.W. Pabst, 1931) since these integrate the process of translation in the filmic diegesis, and therefore are enlightening examples in order to discuss “the multilingual” as a translation issue.

“Sounds of the World”: Sound Film versus Talking Picture

Discourses on non-verbal sound as a specific language in contrast to spoken or written words described in the previous chapter is revealed in the early

sound film context, and in particular within film art and avant-garde circles. In articles and manifestos written during the period of the coming of sound, it is repeatedly stressed that the writers are not critical of the sound in film per se, only of the filmic representation of the word.

The notion of silent film as sound and image synaesthesia or film-music analogy laid the ground for an ambiguous approach to sound in film. On the one hand, the “sound itself”, perceived as “pure” in its absence of dialogue, would be understood as a continuation of the silent aesthetic. Both sound film and silent film are thus placed in contrast to the talking picture. On the other hand, the media materiality inscribed in the conception of images and sounds as “languages” in their own right allow a conceptualisation of sound film as a new “art form” in contrast to silent film. Early sound film experiments such as Germaine Dulac’s short musical films, Walter Ruttmann’s early sound films, or Oskar Fischinger’s synaesthetical films hinge on this duality, that is, sound film as a combination of previous media as well as a new art form. The focus on the sonic rather than the verbal follows the tradition of experimental sound art from the 1910s and the 1920s. In the period of the transition to sound film, sound experimentation in various media from the preceding decades merges with film art in a brief period of extensive sound film experimentation. Many films evoke a dimension of media specificity and media materiality in this time of “crisis” (in Rick Altman’s sense of the word)¹⁶³ of the very definition of “film”.¹⁶⁴ Just as *The Jazz Singer* or other early sound musicals combines different media - film, gramophone and radio – rather than just being films,¹⁶⁵ so are also many of the early avant-garde films only legible in a multimedia context.

The most common criticism against sound film was based on the idea that the sound would reduce film to “filmed theatre”, to a bad copy of another art form, an art of the word rather than of the image.¹⁶⁶ Rudolf Arnheim and Béla Balázs in Germany, René Clair in France or the directors of the Soviet montage school were all “silent” film directors or theoreticians with a suspicious attitude towards the talking picture. In one of the first and most influential aesthetic commentaries on the coming of sound, the sound “statement” issued by Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Alexandrov from 1928, the authors fear that the near future would be dominated by “commercial exploitation of the most salable merchandise, TALKING FILMS”. The characteristics of the talking film, they feared, would be the use of sound recording “on a naturalistic level, exactly corresponding to the movement on the screen, and providing a certain ‘illusion’ of talking people [...]”. Instead, the three authors advocate a contrapuntal montage, an “orchestral counterpoint of visual and aural images”.¹⁶⁷ The statement echoed in many early articles and utterances on sound film. Béla Balázs claimed that instead of “letting the actor talk”, the sound film should provide an “audiovisual counterpoint”,¹⁶⁸ and Ruttmann described the contrapuntal as the basic structure of sound film.¹⁶⁹

The most influential film corresponding to the assumption of sound film as a new film art form (at least in a French cinephile context) was Ruttmann's *Melodie der Welt* (1929). Abel Gance placed Ruttmann's film in contrast to the conventional talking picture by claiming that the use of sound by Ruttmann could make the sound film "gradually [...] become a *new language*, a mode of expression of rhythm and truth [...]"¹⁷⁰ George Altman wrote that the film was "neither theatre, nor cinema, but something else".¹⁷¹ As the film was made with music and sound effects only and without talking sequences, the "new language" of sound film corresponded to a rejection of the verbal in favour of an emphasis on the "sounds of the world". A critic noted enthusiastically: "The sounds of the ship machinery, of the siren, the rattle, stamping and pushing on deck – the sound film as newsreel [...] is in sight. Here are future possibilities."¹⁷² (Ironic comment since the sounds were recorded in a studio.) The universalism of sound is here mirrored in film's thematic level. As the title indicates, the film is about a global travelogue accompanied by music composed by Wolfgang Zeller. In an audiovisual montage, following the rhythmic aesthetics seen, for instance, in *Berlin: Die Sinfonie der Großstadt* (1927), Ruttmann creates a variation of themes and motifs by a montage of images from all over the world. Moreover, as noted by Elsaesser and Hagener in an essay about the "modern" and the transnational in *Melodie der Welt*, as the film was a combination of advertisement film for a transatlantic shipping company and a European avant-garde film produced by Tobis, transnationalism and globalisation is also inscribed at a production level. The film features "a universal gesture, in which intelligibility of mass culture is combined with Eurocentric tourist ethnography which transforms a city into a symphony, and then the whole world into a melody".¹⁷³

It is telling that Ruttmann transcends cultural spheres of commercialism and "art"; the discourses on sound film in contrast to talking film were not exclusively an avant-garde issue. The juxtaposition between sound and dialogue followed the categorisation of different kinds of sound films which existed on the market during this period. As will be developed in the next chapter, during an initial phase of the sound film, the hybrid film forms between silent and sound, with either music or sound effects and only partly sound or speaking/singing sequences, allowed a categorisation of the different kinds of sound film. The most important and most widespread distinction was between "talking film" and "sound film"; the former containing speech and the latter sound effects and music. An even more differentiated categorisation would sometimes be provided by dividing "sound film" into subcategories such as "music" or "singing" film. As pointed out by Charles O'Brien, in France "talking film" could also signal direct sound, while "sound film" meant post-synchronised sound.¹⁷⁴ This categorisation, linked to the recording situation rather whether the recorded sounds were speech, effects or music, was based on the fact that most sounds were artificially

constructed by sound machines or with records with sound samples, while speech was recorded directly. The sound film containing silent talking sequences in combination with sound effects and music would for a short period be a successful alternative to the talking film. The success of sound film over talking film in some cases is a direct consequence of the problems of film “universalism”: by avoiding spoken dialogue, the sound films managed to overcome the problems of international distribution linked to the spreading of the talking picture. The notion of sound universalism is thus not an isolated avant-garde phenomenon, but is part of larger field of film culture and film distribution.

Speech as Regional and Social Signifier

Non-verbal Voices

Marcel Pagnol, the most vocal advocate of *talking* film in the early sound period, mocked non-verbal *sound* film as a kind of film that was “mourning, shouting, laughing, singing, crying, but never talking”.¹⁷⁵ The quotation indicates that even if the sound film was not representing speech, it was still “vococentric”; the film did not talk, but it still produced human vocal sounds. The emphasis on the non-verbal reveals the sonic dimension of the voice, besides (as films with non-vocal sound effects) providing a “universal” sound film beyond the limits of the verbal.

Many of the non-verbal vocal sounds, such as the sound of a scream or the voices of the talking, chattering or screaming masses, became popular attractions in their own right. This is notable by the rise of horror films. The most well-known examples are Fay Wray’s penetrating screaming in *King Kong* (Merian C. Cooper and Ernest B. Schoedsack, 1933), the animal screams of Tarzan or the elaborated transition from a scream to the sound of a train whistle in Alfred Hitchcock’s *Blackmail* (1929). The scream depicts an intersection between body and sound technology, to re-phrase Michel Chion, it incarnates a “phantasm of *absolute sound*”.¹⁷⁶ Another common “trope” in many early sound films is a group of people talking together which creates a wall of human voices beyond the level of intelligibility. This “voice of the masses” transcends genre, it can be a representation of political public demonstrations, as in *Die 3-Groschenoper* (G.W. Pabst, 1931), or the chattering chorus girls of the musical, or secretaries in an office in a romantic comedy. The sound of the masses problematises the relation between speech as either an aural object or a message by revealing the differentiation of speech via a sonic abstraction beyond the intelligible. This trope is also present in Ruttmann’s *Melodie der Welt*. In one of the versions of film (the film was made in three versions with slightly different editing), Ruttmann briefly abandons his “non-verbal” aesthetics and introduces a sequence

named “languages of the world”. In this sequence, we see and hear a succession of spoken languages, introducing one after the other and subsequently rejoining together in sonic montage as a choir of incomprehensible voices. This sequence undermines linguistic diversity and positions speech as a sonic “universal” language.

In the early 1930s, Balázs described the speech act as a physical gesture.¹⁷⁷ This was a continuation of his earlier inquiry on how (silent) film reveals the physiognomy of body movements. The emphasis on the vocal dimension, later labelled “audible gestures of speech”¹⁷⁸, adequately captures the conception of non-verbal speech; the act of speaking is perceived as a physical movement rather than a means of communication. “A proof” of the priority of the voice in favour of words, was, according to Balázs, “that in sound film, it is not disturbing when we hear incomprehensible foreign languages”.¹⁷⁹ In Ruttmann’s case, this notion is stressed by representing language as incomprehensible to all: the problem of language barriers and language differentiation, inevitably related to speech representation, is here solved by the final cacophony of voices in which no distinct intelligible words are audible. The cacophony of voices corresponds to the variation montage, in which gestures and activities from different countries or cultures are “synchronised”. A critic aptly resumed the “refrain” of this “Melody” as “differences between peoples, skin colour, and rhythmic nuances are costumes of the same drama, the human is invariable”.¹⁸⁰ This homogenisation of gestures and body movements reflects notions on ethnic homogenisation and mass media intensively debated and theorised in this period. (Particularly relevant are Marcel Mauss’ ideas of the interaction between film media and body as a means of erasing ethnic differences; gestures are harmonised through filmic representation.)¹⁸¹ The anxiety of speech as disrupting the homogeneity of filmic universalism would consequently embrace the sonic differences as variations of one and the same principle (sonic universalism).

The sound of collective voice is both a variation of, and a contrast to, what Siegfried Kracauer described as “the mass ornament”, namely the visual organisation of the masses in the films of the 1920s that undermines any social or iconic reference and “vanishes into the void of the abstract”.¹⁸² The speaking masses objectify speech as pure sound just as the visual mass ornament forms “thousands of people [...] into one single star”,¹⁸³ and thus functions as a means of controlling the plurality of regional and class-coded languages of sound film. But collective speech beyond intelligibility also, since non-understanding, as such, is brought to light, creates a representation of chaos, and thus functions as a contrast to the visually organised ornament. The unintelligible voices of the masses also illustrate the anxiety of speech “heteroglossia” and contrast the “*mute* patterns” of the ornament.¹⁸⁴ Significantly, the “voices of the masses” in film often belong to societies “unheard voices” (women, working-class members, “foreigners”, etc.). For instance, in the mid-1930s, Bardèche and Brasillach described the “savage ecstasy” of

black people praying together in *Hallelujah* (King Vidor, 1929) as a “collective soul of a people”. According to Bardèche and Brasillach, this was one of the most impressive achievements of the early sound film.¹⁸⁵ This is part of an ideological media discourse in which the *voice* is heard, but the *words* and the potential message remain unheard.

Speech as Voice and Diction

By understanding speech as *diction* rather than *words*, the emphasis on the non-verbal is inscribed in the representation of intelligible speech and more conventional dialogue. As discussed in the previous chapter, speech as diction can be conceptualised as a “grain of the voice” in a Barthesian sense, namely as an expression of the body beyond the symbolic dimension of the word. For the following analysis, it is important to stress that the “body” heard on the sound track also partakes in a discourse of social, racial and ethnic representation (with the conception of social biology at the time, these categories would often be merged), rather than being an individual physical expression.

By proclaiming speech in film as “physiognomy” or “nature” respectively, Béla Balázs and Rudolf Arnheim placed speech representation in opposition to sonic abstraction beyond the verbal, as well as they criticised the dialogue-centred talking picture. This is a revised position in relation to the outraged hostility towards speech representation as such which was proclaimed in earlier writings concerning sound in an avant-garde context. Arnheim claims that language is not only a means of communication, but also a “piece of nature”, it is “a sound among sounds”. Therefore, film speech, in contrast to theatre, should not be recited, it does not even have to be comprehensible. The “the imprecise everyday language” puts focus on the non-articulated and mumbling speech.¹⁸⁶ Balázs makes a similar juxtaposition between film and theatre claiming that the difference between filmic and theatrical speech is that the vocal, physical aspect of speech in theatre is the means, the instrument which brings out the message, while filmic speech is essentially a physical expression. In *Der Geist des Films* from 1930, he claims that filmic speech should emphasise the “acoustic and sensuous expression” of the words.¹⁸⁷ This is repeated and stressed more strongly in the later *Theory of the Film*: “Now in the present-day sound film we understand the words and, therefore, very often understand that their meaning is unimportant. But all the more important is the tone in which they are said: the cadence, the emphasis, the timbre, the husky resonance, which are not intentional, not conscious.”¹⁸⁸

The great interest in regional dialects, accents, and the voice as social signifier during the early sound era turns the sonic qualities of speech into so-

cial categories and consequently, social differentiation. Significantly, Al Jolson's first line in *The Jazz Singer*, the legendary phrase "you ain't heard nothin' yet", is not only a cleverly calculated message (a diegetically established slogan for the future of sound film), it is also an exhibition of filmic speech as voice or diction. The new medium of sound film is promoted by the typical Jewish, New York-Brooklyn *accent* of Al Jolson's character, which indicates his local, social and ethnic identity. In contrast to written dialogue, diction is inseparable from representation in sound recordings. With Robert Stam's words, "the sound film comes inevitably equipped with 'accent' and 'intonation'" which means that "the sound film is virtually incapable of representing speech *without* an accent".¹⁸⁹ By representing accents that somehow disrupt the norm of a standard spoken language, the early sound film stresses this feature of embodiment in sound reproduction as such. The interest in regional, often working-class accents functions primarily as a contrast to the theatrically trained manner of speech, but also in contrast to the abstract dimension of non-verbal sounds.

In recent scholarship, the diversity of languages in sound film has been increasingly discussed in relation to sociolects rather than different national languages. For instance, Christopher Faulkner and Christopher Beach have both pointed out in which ways the social dimension of speech embody a potential "heteroglossia" in a Bakhtinian sense, a discourse of diversity and difference related to speech as a social signifier. Faulkner correlates this linguistic diversity to a differentiation of spectatorship: "What sound (speech) expressly acknowledge was a linguistic diversity – Bakhtin's "heteroglossia" – and what it created was a mass listening public, not uniform or homogenous, but diverse, fragmented, even divided, and with potentially disruptive and unsettling social and political consequences."¹⁹⁰ He further applies these Bakhtinian terms on the well known controversies on talking film versus sound film between Marcel Pagnol and René Clair. Clair developed the contrapuntal, a-synchronous principles advocated by the Soviet montage school (combined with an illusion-breaking operetta style seen in films like *Die Drei von der Tankstelle*, Wilhelm Thiele, 1930), while Pagnol was one of the few who explicitly (and provocatively) proclaimed that the sound film should be "filmed theatre".¹⁹¹ (Not only literarily in the sense that his films were based on theatre plays, but also aesthetically by foregrounding speech over images. Pagnol is even said to have chosen takes by first listening to the sound track.)¹⁹²

By juxtaposing the adversaries, Faulkner stresses the relations between, on the one hand, realism and interest in the mass audience by Pagnol, and, on the other hand, a play with illusion by Clair. He concludes by noting a lack of a "social dimension" by Clair: "What one does not hear in Clair's films is the voice of a social class", but instead, "the uncompromising voice of power and authority and its 'ironic' 'distance'" as "the necessary condition for understanding".¹⁹³ Pagnol, with his emphasis on speech, "seems to allow

for a much more affective intersubjective relationship between film character and spectator. He opens up the possibility of audience pleasure through the recognition of voices which, quite apart from their actual meanings, speak a truth about one's own class, gender and region."¹⁹⁴ It is, however, significant, that Clair also, primarily in his first sound film *Sous les toits de Paris*, emphasised the accent as a representation of social differentiation, and that Pagnol also explored clichés and stereotypes. The two directors were both exploiting regional imaginaries by putting focus on social and local vocal specificity, in the case of Pagnol, the southern midi accent, and by Clair, the Parisian working class accent and the Romanian "immigrant accent". It is rather the different approaches to the word as intelligible sign in relation to the materiality of the voice that differentiate the two.

Filmic speech embodies an interaction between the representation of the word and diction or accent, an interaction which will either be represented as a conflict (which would be the case in René Clair's *Sous les toits de Paris*) or, contrary to this, with the two dimensions reinforcing each other, which would be the case in Marcel Pagnol's Marseille trilogy, *Marius* (Alexander Korda, 1931), *Fanny* (Marc Allégret, 1932) and *César* (Marcel Pagnol, 1936). Pagnol is, with Christian Metz's words, "avoiding the paradox of the talking picture",¹⁹⁵ a paradox of two "languages" in conflict, verbal language in conflict with film as "language system".

Clair teases the audience who had gone to see the first "film 100% talking and singing in French"¹⁹⁶ by constantly undermining the expected speech acts: music cancels out the conversations, windows intervene between the viewers and the talkers, passing trains overpower speech, etc.¹⁹⁷ As Michel Marie has noted, "the film's secret resides [...] in the way the signifying function of the word is, so to speak, interfered with. Whenever a character has something verbal to express, his or her action is hindered by the dramatic situation or by a deliberate directorial device."¹⁹⁸ The focus on accents follows this logic. In the introduction, the film starts with incomprehensible slang followed by a dialogue in Romanian. Consequently, dialects and foreign speech are used to make speech unintelligible.

Pagnol's notion on sound film, on the other hand, pivots around reaching a mass audience, and devices regarding the difference between film and theatre are related to this ambition. It is significant that Pagnol does not actually advocate that sound film should only reproduce the theatre *as it is*. Instead, the sound film should "help" the theatre, it should spread it and also change it aesthetically. In one of his articles, he writes that "we can write a scene in whispers, and make it understandable for the three thousand people, without changing the pitch and tone of the whispering".¹⁹⁹ By taking the apparatus into account, he points out a fundamental difference between film and theatre, and advocates sound film as a combination of film and theatre. In the same way, he emphasises the materiality of the voice in combination with foregrounding the dialogue as intelligible words. In the Pagnol films, in

contrast to Clair's opposition between meaning and speech materiality, *what* the characters say and *how* they say it are two interdependent dimensions of speech. From this perspective, Pagnol correlates cultural and linguistic differentiation on several levels. As Christopher Beach puts it (regarding the Marx Brothers' or Lubitsch's comedies), "language becomes a medium in which difference – whether defined in terms of ethnicity or class - is actively foregrounded".²⁰⁰ It is *spoken language* rather than sound proper that is the "medium of difference", thereby, the conflict between word and sound/body as two dimensions of speech is dissolved and the two components are, on the contrary, interdependent in a process of differentiation.

"These people have an accent the way others have a black skin"

Balázs' theory follows the tradition of scientific and aesthetic ideas on "physiognomy" in which racial and socio-biological differences are categorised as "types". Physical gestures are the basis of human language, divided into "types" based on ethnic (understood as "racial") or social (i.e. class) backgrounds. Concerning sound, the so-called "speech gestures" would thus function as means to represent language as voice or diction by social or biological peculiarities of oral expression. As demonstrated in the discussion on Ruttman, these specificities could, however, be understood as variations of the universal language of physiognomy, of language as physical gesture.

Following James Lastra, the early sound film era can be conceptualised on the spectrum "intelligibility" and "high fidelity" which captures the dichotomy of sound versus language inscribed in sound theory (as discussed in the previous chapter).²⁰¹ The social and regional accents in feature film reside within in this dichotomy. Film accents are rarely realist in the sense that they aim to reproduce speech as actually spoken. Just like costumes, make-up or acting style, the accent is a construction in order to represent or to caricature a specific recognisable "type". Established dialects in films function as "speech genres" in a Bakhtinian sense, that is, "relatively stable types of utterances" in order to represent language differentiation.²⁰²

Within many national languages represented on screen in the 1930s, there are a few distinct "film accents"; the film accents could, for example, represent the metropolitan working-class accent, or non-modernised rural cultural identity in contrast to the metropolitan. These accents are modified versions of actual dialects and are deliberately changed in order to make speech intelligible and to produce caricatures.

François de la Bretèque describes the popular southern French "midi" accent by Pagnol (and others) as such a construction, a homogenising representation of a region with a variety of languages and dialects:

The most obvious of these unifying factors is the accent, the famous midi accent, which is actually a maritime Provençal accent, reworked in the school of the theatre and imposed fictionally as the accent for the whole of the south. With accent ruling supreme, the cinema steered clear of representing the actual languages of the south.²⁰³

The midi accent or the working-class Parisian accent à la Jean Gabin or Arletty in French cinema, the Berlin accent heard on both cabaret stages and on screen in the 1920s and the 1930s, the different American immigrant accents or the southern accents in *Gone with the Wind* (Victor Fleming, 1939) etc., are all filmic constructions of speech captured in between the attraction of the “grain of the voice”, the voice as body, and “images” of ethnic identities.

Speech as ethnic signifier can be conceptualised as a feature “making white strange”, in Richard Dyer’s sense, that is, to disrupt the invisibility (or inaudibility), neutrality and normative position of white ethnic identity and to “dislodge it from its centrality and authority”.²⁰⁴ Arne Lunde’s writing on cultural, social and racial imaginaries revealed by the Swedish accent of Greta Garbo is one of the few examples of readings of the voice from a “whiteness”-perspective. Lunde elaborates on how “prevailing visual paradigms of whiteness in classical American cinema (faces, bodies, skin colour, cosmetics and lighting) are problematized, if not trumped, by the surprisingly powerful acoustic signifiers of recorded voice, accent and dialect”.²⁰⁵ The displaced white identities are inscribed in speech representation as “a medium in which difference is foregrounded” both in the representation of foreign accents, as well as in the representation of regional or class-coded accents.

Significantly, Bazin located the cinematic quality of Pagnol’s films in the realism of the accent:

This accent is not just a picturesque addition to Pagnol’s films; it’s not merely there to inject a note of local colour into the proceedings. It unites with the script and thus with the characters, to create the essential nature of the Pagnol films. These characters have an accent the way others have a black skin [...].²⁰⁶

As described by Claudette Peyrusse, the midi accent was a popular attraction of several media in the late 1920s and early 1930s.²⁰⁷ Pagnol’s first sound film, *Marius*, enjoyed great success on gramophone and radio prior to the film version, and the emphasis on the accent means that not only the words but also the “grain of the voice” functioned as the intermedial link across media.

Bazin’s “black skin” parallel is telling; it places the accent in the realm of the Balázsien “physiognomy”, and explains the presence of “realism” in

spite of the obvious stereotypes.²⁰⁸ The characterisation of biological “types”, namely what one might call an “ethnotype”, is represented by a certain physicality of the voice, and thereby captures a tension between the “real” and construction of “types”. From this perspective, it is significant that the so-called “black voice”, which in the 1920s and 1930s was a great attraction due to the popularity of jazz music and the success of films such as *Hallelujah* has no racial counterpart in white identity: whiteness has different languages, different accents, but there is no “white voice”. Even if the “black voice” as a singing technique can be learned by anyone, it functions as a vocal identity derived from a racial stereotype and indissolubly connected to skin colour. The common practice of whites singing with a “black voice” in the 1920s and 1930s emphasised this dimension since it followed the logic of white people’s “right to be various, literally to incorporate into themselves features of other peoples”.²⁰⁹

White skin colour signifies “colourless”, “brightness” and “light” as specific identities,²¹⁰ while the vocal dimension of all whites embodies nothing but “colourless”. The voice as white ethnic signifier is, consequently, inevitably a feature of differentiation between *different white identities*. Significantly, as Ginette Vincendeau has noted, regarding the Pagnol films, the change of accent from regional to standard “neutral” national language reveals a loss of cultural identity: “To talk *pointu* (with a Parisian, northern accent) equals being educated. But to be an educated Marseillais is to lose one’s cultural specificity.”²¹¹ The regional accent both replaces the lack of an overall “white voice” as well as dislocates the conception of “whiteness” in relation to skin colour by emphasising racial variations.

The attraction of (white) ethnic vocal identities lies in the ability to modulate the voice (by the “right to be various”), combined with the voice as a marker of authenticity. This dual attraction is noticeable in the fan press about stars. Raimu’s (Pagnol’s main star) off-screen star persona was described as a continuation of his fictional character; he was acting the “Marseillais” in the fan press as well in the films. It was an important attraction that Raimu spoke with his authentic Marseille idiom in his films.²¹² Pierre Fresnay (starring as Marius), on the other hand, was neither from the south nor did he impersonate the common and popular character he played in the film. As an actor from Alsace in eastern France and known from the prestigious Comédie Française, Fresnay’s efforts to learn to speak with a “perfect” Marseille accent were frequently discussed in popular discourses.²¹³ This learning process and the change of accents was a sound film attraction co-existing with the attraction of hearing “real accents”, a dual identity which turns speech into a one of the most important devices of constructing ethnic differentiation.

Multilingual Representations

Internationalism and Polyglossia

In one of the first attempts to write a “universal film history”²¹⁴ in the 1930s, Bardèche and Brasillach described film production during the period of the early sound film as a degenerated cultural amalgam opposed to the utopia of “pure” film art:

Films were made by wandering Slavic directors, Germans who spoke no English, Frenchmen who spoke no German, actors whose voices their own mothers could not recognize, singers with tiny voices whose songs were magnified by the microphone, Austrians who assumed Hollywood accents when making French versions of pictures.²¹⁵

The international film industry, with immigrant filmmakers and actors, co-productions between European countries or between Hollywood and Europe, was always seen as a result of the “universalism” of (silent) film. Bardèche and Brasillach describe the internationalism of the film industry in the sound period in terms of language barriers and obstacles of communication rather than a means to overcome cultural differences. They describe a situation with filmmakers who are all foreigners to each other because they do not speak each others languages. This, in turn, is related to the microphonic transformation of the voice. The combination of voices “magnified by the microphone” and foreign languages generates a loss of cultural origin, films with actors whose “voices their own mothers could not recognize”.²¹⁶ In relation to speech as representation of cultural international identity, it is significant how filmic transnationalism is interpreted in two dimensions as a means to overcome language barriers and as an obstacle of communication.

The problems of language differences exacerbated a plethora of debates about the monolingual/the multilingual, debates most intense in multilingual countries like Switzerland, Belgium or Luxemburg and in multilingual regions.²¹⁷ A frequently-discussed topic in the French film trade press was the so-called “bi-lingual question in Alsace-Lorraine”,²¹⁸ a debate about whether the French state should or should not overtax the popular German talking pictures in this German-speaking part of France. The overtaxing was proposed in order to spread the French talking picture as a “spectacle éducateur”²¹⁹, by which the German speaking minority could be “gently guided on the way to the national language”.²²⁰ This is only one of many examples when the multilingual as a sound film issue is linked to language politics, language hierarchies and the talking film’s ability to teach languages.

These relations between languages are also thematised in many early sound films. “Film polyglossia” or “multilingual film” will, in this section, be discussed on the level of representation in films featuring several languages. Many films of the early sound era contain sequences of mixed lan-

guages, and some films are constructed according to the principle of the bi-lingual as a means of translation between two languages within one and the same film. Such films or sequences within films function as meta-filmic features on several levels, as reflections on the multicultural production mode or reception context, on addressing the issues of translation and cultural identity, or the relation between sound technology and speech.

The variation of the same dialogue line repeated in several languages relates to the practice of translation and, in particular, the multiple language version film (which will be further discussed in chapters five and six). On the level of media inscription, the mixed use of foreign and native languages reveals the tension between unintelligible sound and intelligible language. French/German bi-lingual films such as Pabst's *Kameradschaft/La Tragédie de la mine* would also function as a meta-filmic image of the many French-German co-productions, and thus of the future possibilities of an international European cinema.²²¹

Balázs draws attention to the polyglot dimension and interprets the presence of foreign "real" languages as non-verbal "speech landscapes".²²² In the early German talkies *Melodie des Herzens* (Hanns Schwarz, 1929) and *Die Nacht gehört uns* (Carl Froelich, 1929), secondary characters speak in a foreign language (Hungarian and Italian, respectively), which lends local exotic colour to the story. The presence of foreign languages in films soon became a staple of many early sound films either as a feature of realism or exoticism. For example, German dialogue in the English version of *Der blaue Engel* underlined the realism of language as the story is set in Germany. For an American audience, the presence of some German dialogue gave the drama a European exotic touch. The fact that Leni Riefenstahl's character speaks Italian in the German talking picture *Das blaue Licht* (Leni Riefenstahl, 1932), stresses her "wildness" (to a German-speaking audience), besides reinforcing the realism of a story taking place in an Italian Alp village. In this film, Riefenstahl's "foreign" tongue contrasts with the German language spoken by the male protagonist and triggers a gendered reading of female speech as *voice* and male speech as *words*, as discussed in the previous chapter. The polyglot phenomenon thus depicts both the shortcomings and the strength of the sound film. As a different kind of representation of internationalism than the universal language of sound beyond language barriers, the polyglot film establishes language differences in order to overcome them.

The "speech landscape" as a background sound implies a spectator who does not command the foreign language. Spectators who understand the "exotic" background language might glean a different reading. For example, Jean Renoir's *La nuit du carrefour* (1932) features two Danish siblings in a few scenes speaking in their native language. Only one of the actors (Winna Winifried), however, was Danish and the other (Georges Koudria) speaks Danish with a strong accent. A Danish spectator would, consequently, be aware of this double "polyglossia", and also understand the Danish dialogue

which is supposed to represent unintelligible “foreignness”. Ruttmann’s merging of languages into one and the same sonic cacophony can be read as a response to the inevitable linguistic differentiation embodied in speech representation, that is, that speech cannot be reduced to a background sonic “landscape”. (Even fictional film languages adopt traces of different languages, recognisable to some spectators, unknown to others.) Bardèche and Brasillac claim that in *Eskimo* (W.S. Van Dyke, 1933), “[t]he actors speak Eskimo, which does not disturb the least, for the dialogue is not meant to be understood but [...] blends with the images”.²²³ What the writers did not consider was that there might be spectators who actually understand “Eskimo” and to which the speech does not “blend with the images”. In the Swiss polyglot film, *Rapt/La séparation des races* (Dimitri Kirsanoff, 1934), featuring a struggle between German- and French-speaking villages in the Alps, there is a secondary character, a “village idiot”, speaking a “non-sense” language. He functions as intermediary between the villages, but since he is positioned outside the “separation of races”, he is also located outside rational and intelligible communication. This example illustrates how polyglot film depicts the shortcomings of “sound universalism” as a “language” beyond communication. Instead, the polyglot film proposes a way of coming to terms with language barriers by combining different languages intelligible to different audiences.

Translation and Communication in Bi-lingual Films

During 1931 and 1932 a mode of multilingual translation appeared in French/German bi-lingual film. These are a few but discursively significant films in which two languages are constantly paralleled: one line is said in one language and subsequently repeated in another. The most famous films of this “genre”²²⁴ are Pabst’s *Kameradschaft/La Tragédie de la mine* (1931) and Julien Duvivier’s *Allo? Berlin? Ici Paris/Hallo! Hallo! Hier spricht Berlin* (1931). Other examples include *Camp Volant* (Max Reichman, 1932), *Les nuits de Port Said* (Léo Mittler, 1931), and *Niemandesland* (Victor Trivas, 1931). In contrast to the language sequence in *Melodie der Welt*, the bi-lingual films’ plurality of languages can be seen as a mode of translation involved in production of speech as meaningful utterance rather than reducing speech into a cacophony of sound beyond the intelligible. The universalism of sound and media transposition is combined here with the limited internationalism of translation, which undermines the idea of wholesale universalism beyond language differences.

These films are designed to be understood by both German- and French-speaking audiences and do not use subtitles or any other extra-filmic means of translation.²²⁵ For a spectator who only understands one of the two lan-

guages, the relation between foreign and native speech reveals the tension between materiality and intelligibility of language. The bi-lingual films consequently highlight the translation process and problems of overcoming language barriers within the filmic diegesis. Moreover, they do not, as most films that include shorter polyglot sequences, establish a hierarchy between the languages (that is a hierarchy between the native and the foreign). Whether it is German or French that represented the “foreign” depends exclusively on the spectator, which means that the implied spectator is malleable, either German *or* French. The communication problems between the fictive characters in bi-lingual films reflect this open position and represent the native language as foreign and vice versa.

In both *Allo Berlin* and *Kameradschaft*, the communication problem of the translation process is the main theme. *Allo Berlin* is a romantic comedy about a German and a French telephone operator falling in love over the telephone, and *Kameradschaft* takes place in a mine located under the French/German border. In both films, language functions as a means of separation and difference in the alternated locations presented by parallel editing. As pointed out by Vincendeau, if *Kameradschaft* and *Allo Berlin* were the most successful polyglot films, it was because they did not try to cover or hide the translation process inscribed in the films, but rather make creative and witty use of it.²²⁶ In *Allo Berlin*, the usual misunderstandings and mistaken identities of the romantic comedy are due to the “acousmatic” quality of the telephone.²²⁷ The isolation of the voice causes problems of recognition in the characters’ identities, which naturally are resolved, and the film ends with a traditional happy ending (ironically set in one of those night clubs where a telephone is found on every table). The telephone, at the centre of the story, thus both connects the two lovers and threatens to break their relationship. *Kameradschaft* also deals with problems of communicating over distance. The film is about German miners rescuing their French colleagues from a fire accident; the climax is reached when German and French miners trapped in the lower areas of the mine cry out for help. The trapped miners manage to make contact and are saved first by shouting through the subterranean alleys and banging on the pipes, and subsequently by trying to make use of a telephone. The sounds of the pipes are followed by the telephonic verbal contact. In both films, the telephone enters the bilingual world as a tool of translation which overcomes boundaries. *Allo Berlin*, in particular, evokes a multitude of relations between media transmission and language translation. The “telephonic” parallel editing dominates the whole film and structures the overall ironic style. Every scene in Berlin is matched with a similar scene in Paris and vice versa. The satirically exaggerated use of parallel setting destabilises the mystery of the acousmatic telephone voice. This is a parody of the use of the telephone romantic comedies in early sound films,²²⁸ which display the cultural fantasies of telephone voices and gender.²²⁹

The telephone as one of the favourite early sound fetishes is also an inter-medial link to the development of directional microphones in cinema, microphones developed in order to make speech more intelligible.²³⁰ This is a renewed or reinforced relation between cinema and telephony that can be traced to early cinema and the transitional period, as well as to classical silent film.²³¹ The repetition of spoken lines, as a mode of translation in the film, is a specific “telephonic” manner of conversation; by repeating what the caller said, the person on the other side of the line reconfirms that the message has come through. Telephone technology is about transmission of a selection of sounds with the aim to make the spoken message intelligible. It is a process of “media transposition” involving decoding from the transferred electronic signals into words. This level of intelligibility of the telephonic is, in the bi-lingual film (in *Allo Berlin* in particular), related to translation as an exchange of *the same message* which is contrasted to the high fidelity dimension and the materiality of *different languages*. The repetition as *translation* in the bi-lingual films is thus related to repetition as *transmission*.

Europeanism as Differentiation

The utopian dimension of the polyglot films lies in the *desire* and the *ability* to communicate beyond language by way of “universal” emotions and communication technology. The act of falling in love in *Allo Berlin* or the sense of solidarity between workers in *Kameradschaft* stands against language differentiation. The desire to communicate places the films within discourses on the universal, on eternal feelings, media globalisation or international labour communities. The universal theme is also frequently revealed in reviews of polyglot films, both in terms of reception and representation. “La Tragédie de la mine address just as much a selected audience as the huge mass of men from all over the world”, is stated in an article in *La cinématographie française*,²³² and in a review on *Niemandsländ*, it states that “the language confusion is shown in the dialogue. The talking at cross-purposes and the misunderstandings that only the common distress can overcome”.²³³ The global and universal is combined with a fantasy of a specifically European cultural identity. It is significant that the bi-lingual films alternate German and French. By representing the two most important languages in Europe (as well as in “film Europe”), they constitute some of the few examples in film history, which function as “projections” of a European identity.

As Thomas Elsaesser has emphasised, even though inter-European co-productions have had an important impact on the European film market, the European film is always perceived as a work of either a specific nation, or a specific director (rather than unified “imagined community”).²³⁴ By the structure of separated spaces, the bi-lingual films during the transition to sound depict the lack of a unified Europe; they also, however, illustrate the

“European” as being multilingual. European identity is represented as multilingual, and the theme of overcoming language and cultural differences can be read as an attempt to represent a (future) cultural community. To rephrase Elsaesser’s apt description of European “post-national pastiche”, this is a representation that “does not assert its identity in difference, but to whom it presents itself as an impersonation of ‘difference’”²³⁵ Since the implied spectator is a person who speaks *either* German or French, the film impersonates “difference” both in terms of reception and representation. This image of differentiation undermines a homogenous conception of universalism and generates multicultural transnationalism as the “essence” of a specifically European identity. In *The Search for a Perfect Language*, Umberto Eco describes the future possibilities for a “polyglot Europe”:

Polyglot Europe will not be a continent where individuals converse fluently in all the other languages; in the best of cases, it could be a continent where differences of languages are no longer barriers to communication, where people can meet each other and speak together, each in their own tongue, understanding, as best they can, the speech of the others. In this way, even those who never learn to speak another language fluently could still participate in its particular genius, catching a glimpse of the particular cultural universe that every individual expresses each time he or she speaks the language of her ancestors and his or her own tradition.²³⁶

The utopia of Europe lies here in the *absence* of a common language. In the bi-lingual films, German and French (or Berlin and Paris) identities are inscribed in a discourse of sameness, which can be seen as an attempt to overcome the lack of a European (or white) vocal identity. There is no “European” voice, but the variations of German and French suggest that the inevitable vocal and linguistic differences between the European regions are variations rather than opposed identities.

A significant twist in *Allo Berlin* is that the French/German parallelism/juxtaposition is mirrored in gender representation. The film represents a world in which the only significant differences between the two locations, between Berlin and Paris, are gender and language: in this world, women speak French and men speak German. The main feature of “the grain of the voice” as a desire of the voice of a “woman *or* a man” is the gender difference.²³⁷ *Allo Berlin* tends both to erase the dichotomy between the sexes – by the parallel structure they are presented as variations rather than opposites – and place gender (just as language) as an obstacle of exchangeability between the two alternated spaces. The language-gender connection emphasises speech as body or physical gesture. Moreover, in *Allo Berlin*, the Europeanism as a topic is taken further as Duvivier uses “European film” as a frame of reference. We can recognize a parody of the street film genre involving films like *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (Phil Jutzi, 1931) or *Die Straße*

(Karl Grune, 1923) with fast cutting between spaces, displaced perspectives and unstable camera movements, René Clair's witty ironic style and play with illusion and Ruttmann's montage aesthetics. *Allo Berlin* shows images not only of Europe, but more specifically, of Film Europe. Thereby, "dialogue" between languages and between films constructs a discourse in which the intertextual "heteroglossia" of references is linked to the "polyglossia" of languages.

Hollywood English

Americanism and Sound Film

In a final section of this chapter, I will make some brief notes on the reconceptualisation of "Hollywood universalism" with the introduction of speech, and how the use of English dialogue in a polyglot representation (as in *Der blaue Engel*) depicts the cultural significance of English as "film language". The internationalism of the Hollywood industry derives from the notion of the "American dream" as universal, in Victoria de Garzia's words understood in terms of a "historical process by which the American experience was transformed into a universal model of business society based on advanced technology and promising formal equality and unlimited mass consumption".²³⁸ The development of the classical Hollywood narrative or the rising numbers of movie theatre palaces as architectural metonymies of the "Tower of Babel" (as theorised by Miriam Hansen) amalgamates the utopia of universalism with Americanism. In the debates on Americanism in Europe in the 1920s, the term "Americanism" became a "trope" or a "catchword" for modernity.²³⁹ As described by Hansen, the discourse of Americanism became "a catalyst for the debate on modernity and modernisation, polarised into cultural conservative battle-cries or jeremiads on the one hand and euphoric hymns to technological progress or resigned acceptance on the other".²⁴⁰ The double perception of Americanism depicts the influence of American culture both as a liberating force against traditional patriarchal hierarchies and cultural elitist values, and as cultural imperialism of commercial globalisation. The American paradox of being both a nation and a universal process of modernisation is summed up in Dusan Makavejev's statement (quoted by Elsaesser) that "living in the 20th century meant learning to be American."²⁴¹

The debates during the conversion to sound, and in particular the criticism of the talking picture, mesh with these discourses on Americanism in the 1920s. Hollywood expansion was clearly visible (or rather audible) to the audience and to the European film industry since almost all early talking pictures in Europe were American. The discussions on sound film as a commercial "toy" or mass cultural entertainment in contrast to film as art (as

well as the “patent wars” between German and American sound systems)²⁴² took part in the criticism of Hollywood cinema as such. As pointed out by Thomas Saunders:

Discourse on the talkie revolution [...] was tantamount to commentary on the American cinema. Substantial initial scepticism about the coordination of sound with motion pictures existed apart from Hollywood’s role in the process. Nonetheless, America’s lead in this innovation appeared more than coincidental and fostered particular resistance.²⁴³

This notion of sound film turned the culturally neutral “sound itself” into something “American”. Cultural conservatives claimed that the sound film lulled American audiences “back into the slumber of mental inertia” or that the “the harmless mental babies enjoyed the noise”.²⁴⁴ This sheds light on another paradox in the discourse on Americanism: America is both an incarnation of the modern and the primitive; Americans were described as uneducated, without culture, but moving constantly towards the future. In the context of early sound film, the primitiveness in combination with modernisation were mirrored in the frequent comparisons between the new medium of sound film and “primitive” early film period in the late nineteenth century. For defenders of the talking picture, the notion of American culture as primitive would also be introduced into the conceptualisation of the talking film *in opposition* to American culture. As Saunders has pointed out, the conservative writer Hans Spielhofer claimed that “[u]nlike regions of lesser education and closer proximity to nature (America) Europe was never completely satisfied with the reliance on the more primitive mimic dialogue. In short, what in the United represented a technical toy and commercial gimmick was pregnant with cultural significance when transposed to a European setting.”²⁴⁵

The different interpretations of the relation between talking films and American culture illustrate how the various discourses on Americanism are permeated in the shifting conceptions of sound film.

Vernacular American Speech

The representation of speech plays a specific role in the discourses of Americanism as a sound film issue. American *speech* heard on the screens in Europe undermined the notion of American as a culturally neutral process of modernity and modernisation. The Jewish Brooklyn accent in “you ain’t heard nothin yet” together with the black music performances in the black-face show performed by Al Jolson explore a discourse of American ethnicity related to the medium of sound film. With the heard voices, the American

cinema became inevitably a representation of a culturally specific ethnic group (or several ethnic groups), an image of a people speaking a foreign language with a “vulgar” (“vernacular”) American accent. This response is particularly notable in the British press, where the recurring comments on voice transmission and clear diction in reviews of talking pictures are followed by reflections on whether the alienating American accent is too strong or whether the actor has learned to speak “proper” English. Even with positive comments like “[Laura La Plante’s] voice is certainly more English than the majority”,²⁴⁶ “[Charles Roger’s] voice is pleasant and not too dreadfully accented”,²⁴⁷ or “although accent is apt to alienate, Davy Lee has his charm”,²⁴⁸ is the American accent described as a primitive feature disrupting the standard norm of “English”. It is also noticeable that differences between American dialects are rarely mentioned, American accents are most often described as one single idiom.

The use of American English as a representation of another language is even more strongly criticised, for example, even if Noah Beny was praised for his acting in *Noah’s Ark* (Michael Curtiz, 1928), it was noted that he “as the Russian, [...] has to speak in a broad American accent”.²⁴⁹ The transparency and universalism of Hollywood English, able to represent any language (with or without foreign accents as a signifier of the represented foreign language), was not established in this period. Voice reproduction as an embodiment of “whiteness” in terms of ethnicity is inscribed here in a process of establishing or displacing the relations between “we and the other” within the different variations of English as a language of power.

According to Donald Crafton, the period of early sound film in Hollywood was a period of establishing a norm that would correspond to the universalism of story telling. An initial “quality phase”²⁵⁰ dominated by British accents common on the American stages was followed by a phase of “natural voices”.²⁵¹ The struggle between theatrical speech and “natural accents”, between British English and American English, is also related to the relation between intelligible speech versus the high fidelity dimension of reproduced actual speech. The homogenous manner of speech in the Hollywood films of the 1930s and 1940s is an adjustment of intelligibility (for a large audience) and the attraction of the American “natural” accent. This construction was the result of a third “hybrid” phase in the early sound period that followed the two others, a phase with voices “with a clear diction, as on stage, but with the everyday spontaneity, ease and colloquialism of American (not British) English”.²⁵² An important dimension of this “Hollywood English” was the popularity of foreign accent in Hollywood films,²⁵³ which was part of the interest in the “natural accents” and consequently an extension, rather than an opposite, of the interest in the American accent. The popularity of Greta Garbo, Maurice Chevalier or Marlene Dietrich in the 1930s is, for example, partly linked to their foreign accents. The foreign accents serve as

a representation of speech in the American melting pot as, by which different cultural origins are inscribed in racial and national identity.²⁵⁴

Der blaue Engel/The Blue Angel, as the first German “international talking picture”,²⁵⁵ and as a film frequently discussed in terms of “Germanness” versus “Americanism”,²⁵⁶ allegorises the various implications of Americanism as a speech issue. The film was made in two versions, one in English and one in German. Both versions are polyglot in the sense that they include both languages. Both films establish a relation between the “foreign” and the native from an implied spectator’s point of view. Hence, unlike the polyglot *Allo Berlin* and *Kameradschaft*, one language is dominant in each version. Just like other polyglot films, however, both versions represent language on a realistic level in the sense that the diegetic fictional language corresponds to the actual spoken language. Since the story takes place in Germany in both versions, a number of narrative “solutions” motivate the English dialogue. In both versions the protagonist Professor Immanuel Rath (Emil Jannings) is an English teacher instead of a teacher in German and ancient Greek literature, as was the case in Heinrich Mann’s novel on which the film was based, and in the English version, the “tingel-tangel” cabaret singer, Lola-Lola (Marlene Dietrich), is supposed to be Anglophone, which motivates the English dialogue between the two protagonists (spoken in German in the German version).

The polyglot dimension foregrounds the act of speaking and learning (Hollywood) English as an international language on an explicit level. In the English version, English takes a double position of both a native linguistic norm (since English is the dominant language and the native language of the presumed spectators), besides being a foreign language for the German actors on an extra-diegetic level (as well as for the German fictional characters on a fictional level). The process of learning is represented in the film by the presence of the foreign accent, a feature that also corresponded and reinforced the particular timbre and physicality of Dietrich’s voice (her slow, sleepy speech, her frequent pausing). That Emil Jannings, due to his skimpy knowledge of English, had to return to Germany and cut short his career as an international star made his first sound film playing the role of an English teacher, adds a dimension of tragic irony to the destruction and fall of Professor Rath.

The introduction of sound was a learning situation for the whole film industry, and most notably for the actors: foreign language lessons, pronunciation and diction training became an important part of an actor’s work. For foreign actors in Hollywood, the task was to learn to speak intelligible “Hollywood English” with a slight accent adding a touch of the exotic. The adjustment of differences into “sameness” embodied in the melting pot utopia corresponds to the development towards intelligible speech. The remaining accents as a remainder of cultural origin correspond to cultural differentiation, exposing the body itself as a “polyglossia” dialogue between words

spoken in one language with an accent tracing another. The accent is a signifier of the actor as a “real” person also on a professional level as it sets off the actor as in the act of acting. The act of speaking a foreign language shows the very process of pretending, the staging of the self as an other. In her autobiography, Dietrich draws attention to this process and describes her (foreign and native) speech both in terms of authenticity and as an artificial construction. She claims that Sternberg used her as “living dictionary” for the Berlin slang that she had learned as an actress. “This colourful language, spoken in Berlins’ working-class quarters”,²⁵⁷ was not a natural idiom for a middle-class girl but fashionable on the modern theatre stages of the 1920s. What she had learned at home was “Hoch deutsch – pure from regional dialects”. This idiom was, in her description, an acquisition rather than a natural “mother tongue”, a speech manner taught by governesses and teachers.²⁵⁸ When watching *Der blaue Engel* (German version) many years later, she also claimed to be impressed by the “actress Marlene Dietrich” speaking the correct accent (Plattdeutsch) for a “sailor girl” of the 1920s.²⁵⁹ Significantly, she describes her acting in *English* as becoming “authentic” in the process of learning; in contrast to the other actors who were told to keep their German accent, Dietrich was supposed to speak with an “American” accent, an accent that, in her own view, came naturally to her. The English version was convincing, because “it was authentic and not fake” (in contrast to dubbed or post-synchronised speech).²⁶⁰ Dietrich’s somewhat contradictory comments about her own language acquisition are enlightening even if her descriptions not do always correspond to the result heard in the films (I propose that it is neither “American”, nor Berlin slang or Plattdeutsch in *Der blaue Engel*). She displaces the relation between foreign and native speech by accentuating how all her various speech manners are constructions (and on another level, all are “natural”). Maybe this insight helped her in her successful appropriation of “Hollywood English” as correlation between “foreign” accent and mannered speech. Dietrich’s exotic accent in her Hollywood films is an example of how Hollywood as incarnation of the American dream both redefines and reaffirms itself in the process of creating a specific spoken language.

American Language and Power

Even if the American accent was perceived as primitive, uneducated and a disruption of the norm, it was nevertheless a signifier of a language of power. English after WWII became, to quote George Steiner, “the vulgate” of Anglo-American power, and the interwar period laid the ground for this positioning of the English language.²⁶¹

Many stories are told about the resistance against foreign language film, and in particular the American film, in early sound film in Europe. In French film history it is often cited that in France the violent audience torn the

chairs apart in the movie theatre and screamed “speak French” and at screenings of early American talkies.²⁶² Even if these stories are exaggerated, and even if American sound films were also highly appreciated, the aggressive methods indicate a specific relation between language and power.

In the early 1930s, English was far from being a common *lingua franca* in Europe. However, the presence of American voices on European screens indicated a future dominance of English as international language. In an article titled “English: International language of cinema”, Alexandre Arnoux speculates upon English as the new “universal” language of cinema, an English “pronounced with a yankee accent”.²⁶³ “The United States will win the battle on our own territory. [...] We will sign the peace treaty [...] in the dialect of our conquerors.”²⁶⁴ By this war metaphor, Arnoux does not only shed light on the irony that Americanism here takes the form of linguistic influence (French “territory” by tradition), but also that the only way to confront American dominance of talking pictures is by making English-speaking films in France and Germany.

Discourses on American film speech reveal different dimensions of language as power, depicted in the double interpretation of Americanisation mentioned earlier (as, on the one hand, an imperialist threat, and on the other, a sub-cultural or popular resistance to European art and high-brow culture). Together with a perception of American language as foreign and imperialist, American film speech also functioned as a liberating subversive resistance to traditional values. In a review of *Broadway Melody* (Harry Beaumont, 1929), a French critic describes the American non-theatrical natural speech as liberating in its very primitiveness: “Of course [the English words are used], it is neither the language of Shakespeare, nor, more recently, of Thomas Hardy, or that of a London gentleman, but that is one of the most charming qualities of *Broadway Melody*. [...] It is just like being among Americans, who are shouting ‘Gosh’ [the English word is used] when their hearts tell them to”.²⁶⁵ This conception of American speech can also be seen in the use of lines spoken in English in European films, such as *Der blaue Engel*. For instance, as Richard W. McComrick has pointed out, the discourse of “America” was embodied in the German “new objectivity” in the Weimar culture of the late 1920s, and consequently also in the “new objectivity” sound films. In *Mädchen in Uniform*, a film dealing with the resistance to traditional conservative values (both on a political and gender-related level), oppression versus rebellion is linked to German versus American culture. From this perspective, it is noticeable that the oppressed girls use English expressions like “sex appeal” when talking about forbidden subjects.²⁶⁶

Concerning *The Blue Angel*, the relation between English and German (in the English version) interferes with film’s display of the word as symbol of authority, a feature frequently discussed in terms of media differentiation and psychoanalysis (for example, as described by Elisabeth Bronfen, the fact

that Janning's character is associated with written words, while Dietrich incarnates "image", is legible in a Lacanian symbol/icon dichotomy).²⁶⁷ In order to motivate the English dialogue between characters who are all supposed to be Germans, Janning's repeatedly urges his pupils to "speak English!"; in the initial scenes, English becomes the language of power and authority. Only when he loses his temper – and consequently loses control – he bursts out in German insults such as "Verdammt Lämmel!"²⁶⁸ In the meeting with the "native" English speaking Lola, the relation is reversed. "You have to speak my language", she demands at their first meeting, and Rath's progressive muting (as the story develops he speaks less and less) is reinforced by the disability of speaking "her language". *The Blue Angel* is the most conspicuous example of a general issue. The use of American words or expressions in films depicts Americanisation also as a process of acquisition. If the twentieth century is predominantly, as stated above, about "learning to be American", it is also about learning to speak (American) English. Hollywood speech, which in itself is a filmic construction, an adjustment between the attraction of the voice with its specific regional features and intelligibility for a broad audience, also functions as a means of spreading the American language.

The filmic "languages" or construction of speech outlined and exemplified in this chapter all function as variations of the utopia of universal or translinguistic communication, by emphasising non-verbal sounds or by regarding speech as physical gesture rather than words, by representing the multilingual, or by establishing (or destabilising) a "universal" Hollywood English. The inevitable cultural and linguistic differentiation evoked by languages and accents interplay with the utopias of overcoming language barriers, an interplay that can be seen as a power struggle as well as an inherent duality of speech representation.

Sound, Image and Writing: Hybrid Talkies and Figures of Transposition

Filmic Speech Representation

In the Italian press of the 1930s, film critics mocked the American “talkies” by calling them “100% read” instead of “100% talking”, as the usual slogan stated. The reason for the pun was a law established by the fascist regime stating that “[...] it will no longer be authorised to project films with foreign dialogue, not even a small number.”²⁶⁹ The result of this law was that some famous “talking” films such as *The Taming of the Shrew* (Sam Taylor, 1929), *Broadway* (Paul Fejos, 1929) and *Innocents of Paris* (Richard Wallace, 1929) were exhibited with more than 200 intertitles and accompanied with only music and effects on the sound track. Sometimes the projection time for the intertitles was longer than the projection time for the images.

The Italian method of “translating” foreign films was without doubt extreme, and there is no equivalent example from any other country. Nevertheless, the Italians’ radical solution was a significant example of a common early sound film problem, due to lack of sound projection and translation techniques, many sound films were shown silent, which sometimes generated a veritable avalanche of intertitles. This phenomenon puts the transition to *sound* into perspective. The Italian practice sheds light on the various means of representing speech in the early sound era, as well as how speech representation is linked to translation and language barriers.

In this chapter, I will discuss the relation between sound recording, moving images and written texts as different media of speech representation, which will be theorised in terms of media transposition and ex-changeability versus media materiality. This serves as a starting point for a subsequent chapter on translation and media. The various processes of media inscriptions and media transposition will be discussed in terms of, firstly, the early sound film phenomenon of part-talkies and sound and silent versions of the same film, secondly, the use of writing and acousmatic voices as integrated parts of the filmic diegesis or artistic expression. Besides the film examples and theoretical writings, I take examples from French popular press and from *Variety*.²⁷⁰ The initial “silent” phase of sound film has traditionally discussed as a chaotic period in early European sound film;²⁷¹ in recent scholarship, however, the silent and hybrid “sound” film has been reframed

from various industrial perspectives.²⁷² My perspective is instead media theoretical and constitutes a reading of the hybrid film phenomenon (as a version making practice) and its reception as part of a discourse of “writing speech”. The emphasis lies on how the hybrid film is correlated to allegories of writing and speech as reproduction media in early sound film.

Perspectives on Versions and Intermedia

In order to understand the relation between sound recording and writing in film, it is important to note that speech is represented in three media within film: firstly, on the image track, secondly, by recorded sound and, finally, by written text. Sound recording is a dominant means of speech representation, which increases the presence of speech during the period of transition to sound; the sound medium as a medium revealing the verbal dimension, also, generates a focus on speech representation in other media. It lays the ground for “vococentric” discourses in different media. Even if the coming of sound emphasised speech, it is, however, obvious that speech is represented in all three media in the silent era as well in later sound film. As frequently discussed in film research in recent decades, silent film was an *audiovisual* media; apart from musical accompaniment, film images could be combined with live commentators, live actors talking behind the screen, noise and sound effects created in the movie theatre, recorded sound on a record played separately, and with synchronised sound in short sound films.²⁷³

More importantly, even silent films without live commentators or recorded sound were “talking” pictures, with speech represented by moving images instead of sound. To the popular adage that “silent film was never silent” I would like to add Michel Chion’s observation that silent film was not “mute” (as in “cinéma muet”, “cinema muto”, “Stummfilm”), it was “deaf”.²⁷⁴ The fact that silent films contained “speech and noise, but we did not hear it”²⁷⁵ illustrates how images also represent sound and speech.

Moving images of people talking have a complementary role in relation to sound recording. Following the discourse of “the myth of total cinema”,²⁷⁶ silent images of speech expose a perceptual lack that would be filled by the addition of sound. Intertitles as a representation of speech, on the other hand, function both as a parallel “track” to the sound track, as well as a substitute or even as a representation of aural speech.

Intertitles, or subtitles as they were called in the silent period,²⁷⁷ are usually categorised in two groups: dialogue and explanatory. Dialogue titles were developed in the 1910s, in the transition period preceding classical narrative cinema, and partly replaced the “bonimenteur”, the live commentator common in early cinema exhibition. Spoken commentary and titles were, however, not exchangeable forms of representation (André Gaudreault, for example, points out that texts and speech did not exclude each other, but that there was an interaction between the two in the pre-classical period).²⁷⁸ In

relation to speech, it is mainly the dialogue titles which are interesting, since they correspond to the film image of the character speaking (even if both can be regarded as a representation of a voice).²⁷⁹ As the Italian example shows, dialogue intertitles not only lingered on in the early sound era, in some cases they were even more common than in silent films as they would function both as replacement of dialogue for movie theatres without sound equipment, and also serve as a translation (and often a combination of the two). Moreover, in the so-called “part-talkies”, intertitles and recorded speech are mixed, and the use of texts within the filmic diegesis (letters, telegrams etc.,) did not lose currency in the early sound film, as they played an important role in story telling.

The version phenomenon, introduced in this chapter and developed further in the following chapters, can be conceptualised according to Nelson Goodman’s categorisation of signs as either “allographic” or “authographic”, the first referring to a work in which every materialisation or “instance” is regarded as “equally genuine”, and the latter a work in which “the distinction between original and forgery [...] is significant”.²⁸⁰ The word as exchangeable, as an arbitrary abstract sign, generates an allographic relation between sound, images and writing. The material inscription, revealed by the material differences between film, sound recording and writing (all conceptualised as “languages” in their own right, following a “grammar” of media specificity) mark the same media relations as “autographic”. The relation between media materiality and exchangeability, between the “authographic” and “allographic” functions of the word in different media, disrupt the conception of film as “pure language” in opposition to other art forms as it inscribes the “film language” in an intermedial discourse. Novelisations, radio versions, records with hit songs from popular film or theatre versions are example of “instances” of the “same” work reproduced in different versions. The relation between writing, speech and image as speech representation not only reflects a general problem of the “language” of film, but also of the relation between film and other media.

François Jost and Marie-France Chambat-Houillon have approached multiple language version film and remakes, respectively, from Goodman’s semiotic terms.²⁸¹ Jost’s positioning of the multiple language version film as an “allographic” text is of particular interest since the observations are based on reception, that is, on press material, rather than textual comparison.²⁸² Goodman’s enlarged concept of “text” allows for such a shift of focus, and for my own reading, the functions and significances of differences and similarities between versions is anchored in press material.

Intertitles and Sound

Criticism of “Silent” Speech

As discussed in the previous chapter, the most common criticism levelled against sound film was based on the idea that sound would reduce film to “filmed theatre”. According to the battle cries, sound film had ruined cinematic expression because of its predilection for dialogue rather than sound. Taking the plurality of media into account, the criticism of the word is not exclusively a sound film issue. It follows a tradition from the silent film era of opposing the “language” of film art to verbal language. In writings from the 1910s and the 1920s, critics emphasised both intertitles and close-ups of people talking as means of expression standing in opposition to the true “language” of film.

As discussed earlier (and as pointed out by Christian Metz), the criticism of spoken language in film among the film critics of the late 1920s has to be understood as a confrontation between two concepts of language: on the one hand the semiotic idea of film as a specific language and on the other a conventional understanding of language as words. The criticism of speech might be reinforced by the coming of sound but it is an expression of a general resistance to dialogue-centred narrative cinema, already established in silent film theory and criticism. Metz aptly claims that “the paradox of the talking cinema was already rooted at the heart of the silent movies”.²⁸³ For example, in 1916 the French film critic and filmmaker, Jacques de Baroncelli, questioned the need for intertitles by asking: “Why, when we have light and movement, action and life, is it necessary to use written dialogue [...]?”²⁸⁴ This is an early example of the film theoretical concerns which in the 1920s inspired experiments of filmic storytelling without intertitles.²⁸⁵ The discussion in Germany concerning the so-called “titelloser Film” in the early and mid-1920s, further fuelled such experiments. Films such as *Der letzte Mann* (F.W. Murnau, 1924), *Sylvester* (Lupu Pick, 1923), *Scherben* (Lupu Pick, 1921) and *Hintertreppe* (Paul Leni, Leopold Jessner, 1921) contained none or few intertitles.²⁸⁶ Also Vertov saw the potential universalism of film in the absence of intertitles. In the introduction to *Chelovek s kino-apparatom* (1929), he claims that the “absolute language of film” lies in “the cinematic communication of visible events, without the aid of intertitles”.²⁸⁷ Consequently, the means of showing dialogue by intertitles or silent speech in silent film are, for many early film theorists, perceived as a threat to the purely visual expression of film. Many theorists discussing sound film in terms of “filmed theatre” in the late 1920s mobilised the criticism of other forms of filmic speech representation, such as intertitles. Arnheim, for example, whose refusal to accept the talking picture was more dogmatic than his contemporary colleagues’, picks up the criticism of intertitles during the period of the coming of sound. Still believing in a future for the silent film, he

stressed that the silent film would not need any intertitles, since the absence of words would be perceived as disturbing.²⁸⁸

The juxtaposition of film language and verbal language is also revealed by a criticism of the filmic representation of the speaking mouth, analogous with the criticism of intertitles. In his essay, "The New Laocoön", from 1938, Arnheim refers retrospectively to this tradition and stated that "the better the silent film, the more strictly it used to avoid showing people in the act of talking [...]. The visual counterpoint of speech, that is, the monotonous motions of the mouth, yields little and, in fact, can only hamper the expressive movement of the body."²⁸⁹ One of the most striking earlier instances of this criticism can be found in a report by Louis Delluc from the early 1920s. For Delluc, "the problem is that the spectator sees the movements of the lips. He *hears* the actors *talking*".²⁹⁰ Speech is not only vulgar but could also be dangerous, since the trained audience could "hear" the spoken words by lip-reading. The spectators' ability to read lips brings out the latent "deafness" of the moving image and further underscores the sound as a perceptual effect created in the interaction between film and spectator.

The ability to read lips is discussed further by Béla Balázs, who denounces films which show lip movements in a way that could create an illusion of hearing. In contrast to Delluc, who says that spectators "hear", Balázs stresses this notion as an absence, expressed in terms of deafness: "When we are reminded of the acoustic, because we see how the mouth forms a vowel, we lose the mimic effect. Then we notice that we do not hear the actor, something we did not think of before."²⁹¹ Balázs' criticism shows that the scepticism towards visible sound is not only based on the capacity of hearing dialogue, but mainly that silent sound effects establish a discourse of hearing as artificial, a deaf hearing.

There are significant examples of silent film comedies which display an ironical toying with silent speech representation, or a representation of the absence of "hearing". For example, Ernst Lubitsch uses the audience's ability to read lips in some of his comedies from the 1920s, such as *The Marriage Circle* (1924), in which a dischroniaty between speech and intertitle creates a comical effect for initiated lip readers.²⁹² This kind of discrepancy between silent speech and intertitles are naturally common and not always a deliberate effect. As demonstrated by Isabelle Raynauld, however, the common idea that actors always "discussed unrelated topics while filming" is somewhat of a myth, and most films were spoken from a written script.²⁹³ In translated films, with intertitles in one language and silent speech in another, the ability to read lips explicitly disrupts the universalism of silent film as the film exposes two languages simultaneously. The examples of opposing spoken or written words to "film language", either by rejecting intertitles or close-ups of the speech act, are significant in order to analyse the understanding of non-verbal sounds in opposition to verbal language in early sound film theory.

Intertitles as Graphics

As argued in chapter two, the division between sound and talking film in early sound production was extended to a distinction between the vocal and intelligible dimensions of speech. The focus on “the grain of the voice” exposed the word as an indexical physical trace rather than symbolic sign. This division, revealed by the two dimensions of the sign, is to be also found in writings on intertitles. Balázs’ ideas that the meaning of the spoken word is subordinated to “the tone in which they are said: the cadence, the timbre, the husky resonance”²⁹⁴ corresponds to his description of the so-called “physiognomy of the letters”:

In the last years of the silent film no better-class film was satisfied with neutral, cold letterpress or scripts for its titles. The physiognomy of the pictures had to be continued in the physiognomy of the lettering, in order to preserve the visual continuity of atmosphere.²⁹⁵

Balázs refers to the well-known fact that intertitles in silent film contain a highly graphic quality. Elaborated graphics transcend the division between art and commercial cinema, playing with size, position and the graphic style of writing has been a part of filmic discourse since its early days.²⁹⁶

Philippe Dubois theorises the “physiognomy” of intertitles by using the term “figure” to describe the visualisation of writing in film as a process between different levels of understanding: “The figure operates at once on a legible level (where it defines a realm of signification that I call ‘figured’), a visible level (where it defines what I call ‘figurative’), and something else that I call the ‘figural’.”²⁹⁷ As an “experience passing through the visual dimension of the work”²⁹⁸ the last level, “the figural”, is understood as the perceptual and material dimension of writing interacting with, but also working as a resistance against, the two other levels, the figurative and the figure. This description (to which I will return later) is enlightening since it shows that the word’s symbolic dimension is challenged by other inscription levels embodied in the same medium, i.e. writing; the written titles are inscribed in the constant movement between levels of understanding, between the symbolic and material aspects of writing. Just like the recording of speech, both create a focus on the representation of the word, and the vocal features of the character’s voice, the figural aspect of writing, brings out a visual quality to the text. This can be further linked to hieroglyphic writing (as metaphor for film) as a sign system in which iconic, symbolic and phonic features are combined.

Titles and speech both function as a parallel means of representing the spoken word. They analogously represent verbal language in contrast to the filmic; they also embody a tension between the material, the iconic and the symbolic dimensions of the word. This also creates an interaction not only between different levels of signification within the same sign but also between different media inscriptions: writing is turned into image or an image of a sound, etc.

Part-talkies and Silent Versions as Hybrids

During a transition period between approximately 1928 and 1930, most films were produced in two versions, one sound and one silent. Many mixed “part-talkies” were also produced, films with some selected scenes in sound while the rest was silent with intertitles. In these hybrid films, the written text as a replacement of spoken dialogue and silent speech interact with sound recorded speech. Part-talkies, silent versions of sound films, and partly re-shot and post-synchronized silent films generate a discourse of parallelism and interaction between written and recorded speech. Early talking classics such as *The Jazz Singer*, *Show Boat* (Harry A. Pollard, 1929) and *Noah’s Ark* were all only partly talking, and successfully circulated in both silent and sound versions in wired and unwired movie theatres. Great silent classics such as *The Phantom of the Opera* (Rupert Julian, 1929) would be re-released with a partly synchronised sound track; completed silent films in 1928 such as *The King of Kings* (Cecil B. DeMille, 1927) or *The Godless Girl* (Cecil B. DeMille, 1929) were post-synchronised with music, sound effects and some dialogue. During the transition period, almost everybody, in the US as well as in Europe, believed in the co-existence between silent and sound film, between representing dialogue with intertitles, film images or with recorded speech.²⁹⁹

The written titles in the early sound era function both as a means of media transposition (between sound and silent film, with spoken and written dialogue, respectively) and language translation. The Italian translation mentioned above is a mix between these two: the films are silent versions of sound films made in order to cover one language with another - a kind of dubbing with written titles. If Italy chose such a radical and somewhat absurd solution for foreign film exhibition in late 1930, it was because the hybrid film forms had laid the foundations for the use of writing as a replacement of speech during the first years of sound film. For instance, for the French-speaking audiences early sound classics such as *Der blaue Engel* and *Hallelujah* were shown without sound;³⁰⁰ and early American musicals like *Broadway* and *The Jazz Singer* were shown with subtitles or intertitles in several non-English speaking countries.

The hybrid film forms between sound and silent reveal the representation of speech as a problem of intermediality. Sound, image and text function as replacements of each other. The combination of different means of expressing dialogue within one and the same film sets off each form of speech representation in its difference in relation to other forms. The mix of representation forms also inflects continuity narrative into different modes of storytelling. In contrast to the speaking and singing sequences, the silent sequences are perceived either as an absence or as a specific alternative form of speech representation. The many silent versions in Europe of American films originally produced as sound films form a specific discourse of silent films “hiding a talkie”. Pierre Leprohon writes in *Pour Vous* about the French version *Le chant d'amour*:

[E]ven the most ignorant spectator suspects that this silent track hides a ‘talkie’. [...] [T]he silent version proposes some notes about a genre that we have to get used to: the American talking picture europeanised by silence. We do not know how many producers in Hollywood who produced two versions for the needs of exportation. This gives a hybrid form [...]. The silence that we still love appears false as a result of the excessive use of dialogue scenes from the original versions.³⁰¹

By describing silent versions as “europeanised by silence”, this article offers an alternative reading of the notion of talking film as American and silent film as European. Moreover, even if this film is a silent film with intertitles representing all speech, the journalist here calls it a “hybrid” film rather than a “silent film”. Since the many singing performances (represented silently) are at the centre of the story, the film is, according to the writer, a film of “transition” between sound and silent film. This is an example of how silent speech represents a lack of perception, i.e. “deaf hearing”.

On one level, the parallel between writing and sound in the sound and silent versions or in the part-talkies creates a mode of repetition or exchangeability, which means that the “allographic” dimension of speech is thus reinforced. In the sound and silent versions, the dialogue is “rewritten” either in sound recording or intertitles; the two forms of representation being two different versions of the “same” text. Also the part-talkie contains this level of exchangeability since the mixed mode implicitly makes it clear that the seen speech (hypothetically) could be expressed by two forms of representation, i.e. as intertitles or sound recording. In some part-talkies, we hear and read the same word simultaneously or after one another. The repetition thus functions as a translation intertitle only in the same language, with the difference of media representation exclusively. The repetition of the same word between different media is part of silent film speech representation, where we first see the speaking mouth and then read the dialogue intertitle. Silent film inevitably repeats the same line twice. This repetition becomes more

complex with the addition of sound as a third medium of speech representation.

This allographic dimension is, however, in constant interaction with its opposite: the authographic dimension, where text is understood as a trace. The strangeness of the mix between speech and intertitles in the part-talkies shows clearly the non-identity between the means of expression. In silent versions of sound films, the media differentiation is more implicit, yet still perceptible, as the concentration of intertitles and the focus on voice representation by images is sometimes perceived as a silent film “hiding a talkie”. The images of the *lack of sound* show the non-identity between sound and silent representation. A French critic wrote about the silent version of *The Jazz Singer*: “we do not hear his voice, but his face makes us feel it”.³⁰² This illustrates the focus on, and the interest in, the *absence* of the heard voice.

The graphic dimension of intertitles is emphasised when the intertitle is used in combination with sound dialogue. By considering writing as a material trace and (thereby authographic rather than allographic), the classical understanding of writing as arbitrary symbolic sign is re-evaluated. Akin to sound recording or photography, writing would be conceptualised as an indexical trace. The authographic trace divides writing and sound into two different material levels of inscription. Consequently, in the part talkies, the sameness of the word, the allographic, is constantly undermined by the differences between the means of expression.

The specificity of the part-talkie is caught in alternation between two modes of storytelling from one moment to another within the same film. The most famous example is when Al Jolson talks and sings to his mother in sound, and then suddenly, when the father enters the room and opens his mouth in order to stop the singing, the narrative mode changes and the speech is represented by titles. The alternation of media in this scene can even be read in terms of gender: the law of the father in contrast to the love of the mother is split in symbolic signs of written titles and sound media, respectively. Several critics commented on this scene as a disruption of homogenous story telling. In an article about the audience reactions to the premiere of the film in Paris, it was noted that “we hear a dialogue between two actors. Suddenly, the door opens; the father, Jackie, enters. At once, we do not hear any speech”.³⁰³ According to this article, people in the audience complained about that “they stopped the dialogue at the most interesting moment”³⁰⁴

Part of the press reports make us believe that the rift caused by the jump between intertitles and speech was just as striking in 1929 as it might seem to be today. However, many sources tell that in an early phase it seems to have been far less disturbing: the sound was understood as a mode of attraction, and the logic of classical narrative was subordinated to the singing or talking performance. The years of 1928 and 1929 was the era of the %-film, where films were categorised as percentage of talking or dialogue. This

categorisation tells the reader exactly how many minutes of spoken dialogue there is, but not how the talking is represented and how it is mixed with silent sequences. In some films, like *Noah's Ark*, the dialogue increases as the film proceeds. In other cases, as in *Saturday's Children* (Gregory La Cava, 1929), the division between dialogue and intertitle is divided into reels; first 20 minutes talking followed by 20 minutes of intertitles, then 20 minutes of talking and so on.³⁰⁵ In some films that were originally shot silent, the talking parts are added scenes, often prologues or epilogues. The *Variety* description of the post-synchronised film, *The Perfect Crime* (Bert Glennon, 1928), is telling: "It's like, for the best illustration a regular feature with a talking sequence of foreign nature at either end, leaving the body of the regular picture entirely complete. The prologue here, joined with the epilogue, and with little cutting could almost be sent out as a comedy talking short."³⁰⁶ In most films, the talking parts functioned as an element of attraction, as an act of direct performance in contrast to the indirect speech of the written intertitles. In the early musicals, the dialogue is often a part of the singing performance where direct address to the audience changes the narrative form. In other films, the main dialogue scene is a trial scene or some other speech dominated event. The performative act of speaking is shown and is explicitly directed towards an audience. Speech in part-talkies are often limited to, as Altman phrases it, a "megaphone discourse", that is exclamations or speeches, creating a "live" appeal.³⁰⁷ By showing the act of speech as a performance for the audience, the directness is contrasted with the indirect speech represented with intertitles. The liveness discourse is also embodied in the mixed performances of live and recorded sound (which were common 1928-1929) as a prolongation of live "silent" film sound effects, as well as in the intermedial dimension of the part-talkie as a hybrid form between records, radio and film. As described by Müller, a common exhibition form in Germany was screening sound films with live music. *The Wings*, for example, was in Germany (contrary to in the U.S.) screened in that manner.³⁰⁸ Altman elaborates further on the mixed character of early sound film and points out that "according to John S. Sprago, critic of *Exhibitor's Herald*, *The Jazz Singer* was a recording of a half dozen of songs on a large Vitaphone record rather than a film (15 October, 1927)."³⁰⁹ Such a selection of songs joined together as a succession of performances positions the film in the context of music recordings and live music performances rather than in the trajectory of the classical narrative film. The disruption between the sound and silent sequences indicates a different tradition of entertainment culture than classical narrative cinema and is consequently not as "disturbing" as it might seem.

Significantly, a critic in *Variety* wrote with disappointment that the crucial trial sound scene did *not* come as a surprise: "The big dialogue punch here is a court trial. [...] But the dialogue scene did not come as a surprise, and lost its punch through dialogue having been used in the prologue".³¹⁰

Many critics also saw the part-talkie as a narrative necessity, since the talking parts “slow the action” too much. A bored and irritated critic wrote about Paul Leni’s *The Last Warning* (1929) that the “result is slow action while the dialogue is on. [...] Particularly is this true during the opening 12 minutes, which is all talk. [...]”³¹¹ The indirect *telling* with intertitles is regarded as a means of epic narration, and the direct *showing* in dialogue scenes close the drama in space and time.

Tracing the shifting views on the part-talkies by the critics in *Variety*, it is noticeable that later in 1929, criticism of the part-talkie escalated. When the 100% talkie and consequently more homogenous narratives were put into practice, a critic wrote about a late 5% talkie (*Girl Overboard*, Wesley Ruggles, 1929) that it was “freaky in its make-up, running silent with a theme song, [...] then suddenly bursting into dialogue beyond half way and again lapsing to the silent effect thing.”³¹² Here, the mix apparently disrupted the illusion of story-telling by foregrounding the purely technical aspect of story-telling.

Some critics initially either considered the silent parts in part-talkies as parts to be necessary for the narrative, whilst others regarded the talking parts as attractions that should come as a surprising effect and, therefore, should be parts of the whole film. Later, the mixed story-telling mode was questioned according to the norms of classical narrative. It is significant that these approaches all emphasise the fundamental difference between silent and sound film as modes of representation.

The criticism of the hybrid part-talkie confirms the classical idea of the speech event as original and singular and writing as an indirect representation of speech. The notion of dialogue as attraction, linked to a discourse of liveness in contrast to an indirect epic mode, confirms the notion of speech as the “origin” of writing; the oral situation is grounded in space and time whereas writing is transposed and indirect. However, the potential repeatability of the word in different media emphasises the textual aspect. Following Derrida, what characterises writing is repeatability, that is, that the words are infinitely citable. From this perspective, the exchangeability between speech and writing embodied in the hybrid film forms confirms the textual dimension of the word. By the repetition of the same word in two different media, in sound recording and intertitle, respectively, the early sound film also undermines the classical juxtaposition between speech and writing. Las-tra captures this double function of sound as both the “original” of writing, the time and space specific and unique event, but also a continuation, another kind of writing: it is “writing (as legible mark) that ‘comes to the rescue’ to ensure the uniqueness or non-repeatability of the speech event”. Sound as a parallel to writing follows a similar logic of repeatability which means that “sound may be understood as ‘inscribed’ rather than ‘spoken’”.³¹³

The tension between the allographic and the authographic, between speech as a singular event or as a written text is even more striking in the

rare cases when part-talkies contain parts where the exact same word is repeated in sound and writing. Crafton observes that this phenomenon was sometimes resorted to at a very early stage in order to create an unexpected thrill. For example, in *The First Auto* (Roy del Ruth, 1927), a character shouts “Go!” and subsequently “Go!” appears in the intertitle. The same redundancy is created later in the same film when another character shouts “Bob” in addition to including the word supplied on the traditional title card.³¹⁴ In those cases, it is the redundant repetition - the same words delivered twice in two different media - that shows the non-identity between recorded speech and writing. (Mostly, however, the sound and silent versions followed a procedure of removing or adding the intertitles. As described in detail by Barnier, silent films which were re-edited talking pictures had intertitles especially added for silent exhibition.³¹⁵)

As described by Valérie Pozner, in Soviet film production in the early 1930s, where the part-talkie was more common and the practice lasted longer than in most western countries, the repetition of the same word in sound and intertitle acquired a special position. The repetition was not only made for economic reasons or as a means of translation, but also as a montage technique.³¹⁶ For instance, in *Odna* (Grigori Kozintsev, 1931), one of the first Soviet sound films, we find an example of when title and sound expressing the same word is used consciously as a means of artistic effect in a montage tradition. The double representation reinforces the emotional value of the expression. This kind of emotional emphasis follows the Russian tradition - seen for instance in Vertov’s films - of using intertitles parallel with the image. According to Vertov, redundant intertitles (i.e. from an informative and a narrative point of view) are to be understood as an emotional montage, and not as a hierarchical relation between signifier and signified.³¹⁷ In these particular cases, the non-identity between media is emphasised as a montage effect allegorising a larger discourse of repetition vs. inscription.

Writing and Sound as Figures, Motifs and Themes

Writing and “Spaceless” Voices: *Prix de beauté* and *The Phantom of the Opera*

The figure of the disconnected or disembodied voice in cinema has been broadly discussed in sound film theory. Most notable are Chion’s various readings of “acousmatic” voices,³¹⁸ Altman’s notion of sound film as “ventriloquist”,³¹⁹ and Mary Ann Doane’s gendered “bodiless voices”.³²⁰ In early sound film, the dislodged voice becomes a sound film trope reflecting various aspects of voice representation in film. Such disembodied voices ema-

nate via telephones, radio or gramophone, or mysteriously as a supernatural feature. As described by Elsaesser, not only do famous classics such as Fritz Lang's *Das Testament des Dr. Mabuse* (1932/1933) stage an omnipotent voice as a metafilmic device of the new sound film technology; dislodged voices appear even more frequently in musical comedies where the radio and record industry is part of the fiction.³²¹ Films with established radio stars such as Jan Kiepura or Joseph Schmidt illustrate the disconnected voice in relation to records and radio.

Discussing speech representation in relation to writing, James Lastra gives an enlightening reading of the isolation of the voice in sound film. For Lastra, the disconnection between sound and image is a reflection of not only the technology of combining images and sound, but also of the technological process of isolating sound in order to make speech intelligible. The disconnection is about isolating the verbal features of the voice from the rest of the sound. This creates an audiovisual effect of "spaceless" voices; the vocal strength and intelligibility of the words are not adjusted to the represented visual space but to the narrative function of audible and intelligible speech. Lastra claims that the use of close frontal miking, developed in order to make the speaking voice more intelligible, "falls on the side of writing rather than that of speech" by its "contextless or spaceless" quality.³²² However, he further states that "having made sounds intelligible and signifying, they needed to be 'reconnected' to concrete (but now diegetic) situations".³²³ This means that there is a process between spaceless sound "on the side of writing" and a reconnection to the spatial source of the sound. In many early sound films, this process is shown in the filmic diegesis by themes and motifs showing the source as a form of writing, equating sound recording with inscription.

The many disconnected voices of early sound film that often have been read as allegories of sound film as an arbitrary audiovisual "contract"³²⁴ are also inscribed in the relation between sound and writing. This is particularly striking in the use of the disconnected voice in the part-talkies, where spatially and temporally separated intertitles function as a parallel to the split between voice and body. The hybrid talkies, *Prix de beauté* (Augusto Genina, 1929) and *The Phantom of the Opera*, illustrate these relations between writing and speech. *Prix de beauté* is a post-synchronised silent picture, produced in four language versions and one silent version, in which megaphones, records and sound film are placed in relation to the representation of writing. It is significant that the story starts at a newspaper office in which the two protagonists (Louise Brooks and George Carleia) are working, and ends at a sound film studio in which a fatal confrontation takes place between them.

In the sound version(s) of the film, there are several scenes in which the two media are either paralleled or juxtaposed. For example, the sounds of printing and typing, heard in the scenes at the newspaper office, reveal the

relation between sound technology and writing; here, the sound of writing emphasises the material dimension of the written word. The use of sound media in parallel with writing as sources of information is a key aspect of the story. For example, a megaphone placed outside the office announces the same information (about the beauty contest that the film is about) as the newspaper; the announced sound message stresses the “megaphone discourse” of sound technology, as well as revealing the mediation process and thus placing sound technology on par with writing. Sound technology is represented, on the one hand, as a recorded mediation severed from the body which is closer to writing, and on the other hand, as a technology of the “realness” of a live performance, which places sound technology in opposition to writing.

The final scene of the film functions as an allegory of this relation between live and recorded. Louise Brook’s character has just won a beauty contest and completes a screen test for a sound film, and is sitting in the movie theatre watching herself on the screen singing. Suddenly, out of jealousy, her former fiancé sneaks in and shoots her and she dies, but her voice continues to sing on the screen. Images of her dead face, illuminated by the lights of the projector, are accompanied with the sound of her voice. This is, of course, a metaphor of the recorded sound as a means to simulate real life in contrast to the dead body connected to the visual. The recorded voice, a dead voice from the past, inhabits and embodies the space, the diegetic space as well as the actual physical space of the movie theatre. As argued by Malte Hagener in an essay about the film, the disconnected voice in *Prix de beauté* as an allegory of early sound film technology is foregrounded also on a production level, since Louise Brooks had to be dubbed by different actors for the different language versions.³²⁵ The final scene thus reflects upon the problem of vocal authenticity, besides offering a condensed image of the transition from silent to sound. The “death” of an art form of silent faces overlaps with the birth of a new medium of artificial vocal “liveness”. The close-up on Brooks’ dead face in the foreground while her filmic “double” sings in the background highlights the relation between a former silent icon and the new singing star. In this scene, sound and image reveal “death” differently: the mechanical voice as a technology reanimating the dead (as discussed in chapter one, a technology with the ability of register “the last words of a dying person”)³²⁶ is opposed to the visual icon as an image of the past.³²⁷

Sound recording as memory is also related to the repetition of speech (or songs), as a feature emphasising the textual dimension of sound. The final scene in *Prix de beauté* follows a structure that was to become a formula for musical comedy in the 1930s; the song Brooks (or her French dubber) is singing, “Ne soit pas jaloux” (don’t be jealous), is repeated several times in the film both as songs and as background music (in order to let a tune stick in the mind of the spectator/listener for future records and radio success).

The initial juxtaposition between writing and sound in the final scene is replaced by a juxtaposition of sound and image. By repeating the song, and with the disconnection between body and voice, the textual dimension of sound recording is reinforced; it places the recording “on the side of writing”, to use Lastra’s words. This dimension is, however, combined with the effect of “liveness” in the recorded singing performance. The impression of liveness is contrasted both with writing as trace and to the image as a “dead” icon or an incarnation of the past.

Another example of when writing and disconnected voices became a central motif is the post-synchronised sound version of *The Phantom of the Opera* from 1929. This classic story about the (at first) invisible phantom who communicates either through his voice only or by letters places the two media as parallels in the fiction. Just as the materiality of the voice is revealed by the isolation of the voice, so too is the materiality of writing emphasised. Both the Phantom’s (Lon Chaney), and the woman he desires, Christine’s (Mary Philbin), handwriting are visualised by close-ups on the numerous letters that appear as titles in the film. As a counterpoint to Christine’s small handwriting with round letters, the Phantom’s sprawling hand and his particular stationary, with every sheet lined in black, trigger the curiosity of the spectator about the phantom’s identity in the first half of the film. (It was planned to shoot the phantom’s letters in Technicolor and thereby visualise the red ink as mentioned in the novel.)³²⁸

Until the famous unmasking scene when Christine rips off the mask of her mysterious master, the phantom appears first as a shadow or a silhouette, and subsequently with a childlike mask covering his fearful face. (And even then, the unmasking is just as much reveals the make-up mastery of Chaney as the Phantom’s real face, a make-up promoted as something between a magic and scientific achievement; the unmasking shows another disguise hiding another mystery.)³²⁹ The disconnected voice combined with the letters corresponds to the shadow of the phantom and the mask he wears until the unmasking scene.

In the silent version, the voice is represented by intertitles which mark voice and letters as two forms of writing, of which the latter, the written word, has a more explicit physical dimension. The physicality of the voice thereby switches place with the writing, traditionally perceived as a symbolic or arbitrary sign. In the sound version, the two levels of writing are turned into three. There is a co-existence between written intertitles representing some of the phantom’s speech, the recorded voice representing other parts, and the written letter of the diegetic space. By different means of representation, the division between the phantom’s words and the visual appearance is consistently maintained. Neither in the sound nor the silent version do we see the unmasked phantom move his lips as in the act of talking; only when he is wearing the mask, or when he is shown as a shadow, are the spoken lines represented with the physical movement of speech.

In the sound version, the disconnection between voice and body goes further. It is not only a thematic and technological issue but part of the production strategy. The film is partly based on shots from the silent classics from 1925, and the idea was to re-shoot some scenes for the sound version and post-synchronise others. Lon Chaney, however, would neither re-shoot or dub any scenes nor let his voice be dubbed by another actor's, with the result that all the scenes where Chaney is seen talking had to be silent. In order to bypass the drawback that the main star of the film would remain silent, it was decided to use a strategy of indirect voices by introducing a new character, the phantom's lieutenant. According to Chaney's contract, Chaney could not be *seen* talking, but there were no restrictions to use a voice that one might *think* would be the phantom's. The lieutenant is only seen in short sequences, but his voice (the voice we understand as the phantom's) is heard several times in the first part of the film, in the part when the phantom has not yet shown his face, and appears either invisible or as a shadow.³³⁰ The use of another character in order to get around Chaney's contract corresponds to the ability of the phantom's voice to be transposed into other spaces or bodies. A critic in *Variety* wrote that: "Chaney [...] is never seen talking, but *what is supposed to be his voice* [my italics] is heard on a number of occasions. [...] Unless the audience is alert, these quick shots might be taken for Chaney."³³¹ The confusion between the phantom and his lieutenant, and consequently between Chaney and the invisible voice, was exactly what was intended. Since the phantom's speech had to be conveyed by intertitles when his face was shown, the absence/presence of the recorded voice was always related to the absence/presence of Chaney's bodily appearance. The sound version emphasises that the connection between visual body and speech generates a new division and there is a perpetual movement of dis- and re-connection between the speech (intertitles and sounds) and the speaking body (the image).

These two examples display the use of sound and writing in part-talkies as part of a larger discourse in which sound is conceptualised as writing (and vice versa) and simultaneously positioned in contrast to writing.

Figures of Media Transposition

As discussed earlier, the interaction between sound and writing can be understood in terms of media transposition as a material transformation from one media or inscription into another. Following Kittler's use of the concept, media interpretation as decoding a "rebus" (in contrast to hermeneutic interpretation) positions writing as both as a symbolic representation and a visual inscription.³³² As shown in the examples above, the co-existence between sound and text in the filmic representation emphasises the interaction between sound and writing.

When Dubois discusses the interaction between the visible, the readable and the figural concerning writing in silent film (as discussed above), he shows that the filmic writing is a process between semiotic levels rather than a closed and stable sign. However, by focusing on the relation between the legible, the visual and the figural dimensions of writing, Dubois neglects the audible level in this process. Writing in films is both in and beyond the filmic space, in a non-space, a space in between; therefore it is to be understood as a process of transformation rather than a well defined entity. Dubois' main examples of how the figural is embodied in filmic writing are the so called "surtitre", i.e. texts in the film image, in classics like *Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari* (Robert Wiene, 1920) and *Dr. Mabuse der Spieler* (Fritz Lang, 1922). It is significant, however, that "surtitres" or "pictorial titles" in the pre-classical period often were connected to sound communication. For example, as Jan Olsson has pointed out, in the 1910s, it was common to represent telephone conversations with a text of the dialogue placed on the image or in the middle of a triptych split-screen image.³³³ This can be linked to the use of titles within the filmic diegesis in sound films. The so-called "inserted titles", text signs as letters, telegrams, newspaper lines or street signs are just as present in early sound film as in silent film. (Even if they were not always, as in classical silent narration, "shown in a separate shot [...] within the main long view of the action".³³⁴) In the sound films, they often interact with some kind of speaking voice or other sound. Letters can be read aloud or dictated as well as shown to the audience, newspaper headlines are often shouted out in the street, the sound of the telegraph and not to mention the sound of tapping keys on a typewriter become a sign of the sound of writing in the era of modernity and mechanisation. If the use of intertitles in combination with spoken dialogue mainly establishes a discourse of parallelism and materialisation, writing within films shows more clearly the movement between writing and sound. Following Dubois, filmic writing is located in a space between spaces, neither entirely within the literary realm of the symbolic, nor completely integrated in the image. Consequently, it shows the ambiguity of speech transposed by modern technology. By its ambiguous spatial location, it is analogously related to sound technology which is both (like writing) an indirect transposition of the original speaking situation and (like speech) located in space and time.

In early sound film, akin to the representation of telephone conversations in the 1910s, the spatial anchoring of writing is often explicitly connected to audible expression and sound technology. For example, as shown in *Prix de beauté*, an important audiovisual expression of early sound film is the sound of writing. The frequent images of tapping on the typewriter and the telegraph are metonymically related to the interaction between sound recording and writing. In films such as *Die Privatsekretärin* (Wilhelm Thiele, 1931) and *Die Drei von der Tankstelle* (Wilhelm Thiele, 1930) the modern woman writing mechanically on her typewriter depicts both the de-

connection between body and text,³³⁵ and the audible dimensions of this disconnection (becoming a *re*-connection).

The use of sound in order to represent writing makes writing more similar to speech since the inscription situation in space and time foregrounds the signification of the word as a symbol. In *Die Drei von der Tankstelle*, the sound of writing is extended to an entire musical number. The star, Lilian Harvey, is singing about question marks and commas, subsequently followed by her melodic tapping on the keyboard. This song is, like most dances and songs in early operetta, a narrative digression, and Harvey's typewriting is a means of placing the heroine in the realm of modernity and mechanisation of the body.³³⁶ The mechanical sound of writing functions in parallel to the voice reading or dictating the written text, as transposition of the dictating voice (in this case Harvey's own singing voice).

The sound of writing as a re-connection to the body is more conspicuous in the frequent telegraph scenes in early sound film. In films such as *SOS Eisberg* (Arnold Fanck, 1933) and *Stürme über dem Mont blanc* (Arnold Fanck, 1930) - films of the mountain genre in which modern technologies interplay with romantic fantasies of primitive nature and a fascination with the body³³⁷ - the movement of tapping on the telegraph is shown as a masculine performance of perceptual concentration. There is often a focus on the muscular body of the hero tapping intensively on the telegraph in moments of catastrophe. The telegraphic writing corresponds to the telegraphic "reading", a situation demanding individual isolation and concentration in order to transcribe the sound signals into an intelligible (written) message.

As Jonathan Sterne has pointed out, the culture of listening in the era of sound reproduction follows the logic of individual isolation, creating a physical space for listening disconnected from the surrounding space.³³⁸ The isolation of writing and listening in a specific location, however, always interacts with the opposite, with the connection to another space. In *SOS Eisberg*, the hero's intensive tapping turns into an act of desperation; at the same time as he is tapping the SOS code, he also screams out the message. The desperate screaming underlines the isolation by showing the limitation of the physical voice, the limits of the body in the isolated space in contrast to the possibility to transpose the message by telegraphic writing.

The use of the telegraph in sound films is an example of the relation between text and hearing in general, and therefore significant in relation to the juxtaposition and interaction between writing and sound in early sound film. The telegraph is multimedial, combining text and sound signals in a process of decoding, writing turned into coded signals, that can be decoded into intelligible words. As discussed in chapter one, professional telegraph operators learned to "read" the sounds without the written strip and decode the message only by listening.³³⁹ This generates an analogous relation between reading and listening. In *Stürme über dem Mont blanc*, we see the perception of listening as a central part of the fiction, combined with showing the writ-

ten text as an intelligible message in order to make the content understandable to the audience. The very process of decoding, the process of media transposition from signals to words, is thus shown in scenes depicting the combination of writing and sound correspondence, between isolation and transposition of the body, and between separation and unification of the message and the writer/receiver.

The representation of handwriting as a form of writing intersecting with the two media of sound recording and writing is of particular interest, thematised most famously in Fritz Lang's *Das Testament des Dr. Mabuse* and *M* (1931).³⁴⁰ These films feature the Benjaminian notion of the movement of the hand contrast mass media reproduction,³⁴¹ as well as it illustrates that with handwriting, the sign is turned a material trace and enters the realm of mechanical reproduction as a parallel to photo- and phonography. The parallel between handwriting and sound is not only common in the early sound film but is an established figure already in the silent era. For instance, in Robert Wiene's *Orlacs Hände* (1924), it is the process of producing sounds (piano music) and writing, respectively, that reveals the split personality of the protagonist. Fragmentation of the modern man and are shown by the materialisation of sound and handwriting, and just as the recorded voice refers to the real speaking voice, the handwriting refers to the writer's hand movement. As the recorded voice is identified with the speaking individual, handwriting, and in particular the individual signature or autograph, is considered to be a unique trace of a specific person, equivalent to a finger print. Handwritten notes or letters in film reveals this notion of handwriting as analogous to sound recording, and as a text that is linked to the writer or to the situation in which it was written (rather than what the words represent). As the example with *The Phantom of the Opera* shows, the handwritten text serves both as an informative message to the spectator, but also in a concrete relation to the film's characters.

The handwritten letter is the most common inserted title in silent film; its position in between spaces, within the diegetic space and yet cut out of it by close-ups (that make it similar to the intertitle) creates an ambiguous spatio-temporal identity. The handwriting shown in cinematic space is located in several spaces simultaneously: in the location of the writing situation, in the diegetic reading situation and, finally, in the actual space between the screen and the audience. By close-ups on the written texts, the image of the letter becomes an image of perception, i.e. of the spectators' own reading process mirrored by the diegetic reading within the fictional frame. The filmic representation of writing shows a localisation and materialisation process embracing the indirect representation of the writing situation (by showing the handwritten letter as a trace of it) as well as the direct spatial relation between the screen and the reading audience.

The frequent use of handwritten letters in the cinema from the 1910s into the early sound film era evokes the relation between handwriting and cinema

as an art of mechanical reproduction. The autograph is a semiotically double-edged sign as it is both an indexical trace of the moving hand and a symbolic reference to the name of the writer. It is paradoxically closer to sound recording by its “authographic” material dimension than to writing (as an “allographic” art form). The great interest in handwriting in the twentieth century, for example, by the rise of autograph collectors or the growing science of graphology, inscribes handwriting both in opposition to mechanical reproduction and also as an inscription form, just like cinema, based on reproduction. As described by Lastra (referring to Derrida), the paradox of handwriting is that the authenticity is linked to reproduction in the way we rewrite our own signatures in order to prove their authenticity.³⁴²

An enlightening example which reveals the paradoxes of handwriting in the early sound era is the invention and practice of so-called “synthetic sound”, invented in the late 1920s and early 1930s. By a technique based on “handwritten” or hand-painted film sound track, synthetic sound deconstructs the opposition between copy and original; the technique of synthetic sound “writes” the sound itself, and consequently destabilises the notion of writing as a *representation* of the spoken word. Synthetic sound is mainly known from the abstract synaesthetic filmmaking of Oskar Fischinger and Rudolf Pfenninger’s documentary with the telling title *Tönende Handschrift*. With his *Sound Ornaments* (1932) Fischinger showed that “what you see is what you hear” in a literal sense (the image on the film is the sound track we hear), and Pfenninger stressed in his documentary that “tunes out of nothing” could reproduce sound. The attraction of Fischinger’s *Sound Ornaments* is just as much the manual “handwritten” production process behind the creation as the result. Behind every second of sound there are many hours of manual work “writing” enormous strips that later would be filmed and transformed into sound. In Fischinger’s work, there is an interesting tension between handwriting as a traditional manual work and a pre-digital production of sound without any “real” sources beyond inscription.³⁴³ The painted strips themselves function as abstract paintings in their own right, paradoxically as “originals” for the films that, to some extent, eliminate the distinction between copy and original. As described by Thomas Levin in an essay about the media archaeological traces of synthetic sound, one can divide synthetic sound into imitation of the recording situation and the production of new sound. In Fischinger’s case, the ability to produce new sounds (for instance music that could not be reproduced by any musical instrument) is emphasised, while Pfenninger aims to reproduce already existing sounds.³⁴⁴ As described by Levin, an example of the practical use of synthetic sound as imitation is in the work of inventor, E.A. Humphries. Humphries used synthetic sound in 1931 in order to imitate some parts of the dialogue (Constance Bennet’s, own voice).³⁴⁵ Thereby, the “handwritten” production of sound enters the realm of speech reproduction. Fischinger’s project was about visualising the text and creating new sounds, whereas Humphries and

Pfenninger aim to imitate known, conventional sounds. These two seemingly contradictory dimensions of synthetic sound can be traced to the phonographic inscription: the interaction between simulation and inscription in the phonographic recording is taken a step further by merging inscription and recording. By the invention of synthetic sound, creating an entity of writing and sound (and in Fischinger's case also the image), sound is not only transformed into writing; writing is an actual sound as well as the source of a sound. Pure writing becomes pure sound; the wholeness of the expression appears by isolation. Sound, image and text are not combined, but appear in perpetual filmic movement where image is transposed into text, text into sound, and sound into image.

The seemingly unrelated phenomena of hybrid talkies, media transpositions as figures or motifs, and avant-garde experiments intersect a discourse interrogating speech as writing, image and sound. These various practices destabilises the notion of writing as representation of speech, and refigure issues of indexicality and reproduction. In the next chapter, I aim to analyse how these processes interact with translation.

Translation as (A)synchronisation: Titling and Dubbing

Approaches to Film Translation

Translation has been discussed extensively in philosophical theory, in the wake of the so called “linguistic turn” as an incarnation of “difference”.³⁴⁶ This somehow disrupts the mimetic relation between signifier and signified; the translation refers to the original text, which destabilises the mimetic relation to the outside “reality”. As Philip E. Lewis puts it, “translation, when it occurs, has to move whatever meanings it captures from the original into a framework that tends to impose a different set of discursive relations and a different construction of reality”.³⁴⁷ Translation thus has a textual quality as language representing language, a text representing another text. It is, according to Walter Benjamin, a way of “coming to terms with the foreignness of languages”.³⁴⁸

When it comes to film, this incarnation of “difference” is even more complex. Film translation is a combination of language difference and different media. The different means of representing speech discussed in the previous chapter interferes with the difference of languages. Subtitling is a transposition from sound into writing, and dubbing an audiovisual expression with one language seen, another heard. Both subtitling and dubbing deal with synchronisation just as much as language differences: in classical subtitling, the subtitles are supposed to remain on the screen during the time of the spoken line, and it also has to follow the editing smoothly. In classical dubbing, the number of syllables as well as the duration of the spoken line is supposed to correspond with the original.

Differences between media make differences between languages both audible and visible, with dubbed and subtitled films representing two languages simultaneously. Following Robert Stam and his Bakhtinian reading of cinema, a translated film draws attention to itself in its “heteroglossia” of signs and its “polyglossia” of mutually incomprehensible languages.³⁴⁹ From this perspective, the “heteroglossia” is a semiotically differentiated system of signs, combinations of writing, sound and image reinforcing the “polyglossial” dialogue between languages. By discussing Jean-Luc Godard’s use of the written word, Stam demonstrates a “dialogue” between the written word,

sound and image linked to translation as “polyglossia” (the two would be combined explicitly in *Le mépris*, 1963).³⁵⁰

In this chapter, translation in the early sound era will be discussed in terms of media diversity of speech representation (followed by an introduction about later subtitling and dubbing as an issue of synchronisation). During 1930 and 1931, when translation techniques were debated intensively, the deliberations on translation simultaneously replace and reframe previous criticism and discussion about sound film. My point of departure lies in dubbing and titling as modes of translation. These modes are, however, only two examples of the numerous translation techniques co-existing during this period, which can all be described as processes of replacing of body and media in combination with language difference. As argued by Leonardo Quaresima, for example, dubbing can be seen as part of the translation practice of multiple language version production.³⁵¹ (This will be further discussed in the next chapter.) I emphasise this line of argument and take it further as I outline how similar issues are addressed by different translation practices in a broader cultural sphere. Thereby, I argue against the position suggesting that each form of translation answers to a fundamentally different perceptual activity with different cultural signification.³⁵²

As a result of convergences between media studies and translation studies over the last decades, there has been a “cultural turn in translation studies”.³⁵³ Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevre observed that “the relative function of the text”³⁵⁴ has foregrounded purely linguistic approaches. The “function of the text” will here be located in the press context on a meta-level; translation in terms of media synchronisation, actors’ politics or artistic recognition was frequently discussed in this period. These debates turn the early sound film era into a field when the reception of the *translation process* foregrounds reception of *translated texts*.

Double Language in Film Translation

The relation between original and translated text draws on the discourse of media separation and media transposition outlined in previous chapters. The translation itself is foregrounded since the “difference” remains perceptible on a material level. This is most obvious in subtitling, in which the translation and the original are represented simultaneously at the bottom of the image and on the sound track respectively. This doubleness is, of course, frequently stressed in writings on subtitles and placed in opposition to dubbing or other forms of translation. For example, Antje Ascheid points out that subtitling “foregrounds the translation process by visibly underlining one text with another, hence creating a double text, which reflexively mirrors the textual construction between one text and another”.³⁵⁵ Stam claims that subtitling is an “interlingual film experience” which is “perceptually bifurcated; we hear the other language while we read our own”.³⁵⁶

Dubbing too, is, however, both “interlingual” and “creates a double text”. In dubbing, the translation is perceptible by the lack of lip synchronisation. Just as in subtitling, the original text remains visible for the spectator. The visually perceptible language in dubbed films is similar to the silent speech of silent film, and thus inscribed in the filmic representation of speech by way of images alone. Translated silent films, with intertitles in another language than the language the actors speak, evidences a similar “polyglossia” between the non-audible movements of the lips and the words in dubbed films. In both silent and dubbed films, it is possible to see the original line in close-ups and sequences with well articulated speech. The lack of lip synchronisation signals the presence of a foreign language. The spectator is however not, as in the case of subtitling, confronted with the audible character of that language and the “foreignness” of dubbed film is consequently more abstract.

Even if the spectator is confronted directly with the relation between translation and original in subtitled films, subtitling is also a means of *avoiding* translation, i.e. translation as a process of exchanging one language for another. Subtitled films, often called “original version” in screening programs, do not, with Ascheid’s words, “tamper with the original text”.³⁵⁷ In dubbing, the division between copy and original is revealed by the fact that the spoken language and the diegetic language are not the same, and also, more importantly, by the fact that the voice and the body onscreen belong to two different actors. Non-identity between actual and diegetic language is, of course, the case in most translated fiction; translated novels or plays for the most part contain dialogue in one language (the translation) representing another language (the language that the fictional characters speak). In film, however, the attraction of the voice as a trace of the “real”, as well as the parallel media “tracks”, makes this split between actual and diegetic language more noticeable than in translated literature. Taking the frequent criticism of dubbing into account, it seems to be more “disturbing” to hear New York street talk in a Hollywood film transferred into French, German or Italian than hearing Shakespeare in Swedish or Chekhov in French in the theatre.

Difference between actual and diegetic language also remains in the multiple language version film. This mode of translation otherwise keeps the unification and synchronisation between voice and body intact, as well as avoiding the problem of vocal authenticity by not removing the authentic voices of the film actors seen on the screen. Ascheid describes the multiple language version film as a means to “solve the translation problem by avoiding it altogether”.³⁵⁸ However, as I will discuss in the next chapter, the multiple language version film, too, foregrounds the translation process as such; the division between diegetic language and spoken language in the multiple language version film generates differences between representation of cultural identity and even, as in the case of dubbing, between voice and body.

All forms of film translation incarnate “difference” not only on the level of language, but also on the level of representation of body, culture and media inscription.

As discussed in chapter one, the plurality of media embodied in the practice of translation undermines the prevalent notions of translation as interpretation of meaning. Film translation thus embodies a paradox; it both broadens the idea of translation (by including inter-media relations) and also (by the materiality of media) undermines a conception of translation as *two* languages written in *one* medium. This process of both broadening and reducing the concept of translation is notable in contemporary translation theory, and in particular in writings on film translation. Ascheid and Stam both evoke culture and politics beyond language equivalence in their descriptions of film translation as a “cultural ventriloquism” or “polyglossia” as a struggle of ideological power. Ascheid claims that subtitling “highlights the operational elements necessary in reading any artwork”³⁵⁹ and that dubbing reveals the “ventriloquist” combination of sound/image in all films.³⁶⁰ Stam makes a similar connection between the differentiation of signs in order to theorise the relation between languages in translation. Film intersects the relation between perception, media and translation and thus underscores the notion that “human communication equals translation”,³⁶¹ to rephrase George Steiner.

Synchronisation in Classical Cinema

Subtitling provides synchronisation by adjusting the appearance of written lines to the duration of speech represented on the sound track. In perfectly synchronised voice subtitling the text appears on the screen at the exact moment as the speaker starts talking, and the text remains on the screen until the speaker finishes. Additionally, when possible, perfectly synchronised titling follows the montage of images.³⁶² In some cases synchronisation undermines legibility or meaning, as well as reading speed and literal translation of the spoken content.

Synchronised dubbing complicates the relation between lip movement and speech. Since dubbing is integrated into the film image on another level than subtitling, the synchronisation problem is more complex. Candace Whitman-Linsen describes dubbing synchronisation according to three intermedial and perceptual relations:

On the visual level, we take in concurrences and discrepancies in lip and mouth movements. This includes: **first**, harmony or lack of it between the vowel and the consonant articulation we perceive visually in actors on screen and the sounds we actually hear; **second**, congruence or non-congruence between visually and acoustically perceived syllable articulation, and **third**,

temporal correspondence or disparity between visually and acoustically perceived beginning and end of utterances, also known as isochrony.³⁶³

This shows to what extent film translation undermines the idea of “identity” between original and copy. Just as sound reproduction is conceptualised in terms of “high fidelity”, so can film translation can be described in terms of “fidelity”. The “fidelity” between original and translation in both dubbing and subtitling is a dual problem. It is either about fidelity in terms of language translation, that is a literal translation referring to the meaning of the words, and fidelity linked to the relation between image and sound, or image sound and text.³⁶⁴ A third aspect of fidelity in dubbing concerns the relation between the vocal features of the original removed voice and the dubbing voice.

The synchronisation between the different “tracks” of film is generally conceptualised as part of the classical story-telling mode, which stands in contrast to an “abusive” aesthetics of translation, to use Abé Mark Nore’s term, which is found in recent experimentation with subtitles.³⁶⁵ Here translation becomes as form of “*Verfremdung*” or an art of montage. Trinh T., Minh-Ha criticises the invisible translation from the point-of-view of ideological apparatus:

The duration of subtitles, for example, is very ideological. I think that if, in most translated films, subtitles stay on as long as they technically can [...] it’s because translation is conceived here as part of the operation of suture that defines the classical cinematic apparatus and the technological effort it deploys to naturalize a dominant, hierarchically unified world view. [...] Therefore, the attempt is always to protect the unity of the subject; here to collapse, in subtitling, the activities of reading, hearing and seeing, into one single activity, as if they were all the same. What you read is what you hear, and what you hear is more often than not, what you see.³⁶⁶

Classical film translation (both dubbing and subtitling) follows the logic of media synchronisation in order to shape the “unified worldview” Trinh T., Minh-Ha is referring to, a process in which reading, hearing and seeing are understood as “one single activity”. In a French subtitling manual from 1957 one consequently reads that “it is *desirable* that the translation corresponds exactly with the text fragment spoken during the apparition of the subtitle”, but it is “*absolutely necessary* that the subtitle appears simultaneously (in synchronisation) with the first syllable of the spoken text and that it disappears simultaneously with the last syllable of the same text”.³⁶⁷ The exact translation of words is thus subordinated to synchronisation between voice and text. Subtitles are, consequently, texts imitating the spoken dialogue in film. This is shown in different ways, for instance, by the absence of subti-

ling for other words than the dialogue. Stam points out that “subtitles tend to be vococentric, concentrating on spoken dialogue while ignoring other phonetic linguistic material [...] as well as visual and graphological materials such as posters, marquees, billboards and newspapers”.³⁶⁸ This is linked to the aim of synchronising the heard dialogue with the perceptual “inner voice” which subtitles generate, “the soundless, mental enunciation of words, the calling to mind of the phonetic signifier”.³⁶⁹ The synchronisation in subtitling forms a temporal dimension between sound and text, in addition to a spatial synchronisation between image and text. The manual concludes that “it is expressively recommended [...] not to use the same subtitle on two shots ‘cut’ [...]”.³⁷⁰ In this case, apparently, the sound synchronisation would be subordinated to the synchronisation between text and image.

In later subtitling practices, the strict rules of synchronisation are revised and the translation of the spoken content, adapted in relation to reading speed, has taken a somewhat more important role than synchronisation. Contemporary methodology of subtitling, outlined in Jan Ivarsson’s writings on the topic, for example, consider readability and content more important than synchronisation: “There is in fact no reason whatsoever (except tradition and prejudice) to remove the subtitle the moment the characters finish speaking. All that this achieves is to deprive the slowest readers of necessary information.”³⁷¹ Ivarsson concludes, “readability should never [...] be scarified for the sake of synchronization”.³⁷²

A significant paradox in earlier synchronised subtitling is the economic use of titles, which disrupts the media equivalence of “what you see is what you hear”. In subtitling from the “classical era”, it was common that words or sentences comprehensible by visual information (such as insults in a violent scene or repetition of the same word) were not translated (according to the cited manual, that would “take the spectator for an idiot”).³⁷³ Perfect synchronisation and fragmentary titling were advocated to guide the spectators’ attention towards the original speech and minimise the awareness of the reading process. This is embodied in the double identity of subtitles as both (like dubbing) part of the film, an integrated imitation of the speech act, and also (like intertitles), as an addition, a shorter résumé of the entire speech.

Like subtitling, synchronisation of dubbed voices was more important in the classical era than today. Strict synchronisation was an “absolute dogma”³⁷⁴ until the 1960s but today is of secondary importance, or even, according to Whitman-Linsen, “anachronistic”.³⁷⁵ This development is, however, not to be considered as a development towards experimental, “abusive” translation in mainstream film. Rather it is a continuation of the classical aesthetics of “invisibility” of translation techniques, which shift focus to other aspects of the story-telling. It is however notable that synchronisation does not always achieve invisibility in this respect. Various attempts to have subtitles imitate the sonic level of speech show how synchronisation reveals the *differences* between media. For example, the use of italics to represent an

off-screen voice, capital letters to represent difference in intonation bring out the plasticity of the letters and, therefore, positions writing in contrast to speech. Another example is of subtitles imitating spoken language by misspelling words or by using fragmented sentences that reveal the differences between spoken and written language. Subtitles, at times, represent a sonic juxtaposition between the intelligibility of speech and non-intelligible voices. Letters or parts of sentences removed from the written text in order for the text to correspond to a fragmented manner of speech and therefore makes the subtitle visible.³⁷⁶ Subtitling as “vococentric” imitation of speech can thus generate the opposite effect and reveal media materiality.

The difficulties of synchronisation in dubbing and subtitling pose obstacles to classical narrative transparency, consequently, the development of dubbing and subtitling techniques are often read as a development towards maximum equivalence between translation and original. By using Rick Altman’s concept of “near-equivalent”, Nataša Đurovičová suggests, in an essay about early dubbing techniques, a different reading of dubbing in relation to classical style:

To write dubbing, and through it a mark of difference, back into the picture of the classical narrative’s historical reception, I propose to borrow the term *functional near-equivalent* from Rick Altman’s revisionist ‘crisis historiography.’³⁷⁷ Intending to challenge the core concept of functional *equivalent* so central to the functionalist historiography of the Classical Hollywood Cinema model, Altman proposes this modified term as a way of rendering (more) apparent the losses and substitutions that occur when moments of innovation (be they stylistic, procedural or technological) are folded into the large-scale industrial routines of standardized (film) production.³⁷⁸

In the period of the coming of sound, the term “near-equivalent” is useful from various perspectives, not only as stylistic technological and industrial issues but also in terms of reception of translation as “original” or the translator as “artist”. Dubbing, subtitling and multiple language version making all negotiate the problem of equivalence, and all tellingly illustrate the impossibility of reaching complete equivalence. The more adequate understanding of film translation as “near-equivalent” underscores both difference and similarity, and highlights the vicissitudes of media synchronisation and language difference.

Translation in Early Sound Film

Media Materialisation and Synchronisation as Liveness

During the early sound period, asynchrony co-exists with a desire for perfect synchronisation. In discussions concerning translation from this period, the deliberation on language and meaning are subordinated to the issues of synchronisation. Articles and translated films indicate that during this particular period, the attempts to obtain synchronisation were, however, unrelated to invisibility of the translation. Synchronisation was a technological and perceptual issue linked to the discourse on synchronisation between voice and image as such.

In countries which depended on imported films, subtitling was intensely debated. This was especially the case in France, where the domestic production of talking pictures was substantially lower than the demand, as well as in smaller countries such as Sweden, which had a high rate of foreign import. In the critical remarks on subtitling, it was the simultaneous perceptual activity of reading, listening and watching that was questioned. Many critics preferred intertitles for sound films, since it separated the reading activity from the viewing and listening.³⁷⁹ The first screening of *The Jazz Singer* in Paris, for instance, is according to a report in *Cinéma*, followed by comments like: “It’s really difficult to listen to the actors and read the translation on the screen at the same time”, or, “Yes it’s tiring and it disturbs the emotion.”³⁸⁰ Simultaneous translation was, moreover, often discussed as a problem of audience reactions to the multimedial combination of text and sound. The issue of timing in comedies, for instance, was claimed to be disturbed by the presence of the written word. A Swedish critic noted that “before the actor says his line the writer has already delivered it [...] and the laughter – if there under such circumstances are any – comes much too early”.³⁸¹ When considering dubbing, such criticism was a mainstay in most reviews of dubbed films, particularly concerning mismatched lip-synchronisation. A critic in *La cinématographie française* about the French dubbed version *Gabbo le ventriloque* (*The Great Gabbo*, James Cruze and Erich von Stroheim, 1929), complained about poor synchronisation.³⁸² This remark is particularly ironic since the film, like many early sound films, depicts the “ventriloquist”³⁸³ dimension of sound film and even stages a ventriloquist demonstrating perfect fusion between his voice and the lip and body movements of his doll. Dubbed dialogue was frequently criticised for being too theatrical and lacking spontaneity. The French “‘dubbing’ made in Hollywood” made one of the earliest French dubbed films (*Hors du gouffre*, *The Man Who Came Back*, Raoul Walsh, 1931) according to a critic, “too theatrical” and “maladroit”.³⁸⁴ Criticism of sound film and voice reproduction from the initial period of early sound film resurfaced in remarks about dubbing. The lack of synchronisation, the theatrical “non-filmic” speech etc. dominated

articles on sound film from 1929, and from 1931 this line of reason was mirrored in the criticism of dubbing practice. Some critics even made an explicit link between the early problems of sound film and the dubbing procedures of the following years, arguing that dubbing would bring the sound film back to its initial stage. Raymond Berner for one, connected the role of speech in early sound films with the problem of synchronisation in dubbing. Berner states that the “reciting” (rather than “spoken”) character in dialogue of the first talking films later concerned dubbing. In dubbed film he found the same absence of “lightness of elocution” as in the first talking pictures.³⁸⁵

From a reverse, but still parallel, perspective, the advocates of dubbing also used the argument of dubbing as a continuation of technological sound synchronisation as part of filmic voice reproductions. For example, in an article in *Journal of the Society of Motion Picture*, it was claimed that dubbing was just as authentic as other voice reproduction, because no matter how many times the sound is reproduced, it remains “the actual voice of the person speaking in the picture”.³⁸⁶ A similar “defence” of dubbing in *Pour Vous* takes the parallel to vocal fidelity even further by claiming that “the possibility to freely ‘choose’ the timbre of an interpreter’s voice” allows the director to “correct the scarcity of nature and give the actor the rare thing called ‘the voice of his physics’”.³⁸⁷ This recalls earlier sound film discussions on accurate voices corresponding to the star image (as well as current fictional thematisations of these issues, seen in films such as Joseph Schmidt’s opera films which display a discrepancy between the singer’s small body and his “big” voice).

The vocal fidelity of sound reproduction and the fidelity between dubbing and original voices are thus part of the same discourse of “synchronisation” at various levels. Early attempts to synchronise dubbed voices disestablish the limits of dubbing as an issue of voice replacement. In order to obtain synchronisation, images were sometimes re-shot, and close-ups replaced. Different techniques were developed in order to make an a-synchronous relation between the movements of the lips and the replaced dialogue unobstructive. The French dubbed versions *La pente* (*Dance Fools, Dance*, Harry Beaumont, 1931, French version directed by Claude Autant Lara), *La Résurrection* and *Ourang* were mentioned in several articles as unusually successful dubbed versions. Concerning *La pente*, the dubbing technique was singled out as one of the most “positive elements” of the film.³⁸⁸ These adjustments (according to the critics) in the French version were made by editing. In the dubbed versions, close-ups with speech were removed, and in many scenes the actors turn away from the camera when speaking or otherwise hide their faces.³⁸⁹ The different devices for adjusting the image of the film in order to obtain near-perfect synchronisation evidences the importance of lip-synchronisation in the period of the coming of sound. Multiple language versions of films, the form of translation that dominated the market in 1930

and early 1931 prior to the more standardised dubbing, can be read as the most radical solution to the problem of lip-synchronisation.

Differentiation of Translation Techniques

The clamour for perfect synchronisation does not mean that translation in this period was more synchronous than later. On the contrary, the plurality of translation forms, the lack of standardised translation techniques and the technological problems of adding subtitled text or dubbed voices to the original film in many cases generated a-synchronous translation tracks separated from the original film.

It is important to stress that many forms of translation co-existed in this period. The distinction between dubbing, subtitling and multiple versions from the same script is both anachronistic and incomplete. It is anachronistic in the sense that the boundaries between contemporary categories such as post-synchronisation versus dubbing, subtitling versus intertitling, and version versus remake etc. were not established. In many cases, different techniques were united in the same category and often the same film used different forms of translation. Films such as Max Ophüls' German and French version of *Liebelei/Une histoire d'amour* (1933) or the four versions of *Prix de beauté* were productions hovering between multiple language version, remake, and post-synchronisation. Lang's first two sound films, *M* and *Das Testament des Dr. Mabuse*, also fall in the category of mixed translation, since the French, Italian or English versions of the films are partly re-shot language versions and partly dubbed.

The mixing of different forms of translation within one and the same film disrupts the narrative homogeneity of the classical cinema. Different levels of synchronisation, from perfectly synchronised scenes re-shot for the translated version to the a-synchronous titles create an aesthetic of differentiation by which one mode of translation becomes perceptible in contrast to the others.

The categorisation of dubbing, titling and language version is furthermore incomplete in the sense that there are additional forms of translation in the period of the early sound film, which do not fit into this categorisation. The many different forms of titling do not correspond to what today is termed subtitling. Between 1929 and 1931, the most common way of translating by titling was through intertitles placed between the images, and thus a-synchronous both in time and space. Another less common form was to project subtitles separately onto the screen. These could be projected either as modern subtitles are, at the bottom of the screen and thus superimposed, or separately on another screen beside the film screen. A few rare experiments with subtitles printed on the film strip itself emerged in 1930, which in the following years developed into a photographic imprint on the film strip

which today is called subtitling.³⁹⁰ The silent versions of sound films have a double function as they served as translations, besides being adaptations for use in movie theatres without sound projection equipment. If the silent version of Alfred Hitchcock's *Blackmail* was preferred by the German audience in 1929,³⁹¹ it was not necessarily because the audience preferred silent film; it could just as well be the case that they preferred films translated into German (since the silent film was shown with German intertitles, while the sound version was screened without translation). Thus, many films screened as silent films in Europe were just as much "language adaptations" as silent versions.

As Rié Kitada has shown, in an essay on the terminology of titling practices in the early sound era, the French and Swiss press termed all these forms of titling "subtitles".³⁹² In some cases, however, titles projected at the bottom of the image were called "superimposed subtitles".³⁹³ The differentiation of titling processes was described in detail only in cases where the same film was screened in different translated versions. For example, the German- and French-speaking audience in Lausanne in Switzerland could see *Hallelujah* in two different translated versions, one sound version without the dialogue translated with bi-lingual intertitles described as "sound and songs in English with German and French subtitles", and a second version "entirely spoken in English with some words of the German text superimposed" (at the bottom of the image).³⁹⁴

The lack of precise terminology has somehow confused the understanding of the use of (what today is called) subtitles in the early sound era.³⁹⁵ Irrespective of whether titles were simultaneously shown with the dialogue or placed in between the images, such as silent intertitles, only fragments of the dialogue were translated. Therefore, the criticism against subtitles in this period is not exclusively about the simultaneous act of reading, hearing and seeing but also about the lack of translation of the whole dialogue.

Apart from the common subtitling forms mentioned above, Kitada identified a third called "summary" which was frequently used.³⁹⁶ This form is probably (since no exact description is to be found in the press) a narrative form of the film story projected on the screen either before the film started or during projection. The summary is thus not only an a-synchronised translation in space and time, it is an adaptation into another form of narrative. Kitada finds in the Swiss press a more differentiated categorisation of the forms of translation in the early sound era: adaptation, language version, dubbing, and summary.³⁹⁷

It is, however, possible to make an even more fine-graded listing of translation forms. For instance, the category of "adaptation" is rather unclear. It can be a film with partly replaced and post-synchronised dialogue or partly removed dialogue replaced by intertitles.³⁹⁸ There are other forms of translation which provide a translation which, on one level, were even more disconnected from the film and, on another level, more integrated. For instance,

the use of a “bonimenteur”, a live narrator or commentator, in early cinema had a short revival in the early sound era as a translator. (As pointed out by Miriam Hansen, in early cinema exhibition the live commentary could serve as language translation, and thus emphasise “linguistic difference in the cinematic experience rather than its universalising effect”).³⁹⁹ A commentary inserted in the film could also be used in a re-edited version for a foreign market. *La féerie du jazz* (*The King of Jazz*, John Murray Anderson, 1930), for example, was shown in France with short introduction scenes shot in Hollywood with an animator speaking in French who appears several times during the film.⁴⁰⁰ The commentator was the French Hollywood actor André Cheron, described in *Pour Vous* as giving a “nice but banal” impression in the film.⁴⁰¹ Translation/translator as a “character” in the film generates a dual position of translation placed within the film and simultaneously separated from it. Additionally, the added translator was combined with a cartoon commentator (in colour) appearing also in the original version. This example illustrates how the translation functions as parallel or analogue to other kinds of media “attractions” in the early sound period. Moreover, the narrative forms of film novelisation, summaries in the press or printed programs distributed in the movie theatres could also, when no other translation form was available, function as translations. If one stretches the concept of translation even further, local theatre versions of popular foreign films could also function as forms of translation. Those extra-filmic forms of “translation” remain in contemporary cinematic culture and still function as means of transcultural devices anchoring an international production in a local context. The lack of standardised translation in the period of the coming of sound is otherwise akin to the plurality of modes of translation in contemporary television, featuring direct and reworked subtitling or voice-over, dubbing, narration, commentary etc., mixed in one medium.⁴⁰²

The German success of René Clair’s *Sous les toits de Paris* illustrates the convergences between intermediality and translation. In the French film press, this film was proudly announced as the first internationally successful French-speaking sound film because it would use “universal” filmic language beyond the verbal. It was claimed that the international sound film should follow Clair’s recipe and be “little talkative, with action, movement, a lot of music and songs”.⁴⁰³ However, as described by Jeanpaul Goergen, the German translations of the *film songs*, distributed in magazines and on records, did translate the film to the German audience; the German song texts were also revised, and the lyrics emphasised an established cultural imaginary of Parisian libertine girls. The refrain, “In Paris, in Paris, sind die Mädels so süß, /wenn sie flüstern ‘Monsieur, ich bin dein!’”, did not correspond to the more innocent French original.⁴⁰⁴ The translation, cultural and linguistic, of the songs was essential for the international success of the film. “Whole Europe sings the great sound film hit ‘In Paris, in Paris, sind die Mädels so süß’”,⁴⁰⁵ it was announced in the German advertisement empha-

singing the songs in their German translation as a means to promote the film. The translation from French into German occurs on a level of medium adaptation, as well as in terms of cultural adaptation (besides the language translation).

It is significant that none of the translation modes mentioned above can be described exclusively as translations. Dubbing was originally used in order to replace accent or voice spoken in the same language, titling replaced the absence of audible speech.⁴⁰⁶ The extra-diegetic novelisation and summaries etc. are part of the cinematic culture regardless of the problem of translation. The multiple language version practice of replacing one actor by another allows cultural adaptations which change plot and location. Ascheid places subtitling in a context of written commentaries which are not translations but instead explanations, written material “like opera pamphlets, which explain the plot or music, or art guide books, translating for the audience untrained reading the ‘language’ it speaks”.⁴⁰⁷ In the period of the early sound film, explanations, commentary and adaptations were not only similar to translation, they actually functioned as such. The multiplicity of translation practices and the multimedial dimension of translation together reduce the idea of translation as interpretation of content into a problem of material inscription and synchronisation. Simultaneously, it propels translation into a field of medium adaptation, different narrative structures and cultural adaptation.

Aspects of Cultural Representation

Cultural devices for an international audience in the era of modernity and globalisation are by different means adjusted for different local reception contexts. This has been discussed as a discourse of “vernacular modernism” by Hansen (this is developed in chapter six)⁴⁰⁸ of which translation is one of the most significant practices. In the early sound era, the level of adaptation is strongly emphasised and problematised: on the one hand, differences between translated versions generated a level of local cultural adaptation, on the other hand, translation was often considered as a significant part of the film itself, which turns translation into a representation of transcultural identity.

The degree of cultural adaptation in film translations was negotiated as aspects of versions. Differences in plot, acting, directing and atmosphere go far beyond the purely linguistic realms. It is noticeable to what extent translation has been used as a tool of censorship, in particular in fascist regimes in the 1930s. For example, as demonstrated by Massimiliano Gaudiosi, in the Italian dubbed version of Lang’s *Das Testament des Dr. Mabuse* (which was dubbed from the French version of the film, not the German original), dubbing was used to revise some politically-disturbing elements: the good reputation of the Police was reinforced, while the hypnotic powers of Mabuse

were eliminated.⁴⁰⁹ Subtitling was also sometimes used for censorship, even if the audible dialogue made it less powerful. For example, in Leontine Sagan's explicitly lesbian film *Mädchen in Uniform* from 1931, the English subtitles tone down some of the more passionate declarations of love.

The relation between representation of culture, language and body also interacts with synchronisation as an issue beyond the problem of lip synchronisation. For example, as demonstrated by Hagener, the German critique of the dubbing in *Prix de beauté* was partly based on the assumption that the original was French. "It is not possible to dub a dialogue that is spoken in French later into German"⁴¹⁰ one critic marked, and "the acting is French, the talking is German" claimed another.⁴¹¹ The idea of "Frenchness" in this case resides on the level of representation, based on the fact that the story takes place in France, rather than that the actors, Louise Brooks in particular, pronounce the words in French (which she, of course, did not). As a negotiation in terms of ethnicity between fictional location, "types" and synchronisation, the German translation offers a triple polyglossia between a French story and German/English speech.

In discourses on dubbing during this period, one can discern ideas on "synchronisation" between cultural identities, ethnic "types" or represented rather than by lip movements and voice only. Béla Balázs significantly in 1952 looks back on the development of sound film and predicts that the film industry in the future will abandon dubbing based on the fact that the audience will detect a sensibility of ethnic "speech gestures":

The public to-day understands not only the meaning of the spoken word but also the sound-gesture that goes with it [...] and can hear in it the parallel to gesture and facial expression. [...] In the old days when we as yet paid attention only to the conceptual meaning of the dialogue, it was conceivable that someone in a film should say in English with an English calm, cool intonation 'I love you' and accompany the words passionate Italian gestures. It strikes the present-day public as irresistibly funny if it notices - and it does notice - a discrepancy of temperament between word and gestures.⁴¹²

In Balázs' reading, dubbing is a "synchronisation" between two ethnic types, which functions as an extension of synchronisation between visible lip movements and pronounced words. Facial expression and "speech gestures" are indissoluble connected to cultural, ethnic and "racial" behaviour.

The plurality of ethnic identities in translation was, of course, criticised. However, it was also, simultaneously, often an actively foregrounded dimension of translation in this period. Discourses on early sound film translation depict the very *process of adaptation* as a kind of attraction. (This will be further developed in the next chapter.) It is significant that *Prix de beauté* was advertised in France as a film in "four languages" with a poster in all

four languages and with pictures of four different flags.⁴¹³ Rather than showcasing the star, Louise Brooks, or Augusto Genini and René Clair (the men behind the film) the poster foregrounds translation (the fact that the film is shot in several language versions) as the main attraction of the film. The translation itself here contributes to the construction of imaginaries of Europe and transnational identity displayed in the film.⁴¹⁴ In contrast to later attempts to hide the translation and make it as transparent as possible, translation was in the early sound era often showcased as an important aspect of the film itself. In this case, translation acted as a handmaiden for the construction of a European “projection” of cultural multilingual identity. In other cases, however, translation was viewed as an image of the opposite, of American expansion. Just as sound films in general in 1929 were perceived as a sign of Americanisation, dubbing, which began in Hollywood, was understood as a facilitating tool for the American industry to take over domestic markets. From this perspective, the critique of dubbing as non-artistic, as an economic compromise in order to reach a mass audience, follows an overall critique of the role of American culture in Europe in the late 1920s.

Advertising posters for European multiple language versions in the period when Hollywood had moved from version making to dubbing often used the argument of European *quality* against American *commercialism*.⁴¹⁵ “An UFA film is NOT a dubbed film”, a French advertising poster states implying that Hollywood films were often dubbed and thus lacked quality. This anti-Americanism concerning dubbing promulgates national interest;⁴¹⁶ the actors’ union in France, for instance, strongly condemned dubbed American films as a threat to their members. Similar to the resistance against sound film, the criticism of dubbing is inscribed in the debate of American cultural influence in Europe. The increasing presence of dubbed American films was often outlined in terms of American bad taste and arrogance vis-à-vis European values.⁴¹⁷ The denigration of dubbing continued even after the dubbing was recorded not in the Hollywood studios but in the different distribution countries. In many countries, such as France, the US and Germany, subtitled films connote “art” and a culture of cinephilia, while dubbed versions smacked of “industry” and mass audience appeal.

Translators as “Near-equivalence”

The French translation of *Mädchen in Uniform* illustrates another major aspect in the process of cultural adaptation: artistic recognition of the cast involved in the translation. The French subtitling was written by Colette and her name was not only mentioned in reviews, it was even printed on the advertising poster for the film when distributed in France as well as at the head of some reviews (*La cinématographie française* states “French titles: Colette”). Colette’s reputation as writer, and maybe even more importantly, her status within the androgynous “gay” culture in Paris of the late 1920s,

turned her into a French equivalent of the authors of the film, of Leontine Sagan and Christa Winsloe. Hence, in France, Colette's name would correspond to, or even reinforce, the original lesbian theme. Significantly, *Pour Vous* compares the film to Colette's literary work in the review of the film: "Mme Colette has – with her fantastic verve – written the French dialogue. And actually, there are similarities between situations in *Mädchen in Uniform* and *Claudine à l'école*."⁴¹⁸ The critic then continues comparing the fictional characters in the film with Colette's novel, finding differences and similarities between Manuela and Claudine, or between Fräulein von Bernburg and Aimée as a point of departure for an analysis of the film. The comparison between film and novel and between two writers turns the translation into a "near-equivalent" work of art. In contrast to the English subtitling, which aimed to tone down the film's controversial theme, the French translation profiled the film within a certain artistic community.

In the early sound period, the recognition of the translation as an original work was ambiguous. On the one hand, as today, film translators enjoyed less artistic recognition than in literature, and dubbing directors and dubbing actors are less recognised than other directors and actors within the film industry (the Colette example remains an exception, closer to the recognition of a literary translation), and thus corresponds to Benjamin's notion of how translation as "pure language" undermines the translator's position as artist. On the other hand, in this particular period, the translation is almost always mentioned by the critics of the films and thus seen as integrated in the film, in some cases the dubbing actors and directors were named and were mentioned in reviews. Claude Autant Lara received recognition for his direction of the French-dubbed version *La pente*, and Claude Mercy, as the French dubber of Greta Garbo, was praised for having the "exact same voice as the Swedish actress".⁴¹⁹ The "exact same voice" is, paradoxically, not about "identity" since similarity to Garbo's voice apparently attributes a certain "star quality" to Claude Mercy. In almost every review, the quality of the dubbing, the number of intertitles and the ability of actors to speak foreign languages were awarded considerable attention. This can be described as a process of producing "near-equivalence": the similarities between translation and original is part of the film as a means of producing "difference", be it cultural, linguistic or other. The cultural "near-equivalence" between Colette and Sagan or Winsloe, or the similar voices of Mercy and Garbo inspires comparison, differentiation is revealed by similar, comparable, and, consequently, non-identical features.

Media Transposition in Dubbing Techniques

A report in *La cinématographie française* explained how an early Hollywood dubbing practice was based on interaction between image, sound and

text. It was described how the text was written according to pre-calculated sound synchronisation with the movements of the lips to the original sound track, with the right number of syllables, vowels and consonants; then the text was written on a positive film strip which was projected vertically in front of the dubbing actor. The size of the letters marked intonation: there were small, medium and large size letters. Colours at the beginning of each line marked who is to say what.⁴²⁰ The actors thus never saw the images nor did they hear the original voice in the recording. The absence of the original film in the dubbing situation was here replaced by a multimedial procedure with letters, colours and graphics organised in order to be transposed into speech. This example illustrates that film translation can be conceptualised according to the previously-discussed processes of media separation and media transposition. The term “dubbing” derived from the technique of “doubling” bodies in film,⁴²¹ initially referred to a practice of sound montage, which replaced direct sound with recorded extracts from so-called “sound libraries” filled with sound samples of both voices and sound effects.⁴²² The “library” metaphor is significant as it marks dubbing as a process of isolating and constructing sounds, and thus places them “on the side of writing”, to use Lastra’s words. The first techniques of dubbing were voice replacements (due to disturbing accents) within the same language, as in the case of Anny Ondra in *Blackmail* whose Czech accent prevented her from acting in English and who mimed the lines in English simultaneously pronounced by an actress with a “pure” British accent. Between 1931 and 1932, dubbing turned into a means of replacing one language with another resulting in various recording procedures developed in order to obtain synchronisation between lip movements and speech.

Ďurovičová claims that “first procedures working out the conventions of dubbing” as language replacement were “Roy Pomeroy at Paramount, Friedrich Zelnick for UA, the Vivigraph method of Edwin Hopkins, and the Rhytmograph method developed in Germany”.⁴²³ These early techniques are different but generally follow a similar kind of media transposition process as described above. The German dubbing system, “Rytmograph”, and the French system, “Synchro-ciné”, both initially separated the original dialogue by rewriting the syllables from the dialogue on the film strip or on paper. In the Rytmograph method, this process was automatic which made the procedure similar to early sound recording as writing or inscription: firstly there was the detection of phonetic components of the original version, which were then electromechanically transcribed in the form of a graph. This abstract graph was then transcribed on paper, like musical notation, with syllables instead of notes.⁴²⁴ Subsequently, the whole original dialogue was written on the same paper; after this the translated text was placed side by side with the original, first with the syllables then words; and finally the original text was removed.⁴²⁵ The translation itself was thus preceded by a process of media transposition; the dialogue was transposed first into written signs cor-

responding to the sonic quality of the dialogue (that is, the syllables) and subsequently transposed into writing. This takes place first in one and the same language, but between two media, and then between the two languages and two media.

The difficulties to edit the translation after recording in early sound film generated an emphasis on preparation before recording. This is why most of the dubbing procedures focus not only on the exact calculations of syllables, but also on other methods developed in order to make the recording situation perfectly prepared before the recording, for example, by extensive rehearsals before recording. The dubbing was often compared with the work of a theatre actor rather than a film actor, which reinforces the textual dimension of dubbing. The almost mechanical process of reading from a text on a screen is also similar to modern television announcers, who often read their lines from a teleprompter (a screen positioned in front of the camera). The transposition from text to voice consequently takes place at the level of acting; the process of reading lines projected onto a screen is, in some respect, a mechanical movement of transference of text to sound through the body. These various forms of translation procedure, optical or printed subtitles as images or text, the voice turned into words, then back into voice, are indications of the different ways in which translation is a matter of media transposition. Following Kittler, media materialisation and media transposition undermines a conventional conception of writing in a discourse in which “transposition necessarily takes the place of translation”.⁴²⁶ When it comes to film, the process of translation is fundamentally linked to the processes of media transposition.

Inscription/Simulation, Voice/Body, Unification/Separation

Film translation as synchronisation or processes of media transposition can be pinned down as a set of dichotomies related to the problem of speech representation in film as discussed in the previous chapter. Firstly, just like sound and silent versions, translated versions embody a tension between exchangeability versus materiality, which can be described according to the semiotic categories of “allographic” versus “authographic”. This, in turn, is linked to whether the translation should be perceived as the same work as the original or in its own right. To a certain extent, the early sound era moved towards an understanding of translation as an independent inscription of material media. Not only the multiple language versions as new “originals”, but also film reviews’ detailed descriptions of dubbing and titling indicate to what extent each translated version was perceived as a new different version. The various forms of versions in this period, however, also allow a discourse of exchangeability in which one and the same text can be transposed into

different media, different art forms, and different languages. The discourse of materiality in combination with exchangeability is a consequence of an extended conception of translation towards transposition, transformation or adaptation between different narrative forms or media. Secondly, translation reveals a relation between “text” and “body”. The translation is a disconnected addition, and consequently, contains a textual dimension in itself. The sonic dimension of film translation (which is, as discussed previously, also inscribed in vococentric subtitles) functions as physical simulation of organic and perceptual movements rather than a text containing a verbal message. Lastra’s dichotomy of “inscription” vs. “simulation” functions as a variation of the more general “text” and “body”. The dual function of sound recording developed both as a means to reproduce sound as it is actually heard (the so-called high-fidelity-dimension), and the other as the development of directional microphones and a separate dialogue track in order to make speech intelligible, preconditions the problem of film translation. Dubbing simulates speech since it, in contrast to titling, cites the voice’s physical dimension, but also exposes the vocal sound track as separate and a-synchronous, which reveals the inscription level of sound technology and places it “on the side of writing”.⁴²⁷ Finally, “unification” and “separation” (of both senses and media) are opposites inscribed in the discourse of film translation. The different forms of translation can be read on a scale of different degrees of separation and unification: intertitles are both spatially and temporally separated from the filmic representation of speech; projected slides are spatially separated; subtitles are integrated in the image but separated from the image of the speaking subject; non-synchronised dubbing is linking speech to the image which still exposes a difference in the lack of lip synchronisation; synchronised dubbing, with the movements of the lip following the foreign language, forms an even closer connection between the sound and the speaking subject than standard dubbing. Also this translation technique generates division: here is voice and body separated in the recording situation and by the fact that the recorded voice belongs to a different person than the actor shown on-screen. The multiple language version film appears to create the most unified body on this scale. In the case of the multiple language version film, the division between translation and original is located at an extra-filmic level in the combination of native language and foreign representation.

All forms of translation expose division and all aim to overcome them. One form of separation generates unification, and vice versa. For example, sub- or intertitling as the most “bodyless” textual mode are separated from the original voice both in terms of cinematic space and media inscription; these textual translation forms, however, permit the unification between the original voice and the body to remain intact. With few subtitles, the film “body” as a perceptual and organic totality remains intact. The use of intertitles or “summary” instead of subtitles, is to some extent more a-synchronous

than modern subtitling. If intertitles, in many cases, were preferred in the early sound era, it was because the separation itself would help the spectator to understand the film without having the audiovisual experience of an “intact film body” disturbed by the presence of text projected on the image simultaneously with the dialogue.

Example: *M – le maudit*

As an example of the processes of early sound film translation discussed in this chapter, I will make some brief observations on the translation of Fritz Lang’s *M* which was shot in three language versions: the German original, a French version and an English version. Needless to say, the two latter versions have remained relatively unknown. Recent interest in film versions, however, has inspired a search for different versions of the great classics, and now, a fragment of the French version is available on DVD, on the latest Criterion collection edition.⁴²⁸ Among the bonus material, the DVD contains a documentary called *The Physical History of M*⁴²⁹ in which the French version is compared with the original. Here, the French version is described as a mixed form: partly dubbed, partly re-shot with different actors, it is partly translated with titles and, most importantly, the major trial scene in which Lorre makes his famous monologue is re-shot with the same actor. The trial scene is mixed between synchronised and non-synchronised dialogue. The images of the criminals judging the child murderer are not re-shot and the shots do not obtain lip-synchronisation. The mix in the trial scene between the a-synchronous dubbing of the “jury” and Lorre’s synchronous performance breaks with a continuous narrative style. The synchronisation, instead, highlights Lorre’s performance as an attraction of liveness rather than obtaining narrative realism and transparency. Lorre’s direct address towards an audience, the close-ups on his facial expressions and the duration of the monologue, are features in this scene that required synchronisation. Moreover, it is evident that Lang’s typical themes, motifs and stylistic features are embodied in issues regarding translation, particularly the anonymity of the modern man and handwriting as a trace of the body.⁴³⁰ The many scenes in which the actors turn their back to the camera or the frequent use of the acousmatic voice and letters facilitate the translation. The disconnection of the voice and communication through letters assists the translation process - the exchange of German titles or voices with French ones - on a technical level.

It is significant that the handwriting of the murderer’s letter, in French, is written in the same handwriting as the German letter. The equivalence of handwriting in combination with language difference marks the inscription as a physical trace rather than exchangeable words. It is not enough to translate the words, one also has to reproduce the same kind of inscription. If the

anonymity in *M* opens up for translation, the material trace as an important motif in the film becomes an obstacle for transparent translation. The materiality of the handwriting, or even more importantly, the materiality of the voice, expose language as a specific physical trace, which undermines a conception of translation based on language equivalence and exchangeability.

This introduces an important issue. The commentary on the DVD erroneously claims that Lorre himself speaks in French in the trial scene, when he in fact is dubbed by a French actor. Even if the French voice is similar to Lorre's, the difference is clearly audible. The French voice lacks Lorre's differentiated range of vocal strength; Lorre's voice moves in a few seconds from whispering to screaming, the French voice is more restrained and even. (It is also in the moments of screaming and whispering that the disruption between Lorre's visual appearance and the French voice is most striking.) Furthermore, the way in which the French actor speaks is not the speech of a German actor speaking French; there is no accent, no slips in pronunciation, all indicate an example of perfect French "theatre accent".

In an article in *La cinématographie française*, the procedure is explained in detail by the director of the French version, Roger Goupillère:

First I decomposed the film of Fritz Lang into little pieces, that we synchronised one after the other. Then, with the help of the same number of actors and extras that we see on the screen, I added sound to each piece. In the projection room, we projected the fragments of the film. All the actors and extras learned to say the corresponding phrases or words in French, pronounced in German by Fritz Lang's actors. My actors have even been placed with the same distance to the microphone as the German actors in the studio.⁴³¹

This description clearly shows that the dubbing was made before the established dubbing techniques, described earlier, were developed. The article also makes clear to what extent the dubbing director is recognised as director of the film which, consequently, makes the film into an "original" or "near-equivalent" original. The problem of the distance to the microphone, finally, stresses the material level of the translated words. Goupillère continues and explains the shooting of the trial scene:

For some scenes which needed a rigorous parallelism between lip movements and words, I had to return to Berlin. Peter Lorre (the vampire) and the actor who plays his lawyer, acted the final scene in French. But we only recorded the images. Then, in Paris Rozenberg Jr. and another actor recorded the lines that the two German actors had firstly pronounced.⁴³²

This technique was the German system “topology”, a system of post-synchronisation with recording on separate discs. This was used as early as in 1929 for the first German 100% talking picture *Melodie des Herzens* shot in four languages with the same actors lip-synched with local actors in the three foreign languages.⁴³³

The post-synchronisation in the French trial scene in *M* clearly differs from the English version in which Lorre himself speaks in English. The particular German accent of Lorre, which became an important part of his star persona in Hollywood, was for the first time heard by the American audience in the English language version.

Between the two versions, and within each version, there are degrees of separation and unification, from dubbing, replacement of the actors, and the unification of body and voice in the trial scene. This corresponds to the narrative development of the film in which the murderer first appears indirectly through his shadow, voice, his handwriting, before appearing in person. It is during the monologue in the trial scene, in which he confesses and exposes the relation between the two sides of his split personality, that he is finally exposed in his “totality”. This was the reason why this particular scene and not the others were re-shot. The relation between synchronisation and vocal liveness in scenes with direct address can, moreover, be seen in the light of the discourse of sound or speech as attraction in the early sound films from 1928 and 1929. As described in the previous chapter, in many of the part-talkies, the selected talking or singing parts were often shot as a kind of live performance addressed towards the audience; with trial scenes, in particular, as talking sequences while the rest of the film was silent.

Fritz Lang’s *M* is thus an illuminating example of several of the aspects of translation of sound film: the diversity of translation techniques, the relation between media transposition and translation, and the connections between speech representation as such and translation, discussed in this chapter.

Translating Bodies and Imaginary Geographies: Polyglot Stardom

Multiple Language Version Film

Multiple language version film (MLV), defined, with Ďurovičová's words, as "the simultaneous remaking of the same title in a variety of language versions",⁴³⁴ was a more important form of translation than subtitling or dubbing in the early sound film era. These films are the most significant examples of how translation when it comes to film is merged with other forms of transposition or adaptation. Films in multiple language versions are a form of translation, and can thus be compared to titling or dubbing, but are also, however, a kind of "synchronic remake", to rephrase Ginette Vincendeau, in order to anchor a story in a new cultural context.⁴³⁵

MLVs are usually described as either "new originals" or "fake originals".⁴³⁶ As films in between dubbed versions and remakes, they deconstruct the dichotomy between original and copy even more strikingly than other translation forms in the early sound era. In François Jost's reading, the MLV is a step towards an "allographic" understanding of cinema; in the MLV, the *film script* is the original, while the film versions (just like theatre performances) are "instances" of the original script. In an essay about the coming of sound, Kittler approaches an idea initiated by Gisela Vogt (the wife of the famous sound film inventor Hans Vogt) of "reproducing every sound film scene in several idioms",⁴³⁷ from a similar perspective. Kittler locates the conversion to sound film as a process from a *sound* medium into a *word* medium. This changeover is due to a "betrayal" of the emphasis on sound in the initial innovation for the use of sound film for primarily fiction dialogue. With the practice of producing film in the "principle cultural languages",⁴³⁸ Kittler claims that "the voice was no longer music to the ears and the heart, but semantics for the head".⁴³⁹ The emphasis of the voice in many MLVs (many of them are musicals), as well as the prominence of stars, however, undermines the allographic dimension of the relation between script and individual film version.⁴⁴⁰ Of particular interest is the popular interest in foreign accents in this mode of translation which reveals the sonic level as a discursive resistance towards the "word" (as well as to the level of exchangeability between versions).

In this chapter, I will discuss the MLVs as a heterogeneous phenomenon ushering in a variety of issues related to the idea of a universal language, national variations and specific ethnic “types”. A more general discussion on the MLV-phenomenon is followed by an analysis of stardom in relation to MLVs as a discourse of “embodiment of translation” or “translating bodies” rather than languages. For this, I have chosen to focus on the role of the polyglot star, and in particular Lilian Harvey. The main empirical sources are German and French fan magazines. The latter constitutes the most essential material since it focuses on the transnational dimension of stardom.

The cultural signification of the versions anchored in the context of the popular press is stressed more forcefully in this chapter than the last. A close comparison between versions might, when not contextualised in a reception or production perspective, lead to speculative conclusions or an emphasis on insignificant differences. For example, concerning *Die Drei von der Tankstelle*, Martin Barnier has correctly pointed out that a montage sequence is “missing” in the French version.⁴⁴¹ This seemingly important difference is, however, never mentioned when the versions were compared in the press. Instead, other features, like the way in which the main star, Lilian Harvey, speaks French, were frequently discussed. My point of departure in this chapter is to reveal and discuss these topics rather than the more conspicuous “textual” differences between versions. In the next chapter, I will combine a closer textual approach in which I compare stylistic differences between versions, with a contextual reception approach to these differences.

If this chapter deals primarily with the relation between body, voice and translation, the next will deal with the relation between translation, cultural adaptation and intermediality. By analysing the Swedish film version and the Swedish theatre version of *Marius*, I will untangle how cultural and media transposition (from Marseille to Sweden and from theatre play to film) interfere with the process of translation.

Production Background: Joinville, Babelsberg and Elstree

The phenomenon of version making has in the recent years grown from being a historiographic anecdote, an example of the less successful and historically insignificant experiments during the coming of sound,⁴⁴² into an important field of film research.⁴⁴³ Even if the interpretations of the MLV-phenomenon differ in recent approaches, the most notable result of this research is that the production of language versions was neither as limited in time as most survey histories claim, nor was it an isolated or homogenous phenomenon. In particular from a European perspective, the success of the versions have been clearly underestimated; the peak of the UFA versions lasted, for example, well into 1933.⁴⁴⁴ Even if the MLV as a major translation mode declined after 1932 many versions were made, especially Euro-

pean co-productions between the fascist regimes of Spain, Italy and Germany, until the end of the 1930s.⁴⁴⁵ (After WWII, there are only a few exceptional cases of MLV-production, such as *Lola Montès* by Max Ophüls from 1955.) Most important in German production until 1935 was the production of French MLVs.⁴⁴⁶ The French versions of the popular UFA films, as well as the German-French co-productions of multiple language versions,⁴⁴⁷ are important films for understanding the French-German relation in the early 1930s.

MLVs were produced in many countries, but the major European MLV-production took place in France, Germany and the United Kingdom. The dominating companies were Paramount Paris in the Joinville studios, UFA in the Babelsberg studios in Berlin, and BIP and Gaumont British in the Elstree studios in London. Many minor companies, however, also produced MLVs in the big studios, which were constructed for version production.⁴⁴⁸ In Hollywood, MGM, Universal, Warner Bros and RKO, shouldered most of the MLV-production and it did not last as long as in Europe. At the end of 1931, most American production companies had abandoned version making with the exception of Universal which continued until 1933.⁴⁴⁹

It has often been argued that the UFA-production in contrast to Paramount in the Joinville studios in Paris stood for quality instead of quantity. This is because some Paramount films were shot in 12 versions, while many UFA-films were big-budget productions and rarely produced in more than two. The Paramount films shot in Joinville were mostly foreign versions of American originals shot in the Paramount studios in Hollywood. The UFA films were to a larger extent perceived as two originals, while the Paramount versions were perceived as copies of an American original. The bad reputation of the poor quality of the Paramount films, is, however, exaggerated. As demonstrated by Charles O'Brien, between 1929 and 1931, Paramount Paris quickly turned into a French national company with French staff and technicians. After an initial phase, some of the films were based on original French scripts. A few of the most popular French films from this period were produced by Paramount, the best example is perhaps Marcel Pagnol's *Marius*.⁴⁵⁰

Framing Language Versions

The MLVs are a heterogeneous phenomenon as they intersect other kinds of version making and can be traced to silent film and other media versions. MLV production functions as a continuation of different versions of silent film, as a variation of other translated modes in the same period, and as precursor of later version making, such as film remakes or TV-programmes in different national versions.⁴⁵¹

Vincendeau was one of the first scholars to question the historically isolated position of the MLV. By describing the MLV in 1988 as a “[...] point of contact between the aesthetic and [...] industrial dimensions of cinema”,⁴⁵² Vincendeau places focus on this particular production mode as significant in order to understand the overall conditions for cinematic culture. A few years later, Ďurovičová emphasised the hybrid character of the MLV, describing the MLVs as “following a hybrid logic” between film and theatre.⁴⁵³ The intermedial relation between film and theatre or the hybrid character of the MLV as a point of departure for interest in this phenomena during the last decades can be linked to film theoretical approaches questioning the idea of the film as a stable “text” disconnected from reception and production contexts which has undermined the notion of film as an isolated “original” work of art. MLVs explicitly reveal this absence of original, and are inevitably positioned as versions. It is this position that makes the MLV significant for understanding and re-conceptualising the film “text”.

The practice of placing two cameras side by side in order to simultaneously produce two negatives of the same film (one for the European and one for the American market), as well as various editions of silent films, with different editing, content or plot (for example, different versions of Abel Gance’s *Napoleon*, Dreyer’s *Jeanne D’Arc*, Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis* and Chaplin’s *City Lights*) introduces the phenomenon of version making in the early sound era.⁴⁵⁴ Closer to MLVs are, as pointed out by Joseph Garncarz, the short singing films of the “silent” era which were often made in different language versions, such as Henny and Franz Porten’s “Tonbilder” from the 1900s and 1910s.⁴⁵⁵ The link to the German “Tonbilder” shows the important relation between language versions and musical performances. The MLVs were often musicals and the songs became hits in their own right and the production of records in different language versions continued decades after the MLV production had ceased. For example, during her Hollywood career, Marlene Dietrich continued to make records in both German and French even if her multilingual filmmaking ceased with *Der blaue Engel/The Blue Angel*. The intermedial relations between the music and film industries are, consequently, crucial for understanding the MLV-phenomenon.⁴⁵⁶

In terms of both production and reception, the boundaries are blurred between MLVs and other kinds of versions from the same period. There are no clear-cut distinctions between language versions and other forms of translation, in particular dubbing, nor between language versions and other forms of cultural adaptations such as the remake. Pierre Sorlin approaches the difficulties of defining the MLV in terms of production by taking the example of the Italian, English and French versions/remakes of Wilhelm Thiele’s *Die Privatsekretärin*.⁴⁵⁷

Wilhelm Thiele, having directed *Die Privatsekretärin*, was later entrusted with making the French version shot in Berlin with German technicians, while the English and Italian versions were directed by two other filmmakers working in their own countries. Shall we say that the French and German versions are twins, while the English and Italian ones are mere cousins?⁴⁵⁸

The fact that Renate Müller acted in the German, French and English version, but not in the Italian, complicates the matter even further; from a star perspective, there are three “twins” and one “cousin”. Moreover, the Berlin location (of the German version) is in the French version transferred to Paris, which might give associations to Clair’s imaginary Paris, while the story in the English version takes place in Vienna, which positions the English version in a “German” tradition (even if Vienna is an international city in this period, both on- and off-screen).⁴⁵⁹ A British review of this “British film” described it as a “German musical spectacle” which “follows in the vivacious footsteps of *Congress Dances*”.⁴⁶⁰ Is then the English version more of a twin, while the French is more of a cousin? Or, are they all cousins, since all four films, as modern remakes, were adaptations of the same script by four different production companies? In short, versions might differ in sets, camera movement, montage, sound montage, music, director, actors and technicians, they might have different endings, length and plots, while others might share the same set, the same director and even the same actors. Some versions would only replace a few actors and show exactly the same stylistic features. Some would be re-shot entirely (even the scenes without dialogue); in others, however, the same image material is used for most parts, but with post-synchronised dialogue.

The heterogeneous aesthetics and production mode of the MLV is clearly notable in the relation between MLV and dubbing. As Leonardo Quaresima argues, “[d]ubbing should not be interpreted as an alternative practice to the multiple language versions, as a production mode based on fundamentally different principles, rivalling with the MLVs before supplanting them. On the contrary: dubbing is an internal variant of solutions for the multiple language versions.”⁴⁶¹ As mentioned, French- and English-speaking versions of the early Fritz Lang talkies, *M* and *Das Testament des Dr. Mabuse*, and Genina’s *Prix de beauté*, are instances of the predominantly mixed forms of dubbing, post-synchronisation and version making. Some material is re-shot, some re-used between the versions, some scenes are post-synchronised with lip-synch and some dubbed without lip-synch. Rather than being a homogeneous translation mode, the versions expose different modes of translation mixed in order to correspond to different narrative situations.

The malleable signification of the word-dubbing discussed in the previous chapter can also shed light on the problem of defining versions. The term “dubbing”, initially referred to as a practice of replacement of sound samples (voice or other), has taken on a second definition of replacing voices spoken

in the same language (as in the example of Anny Ondra in Hitchcock's *Blackmail*), and subsequently, in a final phase in 1931, the term dubbing takes a signification closer to today's use of the term as the replacement of one spoken language with another. The sliding definitions of the MLV versus dubbing can be seen as an extension of the notion of dubbing as replacement. Just as subtitling and dubbing, part-talkies and sound and silent versions, the MLV partakes in the discourse of exchangeability and replacement of body and media. As Ginette Vincendeau points out, if dubbed films sever the body-and-voice unit by vocal doubling, the MLV provides an "extreme" solution by "doubling" the whole "body of the actor".⁴⁶²

The replacement of the "body of the actor" is only one of the significant features of the MLV. The re-shooting of scenes reveals a higher degree of cultural adaptation than other translation forms. Change of plot, setting, director etc. places the MLV between language translation and transposition of other levels. Most MLVs are based on theatre plays, operettas or musical comedies. They are thus framed by an intertextual context with speech and singing represented in other media, by which the script or the songs stand in an allographic relation to the films. At the same time, however, the MLV does reveal the uniqueness, and thus an authographic dimension of the voice, in contrast to other techniques such as dubbing. Paradoxically, just as the MLVs are films with more replaced features than dubbed film (replacing not only voice and language, but the whole body, sometimes the set, parts of the story, etc.), the MLV also exposes a resistance against replacement in the process of creating "new originals".

MLV as Representation of Transnational Identity

Homogenisation or Differentiation?

The MLV reveal the utopia of the Tower of Babel and as well as linguistic heteroglossia on a concrete level. The huge studios in Paris, Berlin or London, built for MLV production, brought together actors, directors and technicians from all over Europe and Hollywood. They were enclosed spaces in which languages and cultures were mixed and developed in order to overcome the language barriers of sound film. These studios can be seen as both linguistic "heterotopes" and as a new incarnation of the myth of the Tower of Babel. In an article in *Pour Vous*, it is explained that this new filmic Tower of Babel would function as a language school:

Here we see how the film starts to talk like the constructors of the Tower of Babel after the confusion of languages. A man asks about the health of someone else in pure American slang: the other one answers in French, taking a third fellow as a witness who only speaks Spanish. [...] Berlitz school is going multiple. Soon we will all speak six or seven languages.⁴⁶³

This quotation sheds light on the double position of the MLV as a mode of translation, and as a production practice able to preserve and even reinforce multilingual cultural diversity.

When it comes to the issues of national and regional identity in relation to internationalism, the MLV represents a paradox: the phenomenon is both about variation or differentiation and homogeneity and similarities. In the early 1930s, the Russian writer, Ilya Ehrenbourg, presented a series of articles in *La revue du cinéma* from the inside the Paramount studios. The result was one of the most influential portraits of MLV making. Ehrenbourg clearly foregrounds the latter conception of MLV, as a factory-like production mode for the global market. Traditional artistic quality of translation is in Ehrenbourg's reading replaced by the collapse of cultural difference and the rise of a homogenous culture of mass consumption. Language, culture and art are here "translated" into a common currency, dollars:

The name of a dog – in eleven languages. In twelve: the Americans are the masters here. They speak their language. Everybody understands it: they have dollars. Shakespeare is unemployed. They translate the dialogue with poetic depth: 'Mary vous m'avez remis dans le droit chemin.'⁴⁶⁴

His reading is steeped in Marxist criticism of Americanisation and globalisation of the "Fordist" industrial hegemony discussed in this period.⁴⁶⁵ The MLV-production in Joinville is, in turn, described in terms of American industrial culture. Ehrenbourg continues:

We are producing films in a chain. Ford – cars. Gillette – razors. Paramount – dreams. The cinema produces the new century. Its soul, speed. Watching quickly. Producing quickly. The poets and their horses have disappeared. In their place, 40 horsepower and Paramount films.⁴⁶⁶

The equating of Americanism with industry and cultural homogenisation in the wake of globalisation and modernisation spills over into writing on the MLV. As deconstructions of the "original" or by providing a production mode by which the "author" is exchangeable, the MLV was often associated with Americanisation. (Simultaneously, however, as demonstrated in the

previous chapter, MLV as “authentic” versions in contrast to dubbing was sometimes used as an argument for promoting MLV as “European”, while dubbing was considered “American”.) From this perspective, the MLV is, consequently, an example of when homogenisation of the film medium is a result of a mode of variation. The MLV exemplifies what Ruttmann in *Melodie der Welt* or Duvivier in *Allo Berlin* (as discussed in chapter two) depict: cultural homogenisation by variation. The tension between difference and similarities in figure or variation renders the MLV into an explicit image of cultural globalisation in which cultural difference is reduced to pure stereotype.

The comparison and observation of small differences between the versions has been described by Ďurovičová as “fetishism of details”.⁴⁶⁷ Close textual reading generates interpretations attaching dissimilarity paramount signification in terms of cultural differentiation. Ďurovičová refers to the situation of a film historian aiming to make sense of the versions, but the “fetishism of details” is also noticeable in popular discourses on the MLV from the time in which they were made. In the film magazine, *Pour Vous*, a writer compares the dresses of the Italian, German and French actresses: “In the same atmosphere, sitting on the same cushions, expressing the same feelings, the German, the Italian and the French actress is each very different from the other two. [...] The French is dressed in lightweight material. [...] The Italian on the other hand wears a dress of a tragedienne! [The German] dress is neither too light, nor too heavy, just what is needed [...]”.⁴⁶⁸ This is a representative example how popular articles attribute minor differences symbolic meaning in terms of national identity. To re-use Ďurovičová’s term from another perspective, the focus on details can be contextualised according to Marcel Mauss’ notion of national symbols as “fetishes” in the age of modernity and cultural homogenisation.⁴⁶⁹ MLVs are films depicting both the culturally homogenous (since the versions are the same film in different languages) and the small differences as symbols, which inflect the homogenised picture.

Ascheid (referring to Vincendeau) elaborates on this paradox: the MLV-phenomenon can be described as a “cultural and economic negotiation of film as an international commodity that is nevertheless marked by cultural specificity”. This is, moreover, captured in the “tension between the film text as a linguistically and aesthetically coded object that nonetheless aims to function transnationally and crossculturally [...]”.⁴⁷⁰ Compared to voice-dubbing, subtitling, and even remake, the MLV becomes the emblem for representing cultural identity in the era of modern reproduction.

In many fan magazines, there are numerous reports about the making of different versions, focusing on the particular shooting procedure by which one version, or one scene from each version, is shot after the other. In star booklets or star portraits in magazines, journalists wrote about how the actor prepared for acting in foreign languages, and in what ways the acting style

might change from one version to another. Some of the most prominent examples of German MLVs such as *Die 3-Groschenoper/L'opéra de quat'sous*, *Die Drei von der Tankstelle/Le chemin du paradis* and *Der Kongreß tanzt/Le congrès s'amuse* were screened in both versions in Paris and Berlin.⁴⁷¹ In Sweden, both the English and German version of *Anna Christie*, (Clarence Brown/Jacques Feyder, 1930/1931) starring Greta Garbo, were screened as a special attraction. The double screenings involved an obvious element of comparison attributing differences artistic or cultural significance. Articles comparing stars as “doubles”, showing them together side by side, double screenings and reportages from MLV shootings undermine the common idea that audiences in the period of the MLV-production did not have any knowledge of other versions than the ones produced in their language.⁴⁷² On the contrary, MLV production is one of the rare examples in film history (together with the contemporary DVD-culture which provides choices of subtitling or dubbing in different languages) when audiences were well informed of different translations of the “same” film.

MLVs as Allegories of Imaginary Geographies

The awareness of differences between versions is further emphasised since cultural differentiation/homogenisation in many MLVs was turned into a theme or a motif. *Die singende Stadt* (Carmine Gallone 1930), starring the well-known tenor and MLV star Jan Kiepura, for instance, begins with three parallel scenes featuring an Italian boy performing a trick to three tourist families, one from England, one from Germany, and one from France. The boy speaks all three languages and invents a story of his English/German/French origin. All the three families corresponds to specific national stereotypes, the fat German, the elegant Frenchman, and the polite Englishman all answer in their language with the same lines. Here, the cultural variation of the MLV is ironically positioned in the fiction as part of a discourse of national stereotypes and tourism. This kind of staging of cultural imaginaries is, of course, not unique to the MLV, but it is significant that these kinds of meta-reflexive gags appear frequently in MLV and is often featured as language alternation. In one of the first German MLVs, *Die Nacht gehört uns* (Carl Froelich and Henry Roussel, 1929), the French actor Jim Gerald, who had a part in the French version of the film (*La nuit est à nous*, Roger Lion, 1929), is given a secondary role as a French car expert “doubling” a German one in a scene when the two tries to make conversion in their different languages.⁴⁷³ The comical effect, of course, emerges from the fact that they say exactly the same lines without understanding each other. The variation stages several overlapping discourses indicative of the production of the MLV: the context of tourism, the cultural image as fake,

imaginary or make-believe, and a context of globalisation which reduces images of cultures to commodities.⁴⁷⁴ In Paul Fejos' UFA-produced MLV, *Sonnenstrahl/Gardez le sourire* (1933), the cohabitation of these discourses is even more striking. The film is about a poor couple in Vienna (Gustaf Froehlich and Annabella) who dream about a better life of material wealth. In one crucial scene, the couple visits a travel agency filled with posters, mannequins, and small arrangements with decorations from different countries. In a musical performance, the couple imagine travelling between the different destinations and interact with the explicitly fake decorations. The game of make-believe, in which the different locations are integrated into the same commercial space, sets an imaginary stage for dreams and fiction. The mass-produced cultural identities are linked here to a larger discourse of film making as a "dream factory" with MLVs as cases in point.

The MLV as a production mode was predominantly linked to certain genres, in particular, the musical comedy, the operetta and the opera film, all relying heavily on imaginary spaces. The prime examples of MLV-musicals, *Die 3-Groschenoper*, *Die Drei von der Tankstelle*, and *Der Kongreß tanzt*, were all staged in dream-like or theatrically artificial versions of London, Berlin and Vienna. A critic of the French version of *Die Drei von der Tankstelle* states significantly that "*Le chemin du paradis* is neither German, nor French, it is operetta."⁴⁷⁵ The genre of operetta is compared here with an actual geographic location; the stories, irrespective of setting, take place on the imaginary land of the operetta stage.

The imaginary or artificial locations in many MLVs suggest that geographical spaces, like languages, are interchangeable. Vienna is replaced by Berlin or Paris in *Die Privatsekretärin/La Dactylo/Sunshine Susie* just as German is replaced by English or French. Concerning the construction of geographies or identities in MLVs, "language" should be understood in a conventional sense, as well as in an enlarged sense applied to the cinematic representation of locations. The MLV is a mode of translation, i.e. of translating words, confronted with, or in interaction with, a visual cinematic "language". Location is thus paralleled with language as interchangeable features.

Even in the MLVs with a more "realist" tone, the location as "image" and "language" depicting transcultural representation is often stressed, for example, in Siodmak's *Voruntersuchung/Autour d'une enquête* (1931) shot on location in Berlin with many scenes in Berlin streets. In the French version, it is evident that the film is selling an image of "Germanness". The set design can be linked to motifs and images from Weimar film as it was known in France: the movements in the street to the "Straßenfilm" and the vertiginous staircases from a range of expressionist films. Significantly, a large number of text signs in the filmic diegesis (notes, letters, cards etc.) are throughout the film shown first in German and subsequently dissolved into French. This rather common device of representing written language (in

films which were not versions) illustrates the exchangeability of language, as well as showing how one language is located in a specific region.

Another way of dealing with “translation” of location is to create a kind of no-man’s-land somewhere between national boundaries or in an enclosed non-defined space. The first European MLV, the Elstree film *Atlantic/Atlantik* (E.A. Dupont, 1929), about the sinking of the Titanic, is an illustrative example. *Atlantic* was based on a popular stage play by Ernest Raymond and was first produced in English and German versions, and one year later, in French (*Atlantis*, 1930). The closed cabin space or the open views of the ocean on deck represent a neutral location between geographic areas. Even if the film portrays a culturally and ethnically defined group (British upper-class passengers), the location neutralises the culturally specific and turns the film into a representation of something “universal”. The same kind of non-specific location is found Dupont’s subsequent Elstree film *Cape Forlorn/Menschen im Käfig/Le cap perdu* (1929), set in a lighthouse close to New Zealand. Here, the no-man’s-land is thematically linked to a story about changing identities and the difficulties of erasing the past and starting again. Other MLV films such as *SOS Eisberg* or other mountain films, *Anna Christie* or *The Big House* (George W. Hill, 1930) set in the mountains, on a boat and in prison, can be placed in this category. The most extreme example is *F.P.1 antwortet nicht/IF1 ne répond plus* (Karl Hartl, 1932), produced by UFA in French and German versions (Conrad Veidt starring in the French version and Hans Albers in the German), in which the acting takes place on a huge floating platform in the Atlantic.

The MLV’s different means of dealing with geographic representations are not about creating anonymous spaces understood as insignificant backgrounds – neither the representations of the regional as a stereotype or an imaginary dream land, nor the images of a “non-space” between or cut off from specific defined locations. On the contrary, the “glocal” MLV-space stresses the specific, the local, as well as the general and “universal”. Spaces like the lighthouse in *Cape Verlor*, the ship in *Anna Christie* or *Atlantic*, or the platform in *F.P.1 antwortet nicht* are all crucial to the story; the representation of a no-man’s lands foregrounds the spatial dimension. The intermedial convergences between MLV and theatre (which will be further developed in the next chapter) is emphasised by the enclosed no-man’s-land of the MLV, closer to modern stages than film sets.

MLV-stardom

Intersections of Versions and Star Images

The MLV is a radical solution to the translation problem in the sense that the actor is either replaced or has to act in several languages. This practice of replacement might seem to stand in opposition to the established star system of the time, featuring big names as selling points. The paradoxical position of the film star, however, as both unique and possible to copy, intersects the MLV-phenomenon with the star system.

In the early 1930s, stars were constantly criticised of copying each other, to “wear haircuts à la Greta Garbo or copy Adolphe Menjou’s moustache”.⁴⁷⁶ Simultaneously, however, they were considered to be unique, irreplaceable and exceptional. This paradoxical position of mass-reproduced originals was appropriated by the MLV-phenomenon both reinforcing and challenging the very idea of stardom. Apart from the notion of stars as copies of other stars, the double identity of the star as both a screen and an off-screen “persona” (inscribed in an original/copy discourse) can be seen in relation to the problematic of versions.⁴⁷⁷

In his classical study of stardom, Edgar Morin depicts the paradoxical tension between uniqueness and duplication embodied in the star phenomenon, a tension by which the double, the image or reproduction, takes the position of the “real”, and therefore poses as original. The star is “the phantom of his phantom”, “imitating his double by miming his life on screen”.⁴⁷⁸ Morin sheds light on the discursive relation between the real person and the screen image, a relation that in later structuralist theory would be understood as two textual discourses interacting in the process of establishing a “star persona”. To quote Richard Dyer, “[s]tars are, like characters in stories, representations of people”, stars are considered as constructions produced in a discourse in which “the roles and/or the performances of a star in a film were taken as revealing the personality of the star”.⁴⁷⁹ We are dealing with two dimensions of media representation which are both establishing and deconstructing the boundaries between copy and original, between the real and the “image”. The star is both preconditioned and threatened by the mass-reproduced copy – she/he is a “persona” between the divinity above the masses and the prefabricated “type”, an image ready to be distributed in an infinite number of copies.

In the period of the coming of sound, the star system is revaluated by major changes in the film industry, which further reinforces overall issues of the multiple versus the unique. Version making and media “duplications” of the rising stars of musical genres, reproduced in film, radio and gramophone, highlight the stardom as a process of mass industrial duplication.

MLV Star Types

There was not one model for the casting of the MLV actors. One can, however, state a few “types”⁴⁸⁰ of MLV stars, linked to specific production companies, genres or star images.

The polyglot star

The polyglot star speaks several languages and acts in several versions. The “polyglotism” as a representation of internationalism is always used as a major feature of the star persona. In the fan magazines, the polyglot star is often linked to either a jet-set international lifestyle or some exotic foreign origin. Lilian Harvey is the most significant example, but there are many others: Jan Kiepura, Käthe von Nagy, Greta Garbo, Marlene Dietrich, Martha Eggerth, etc.

The phonetically speaking star

The phonetically speaking star learns his/her lines phonetically in the foreign languages, but does not understand a word of what he or she is saying (something that is clearly evident from his/her acting). This method was most successful in absurd comedies with actors like Laurel and Hardy and Buster Keaton. The parody of *The Big House, Pardon Us* (James Parrott, 1931), for example, was produced in Italian, Spanish, German and French with Laurel and Hardy speaking all languages.⁴⁸¹ In these cases, the strong accent, the automatic speech and rather strange stressing of syllables creates a happy discrepancy between diction and meaning, which reinforces the comical absurd dimension and thus links this specific practice to a specific genre. A well-known later example from another genre is the Spanish star Imperio Argentina’s acting in the musical film in *Andalusische Nächte/Carmen, la de Triana* (Herbert Maisch/Florián Rey, 1938).⁴⁸² The musical genre is important for all kinds of polyglot acting. Phonetic speech is rather similar to different musical traditions in which the singers perform in foreign languages, guided by the melody in the pronunciation.

Perfectly matched equivalents

This star type is a product primarily of the big-budget two version model such as the UFA films. The versions featured two actors who were both stars in their own right, and who had a similar star image, both on- and off-screen. Willy Fritsch and Henri Garat in the Lilian Harvey films are the most striking example. Through the French fan magazines, UFA managed to build Harvey and Garat into a French “dream couple” reflecting the status of the star couple Harvey and Fritsch in Germany. The double stardom generated a

conception of two versions of equal stature instead of a foreign “copy” of a domestic original.

Individuals: Stars in Their Own Rights

An alternative way to deal with stardom in big-budget equivalent versions was to choose two very different actors with equal but dissimilating star reputations, who each played their part in their own specific manner and thereby giving the whole film a different touch. The most well-known example is Rudolf Forster and Albert Préjean in the leading part in the German and French version of *Die 3-Groschenoper/L'opéra de quat'sous*. Even if every shot and every camera angle and every line is (more or less) the same, the charming smiling Préjean in contrast to the robust and silently aggressive Forster, changes the film completely.⁴⁸³ Another example is the German version of Marcel Pagnol's *Fanny* from 1932 (*Der Schwarze Walfisch*, Fritz Wendhausen, 1934), in which César is played by Emil Jannings. Jannings gives a more stern interpretation of the Marseille bar keeper than Raimu's cheerful portrait of the same character, closer to the authoritarian school teacher in *Der blaue Engel*.

In secondary roles, the use of significantly different actors is even more frequent and gives each version a unique “atmosphere”.⁴⁸⁴ For example, in the English version of Thiele's *Die Privatsekretärin, Sunshine Susie*, Jack Hulbert's outstanding performance in a secondary role makes the English version more lively and cheerful.

Copies

The idea of copying stars and actors is closely related to MLV-production, and to a certain extent, all MLV-actors can be seen as copies of the actors in other versions. This is, in particular, the case concerning the Paramount versions shot in the Joinville studios, which were low-budget copies of Hollywood originals. However, the hierarchical relation between copy and original is not as clear-cut as one might think, since the actors were often well-known in their own countries, and their regional star appeal carried connotations and associations beyond the original film. The perception of the Joinville actors as mere copies is more blatant in distribution regions where the actors were relatively unknown.⁴⁸⁵

National troupe actors

The Paramount cast was based on national teams, that is, a group of actors who were supposed to act in all the versions. They thereby created a continuity between the foreign versions made by Paramount for the domestic market, rather than between the original and the foreign version. As I will consider in the next chapter, Paramount's Swedish cast were all hired from the

same theatre in Stockholm, which reinforces the local connection between the versions and the reception context.

These categories of MLV star-types naturally merge in many cases. Lilian Harvey and her double or even triple co-stars can, from different perspectives, be conceptualised as copies, as well as in terms of polyglotism and equivalence. In the films of Lilian Harvey, the explicit thematisation of staging stardom and cinematic duplication can also be seen in relation to MLV-acting.

Version Production as Star Image: Lilian Harvey

The “fairy among doll fairies”, a critic enthusiastically quips about Lilian Harvey.⁴⁸⁶ This succinct description captures the paradoxes of reproduction versus uniqueness of the star in the modern society of mass reproduction. Harvey is both “the one and only”, the most sparkling fairy, but she is also a doll, a reproduction of the real. This tension is embodied in Harvey’s star persona on many levels and it is revealed explicitly in her films, as well as in the fan press about her. The most striking example is her Hollywood debut of 1933, *I am Suzanne* (Rowland V. Lee), featuring a marionette doll in the likeness of Harvey’s character, in which Harvey’s typically Weimarian play with illusion and reproduction is reinforced on a thematic narrative level.⁴⁸⁷ As described by Ascheid, Harvey’s image in the internationally successful UFA musicals as a “living doll” is an image in constant interaction with an audience’s interest in her “real” persona often described as an “innocent child”.⁴⁸⁸ These two aspects are somewhat contradictory: the authentic, natural and ingenuous features associated with the child stand in opposition to the controlled and artificial acting style of Harvey.⁴⁸⁹ As Karsten Witte observes, “this siren never sang, she whined out of a built-in voice box”.⁴⁹⁰ Harvey’s patented childish poses and movements – stamping her feet on the ground, putting her finger in her mouth, jumping around expressing innocent joy – are mechanical and strictly choreographed, and highlight the artificial.

As argued by Dyer, the off- and on-screen relation functions as a process of (de)constructing authenticity which permeates the star phenomenon and is thus not exclusively linked to version making.⁴⁹¹ With the sound film, however, the star persona as “double” seeped into the MLV as multiplication of bodies and as a mode of translation. In MLVs, the theme of double identity fuelled new meaning. After Harvey’s first two sound film successes, *Der Liebeswalzer* (Wilhelm Thiele, 1930) and *Hokuspokus* (Gustav Ucicky, 1930) made in German and English versions (in English *The Love Waltz* and *The Temporary Widow*), Harvey began to build her fame on her multiple

language abilities and eventually became the most popular foreign star in France.⁴⁹² In the French versions of *Die Drei von der Tankstelle* and *Der Kongreß tanzt* (*Le chemin du paradis* and *Le congrès s'amuse*), Harvey acts for the first time with the French “jeune premier”, Henri Garat, who later became Harvey’s regular French partner and functioned as a duplication of Willy Fritsch in the German versions. Katja Uhlenbrok has demonstrated how the image of Garat grows in a French reception context into a duplication of Fritsch on both an on- and off-screen level. The “dream couple” Harvey/Fritsch were already in the late silent period a subject of gossip in the press.⁴⁹³ In spite of the fact that those rumours flourished also in the French fan press, with the growing stardom of Garat during the 1930s, Fritsch disappears, and Garat takes his place alongside Harvey.⁴⁹⁴ Fritsch and Garat thus function as duplicates of each other in the public sphere of the fan press. It is noticeable that during a short period when Fritsch was still present in a French context, the press staged Harvey with *both* her partners (and sometimes also a third English one). Lilian’s two partners became her “playmates”, privately as well as professionally. It is described in fan magazines how all three of them go on trips together, walk around Paris, visit the Eiffel tower etc. “Such a friendship is nice to see”, writes *Pour Vous*, “little Lilian and her two darlings [...] – a French and German version – will anew confront the tiring studio lights.”⁴⁹⁵

The duplication of partners around Harvey creates a comical dimension reflecting the slightly absurd features of the double or triple heroes in the films. For instance, the language problem between Garat and Fritsch could generate comical situations:

“Meanwhile I talk to Lilian, he [Willy Fritsch] is making conversation with Henri Garat. In a funny way for that matter. Henri Garat speaks to him in an English in which he pops in some German expressions. Willy Fritsch speaks to him in German and cautiously introduces some English expressions.”⁴⁹⁶ In this “transitional” period of the Garat/Fritsch stardom (a period when, for the French audience, well-known Willy Fritsch was successively replaced by Henri Garat), the love relation in terms of a friendly and innocent ménage-à-trois is never explicitly mentioned, but always implied. The doppelgänger theme in the press is thus part of the construction of a “star persona” for the different actors, as well as a reflection on MLVs and its implications on stardom.

This is, moreover, allegorised in the films themselves. In the two major initial sound film successes, *Die Drei von der Tankstelle* and *Der Kongreß tanzt*, Lilian Harvey is staged as a spoilt but charming girl surrounded by attentive admirers, reflecting Harvey’s irreplaceable position and her acting in all three versions, while her partners were all substituted. The comical symmetry of the “three men from the petrol station” in *Die Drei von der Tankstelle* parallels the staging Harvey’s three partners in the press. Choreographed dance sequences with synchronised movements on a set filled with

mirrors stress the multiplication of bodies indicative of MLV production. In one of Harvey's dancing numbers we see her jumping and dancing around her bedroom, tellingly playing with three miniature dolls which represent her three admirers. The room is replete with mirrors reflecting both her star-like omnipresence and the multiplication of the self, Harvey's greatness and irreplaceable status is embodied in the very duplication of herself in an infinite number of refracted versions. This is contrasted with the three exchangeable "puppets" surrounding her. In the decisive romantic scene, Fritsch/Garat asks Harvey, "Do you think you are irreplaceable?", an ironic question that can be read as a comment on his own position as replaceable "double". In *Der Kongreß tanzt*, one finds similar meta-reflexive features. The doppelgänger motif is shown in the double role of Willy Fritsch (and Henri Garat in the French and the English versions) playing both the emperor of Russia and his look-alike. In 1932 the scheme of male multiplication around Harvey was an established feature of the Harvey films. In *Ein blonder Traum/Happy Ever After/Un rêve blond* (Paul Martin, 1932) Harvey has two partners (in each version, of course) simply named Willy I and Willy II (Maurice I and Maurice II in the French and Willie and Willie in the English), ironically enough played by Willy Fritsch and Willi Forst.⁴⁹⁷ The figure of "the double as the other", to use Elsaesser's expression, intersects with the MLV as a practice of "doubling" body, language and national identity.⁴⁹⁸

In addition to the "double" intersecting with version making, the internationalism as part of Harvey's "persona" reinforces the notion of stardom embodied in translation. Harvey's international appeal, her cosmopolitan lifestyle and crosscultural background were elaborated by the press just as much as her childish appearance and innocent behaviour. This image of an international personality was integral to the MLV films she acted in. Edith Hamann wrote for *Die Filmwoche* that "while the sound film for so many actors meant a limitation of international activity, for her, it meant an extension of her popularity all over the world. Her sound films were not only screened in German-speaking countries, but the French and English versions were also shown in France, Italy, the Balkans, England, America, Africa, India, Australia, Japan and China."⁴⁹⁹ With her English origin, her initial Austrian and later German professional career, and her love for France, she was described as a "European, continental cocktail" and as a global attraction.⁵⁰⁰

From this perspective, Harvey was not exceptional. It was frequent in this period to stress internationalism as one of the most important features of the star persona, especially in a European context. Elaborating this dimension of stardom, Malte Hagener and Jan Hans have by discussing the star image of Jan Kiepura, demonstrated how Kiepura incarnated and promoted a "Europe from below".⁵⁰¹ Command of several languages was considered essential for a star to survive in the international film market. Käthe von Nagy, Jan Kiepura, Martha Eggerth, Marlene Dietrich, Maurice Chevalier and Albert

Menjou are some of the many actors who crossed borders in the early sound film era. The transnational stars were all described in the press as both polyglot and glamorous, modern vagabonds. Promotional remarks like “Madame von Nagy has [...] no permanent address”⁵⁰² or “[Jan Kiepura] has lived for seven years in hotel rooms”,⁵⁰³ were frequent occurrences in the press. Exile or “foreignness” was considered an attraction, indicative of modern stardom.

A recurrent topic in articles referring to the subject of polyglot acting were descriptions of acting in terms of cultural adaptation. A telling example is when the Hungarian actor, Paul Javor, explains to *Die Filmwoche* that “one does not only speak differently in the Hungarian version as in the German, one thinks and creates differently. [...] A simple ‘translation’ doesn’t take you anywhere”.⁵⁰⁴ An enlarged concept of translation as a conception involving bodies, mentalities and cultures dominates the discourses on the MLV. The large number of Eastern European actors working in the German film industry where mixed background is constantly foregrounded, mirrors both a certain idea of Europeanism, besides functioning as means to present version-making in terms of cultural differentiation.

The understanding of internationalism as described in popular film press was both about utopias and fantasies and actual transnational practices. The transition to sound meant the fall of many international stars. The recurring press reports about travelling, polyglotism and cross-cultural identities was also a rejection of, and a resistance against, these new conditions for the majority of actors. Even a national and German-speaking star like Hans Albers was, in the fan press, described as international and polyglot: “He does not only act for Germany, he speaks English just as well as he speaks different German dialects. That turns him into a ‘universal actor’, who, like Harvey and Fritsch, does not need to be substituted in the English and French versions; instead he can act in all the three world languages.”⁵⁰⁵ Lillian Harvey is thus one of the most prominent examples of a larger phenomenon within film culture, in which translation or discourses on translation intersect with images of Europeanism, of cosmopolitan or national identity.

The cross-cultural image of Harvey is combined with attempts to define her identity as ethnically specific. For example, the French magazine often describes her as typically British, with “the finesse of her race” as it states in an article in *Cinéma*.⁵⁰⁶ In German magazines, on the other hand, she is described as both a mixed European and a real *German* star. The pseudonym, Aros, writes in his star booklet that “this actress, who was born in England, today embodies the German feeling, and understands the sense of German mentality as if she had seen the light for the first time at the Spree or the Panke”.⁵⁰⁷

Harvey’s heterogeneous cultural origin positions her in a variety of descriptions; sometimes contradictory portraits are all integrated into the same structure of the ethnically defined (whether it is British, German or European identity that it stressed) with cultural diversity escaping a fixed ethnic iden-

tity. It is significant that Harvey's transnationalism, combined with a taste for luxury, jewellery, a villa on the Riviera etc., also made her the most "Hollywood like" of all the European stars.⁵⁰⁸ The Hollywood-like is, in Harvey's contradictory persona, combined with the descriptions of her as more "European" than most stars.

As mentioned in chapter two, Dyer describes cultural variations within a homogenous white ethnic identity as part of the construction of American national identity.⁵⁰⁹ The Harvey example shows a European counterpart to this construction. The "European", in the case of Harvey, functions as an overall term embracing the contradictions in the descriptions of her in terms of "race" or national "feeling" (as in the quotations above) in combination with the cross-cultural. Harvey's different ethnic or cultural identities are revealed explicitly by the many descriptions of her professional life as a polyglot MLV star. It is often stressed that she had to adapt her way of acting according to different national or cultural identities: "She had to learn her parts twice or three times, because every version does not only arrange the scenes differently, but because German, French or English mentality linguistically and visually are placed under a completely different light."⁵¹⁰ This stands in contradiction to the striking similarities between the versions and to Harvey's mechanical acting style, which reveals a more or less exact repetition of the movements of the body from one version to another. It is also opposed to the fantasy-like operetta style which erases cultural differences into one and the same cinematic culture of modernity. The repeatability embodied in Harvey's acting style combined with discourses in the press on cultural adaptation as corresponding to different national mentalities parallels the contradictory descriptions of Harvey's cultural identity.

Mechanically-choreographed repetition is the answer to Harvey's ability to act in one version after the other rather than her capacity to adapt herself to different "mentalities". As pointed out by Horst Claus and Anne Jäckel, the Harvey versions are, compared to many other MLVs, unusually similar, stylistically speaking. The UFA production mode provided, stylistically, perfectly "synchronised" versions; a scene of the French version was shot directly after and by the same team as the corresponding scene in the German version, without changing camera or microphone positions.⁵¹¹ Harvey thus repeated the exact movements, lines, expressions etc. in the French or English version as in the German. This production mode, in combination with the specific non-realistic acting style of the operettas facilitated "copying" the movements by the same body. On a discursive level, the replaced "doubles" function as a variation of Harvey's repetitions and as a means to "reproduce herself" from one version to another.

Foreign Accents and Polyglot Voices

The unification of voice and body in the MLV (in contrast to dubbing and subtitling) in combination with a discourse of replacement of bodies and languages captures the dual position of the MLV. When the whole “body of the actor” is either replaced or multiplied from one version to another, the disembodiment of the voice is presented by other means than by media separation (as would be the case in dubbing and subtitling). The polyglot star speaking in foreign languages partakes in a discourse of vocal displacement at another level: by speaking a foreign language, the “natural” speech is replaced by the foreign as a learned construction, creating a tension between the natural and physical or the trained or learned. The accent reveals “foreignness” and disconnection between voice and meaning and thereby between speech and the self. The separation between native and foreign in the act of speaking a foreign language corresponds to the separation between titles and speech in subtitling or voice and image in dubbing. The foreign accent emphasises the voice as body, since the accent depicts the vocal rather than verbal dimension of speech. In his essay about foreign accents in film, Alain Fleicher describes the foreign accent as “a trace of a foreign language”,⁵¹² that is, an index of a specific (or non-specific) cultural origin. This origin is present in its absence, it is “a kind of phantom language”.⁵¹³

Ascheid’s description of dubbing actors who are “speaking tongues”, as characters who “express themselves in foreign languages that we know the actors cannot speak”, applies also to discourses on polyglot acting.⁵¹⁴ Dialogue spoken without grammatical mistakes with an elaborate vocabulary combined with a strong foreign accent generates an effect of affectless speech. The process of *reading* rather than *speaking* freely is reinforced and produces a disconnection between voice and words. Speaking with a foreign accent functions as polyglossia of two languages which are linked to a division of two dimensions of speech representation; speech as words represented in one language (the spoken language), and speech as body represented in another (the language from which the accent derives). Consequently, polyglot acting and foreign accents maintain the “authentic” unification between body and voice; simultaneously, however, these features generate a split between two spoken languages (as in dubbing) and even between voice as sounds and voice as words (as in subtitling).

In relation to stardom, Barry King describes accents as either “impersonation” or “personification” of a specific star. The impersonation involves important changes between played parts; it shows that the change itself can be a feature of continuity, it can be “the thing” of a specific star to be able to alter one’s accent.⁵¹⁵ In the case of “personification”, the star has the same

accent in every film. The accent, in this case, characterises the star and becomes the link between the on- and off-screen personas. The accent is an unchangeable physical feature giving an indication of the actual origin of the actor irrespective of the cultural background of the part he or she plays. The “impersonation” concerns the voice as construction of body, the “personification” of the voice as natural body. In the case of impersonation, the accent is, of course, also a link to the actual, “real” body of the actor. The star’s ability to learn is shown as an attraction, and the very fact that the actor changes his/her voice reveals the relation between the off-screen (the professionalism of the actor) and the on-screen (the fictional character) persona.

As discussed in relation to Dietrich’s performance in *The Blue Angel* (in chapter two), in early sound film, these aspects of the voice are interrelated and often linked to one and the same star. In discourses on polyglot MLV-acting, speaking a foreign language erases the origin and at the same time (by the presence of an accent) reveals this cultural origin as an attraction. Articles about the learning process of foreign languages were frequent in both the German and French popular film press. German stars learning French, French stars speaking English, Americans acting (often without really learning) French or German were frequently commented upon in the press.

Camilla Horn’s clumsy French was mocked in the press, and sentences such as “moi pas comprendre vous...j’ai dit tout mon français..alors?” are often quoted.⁵¹⁶ Under the title “Brigitte Helm speaks French” a critic in *Pour Vous* describes the star’s language acquisition as part of her charming childish manners: “French, German and English poets. They are all her friends. Like a devoted little girl, she repeats the same phrase twice, ten, twenty times until she pronounces it correctly.”⁵¹⁷ The same humoristic approach to the many German actors learning French was also directed against French actors “exiled” in Hollywood. Adolph Menjou was claimed to have lost his original accent; he “speaks French with his curious thick American accent”, saying things like “Quand jé voâ une gène femme”.⁵¹⁸

The act of speaking foreign languages as “simulation” of speech is particularly stressed by phonetic speech as an MLV acting method, common primarily in comedies. The alienated foreign speech in Buster Keaton’s or Laurel and Hardy’s strong accents and mechanical way of pronunciation reinforced the absurdist style. For example, the French version of a Laurel and Hardy film was described as “a fantasy land, [...] where one speaks French with the charming accent of an English clown”. Harvey’s German accent and her “charming” way of speaking French were often mentioned in the press as one of her most unique and attractive features. Her accent reveals her polyglot acting, and makes the spectator aware of the fact that she acts in several versions. It also, however, turned the French version into a unique “text” since the accent provided a feature that was absent in the German original: “Lilian is even more seducing in the French version since she

speaks a language that she does not know very well yet.” Comments on Harvey’s accent are off-hand inscribed in other topics about her, such as her childish appearance or her hard-working personality. For example, “when Lilian speaks our language, one hears the funny little amusing voice of a nice and devoted little girl”.⁵¹⁹ The same article continues with a description of her accent French acquisition from another perspective, as a calculated and studied acting performance: “She is also a very intelligent and merited actress; expressing herself, she gives the impression that she understands our old complicated French [...] when, in fact, she does not understand it at all.”⁵²⁰ The remarks are significant. The foreign speech as mechanical repetition without understanding the spoken words co-exists with discourses on the voice as a natural feature, as a part of Lilian Harvey as a “real” and natural child. This generates a dual position regarding the control and power, linked to the so-called “problem of women’s speech”, a cultural technological discourse undermining the position of power and authority embodied in the act of speaking.⁵²¹ Harvey is described as a professional actor in control of her own speech, even in terms of manipulation of the audience (by pretending to speak a language she does not understand); simultaneously, her inability to speak perfect French underscores the mechanical dimension of speaking without control of the content. This captures the merging of sound technology and foreign language acting: as a sound apparatus, she produces and controls sounds, not words. Taking into account that the foreign accent is primarily a female feature, polyglotism as a translation or representation is a gendered issue. The erotic dimension of the voice revealed by accents is combined with a displacement of the spoken *message* embodied in the discourse of female speech as represented in film. The accent reveals an erotic and physical dimension of the voice, and simultaneously a “mechanical” aspect. In the case of Harvey, the German accent emphasised the “real child” embodied in her persona, as well as it reinforced the perception of her speech as a “built-in voice box”.

Lilian Harvey’s cross-cultural background is further reflected in the descriptions of her accent; her accent is always discussed in terms of cultural origin. Curiously, it seems to remain unclear whether her accent is German or English: “Impossible to resist this cute little girl who speaks French with a slight English accent”,⁵²² one learns from one article, and “Lilian Harvey speaks with a strong German accent”⁵²³ from another. The floating and malleable quality of Harvey’s foreign accent is mirrored in the conception of “European” identity as a cross-cultural identity embracing a variety of ethnic “types”; by the accent, the “foreignness” itself is constant, while the ethnic identity is variable. It is noticeable how many of the early sound film stars whose accents are categorised according to different languages, which are united in a common “European” identity. The Hungarian, Käthe von Nagy, is attributed a “Russian” accent in German and French,⁵²⁴ and German, Brigitte Helm, is attributed a both a German and “charming Slavic ac-

cent”.⁵²⁵ The attraction of the so-called “Slavic” accent, which was rarely attributed a particular Slavic language, has a specific position in the construction of “European” speech. Hagener and Hans have described Kiepusa’s Polish accent as clearly detectable but still “neutral” which makes it possible for Kiepusa to play Italian, French or Austrian characters.⁵²⁶ The vague malleable “Slavic” accent becomes the idiom considered able to represent multilingual Europe (Europe “from below”), besides representing the foreign “other Europe”. Von Nagy tellingly explains to *Pour Vous* how her Russian accent came from her Russian language teacher, a comment that illustrates that authenticity (the accent as trace of past or the body) interact with a discourse of transforming, changing idioms and to position the “mother tongue” (which the accent normally reveals) as foreign.⁵²⁷

The foreign accent also has a dual position concerning the social dimension of speech. It reveals the cultural geographical origin (or several origins), but also erases the social dimension of speech, and thus functions as a means of undermining the social origin of the speaking character/actor. The class-coded dimension of the voice is absent and replaced by the foreign accent, exposing a vague foreign “far-away” escaping a positioning in a specific social context. For example, Lorre’s “sophisticated” Austrian accent adds a social dimension to the murderer in *M*, which is undermined when Lorre plays the same character in English. Lilian Harvey’s double cultural identities, with German and English accents, reinforce this imaginary vague dimension revealed by the absence of class-coded speech. In relation to the imaginary style of Harvey’s films, the absence of a social dimension, in combination with a touch of vague foreignness, the accent also reveals the unreal and the dreamlike. Consequently, in the case of version making, the tension between inscription and simulation discussed in previous chapters can be replaced by a tension between “pure nature” and simulation of nature. This can also be linked to the frequent focus on the physical dimension of the voice in many early sound film musicals. In the Jan Kiepusa and Martha Eggerth MLVs, the voices of the two singers are represented, on the one hand, as trained voices and, on the other, as a natural talent⁵²⁸ or erotic attraction.⁵²⁹ In most musical genres, primarily opera, performances in foreign languages are common, and discourses on the polyglot star, the ability to act in foreign languages and with a foreign accent, can be traced to the overall cultural significance of the singing voice. As described by Mathias Spohr, “singing technique separates the voice from the singer as private person.”⁵³⁰ The understanding of MLV polyglot acting as both mechanical, trained and artificial, as well as natural and real, is similar to this notion of the singing voice as an erotic “natural” body and separated from the body and transposed to a public sphere.

It is significant that Alain Fleicher compares the foreign accent with the singing voice in order to conceptualise the dialogue between languages embodied in the accent: “Isn’t the accent, just as music, the melody of a lan-

guage – one does speak of the *melodic* accents – from a state that would be the melody of its *natural* origin [...]?”.⁵³¹ The MLV is a “polyglossia” dialogue between two languages in the sense that every translation sets up dialogue between languages. With the foreign speech “music” of the polyglot actor, this dialogue is part of a sonic level of the film itself. Translation in the MLV takes part in a process of replacing bodies, or by replacing languages in the same body. This process is embodied in a discourse of disconnection between body and voice, and stages translation not only as a means to displace a story in various local contexts, but also to depict this process of cultural transposition as attraction.

Film, Theatre and Translation of the Local: *Marius* in Sweden

Translating the Modern

Joinville – A Sausage Factory

The notion of multiple language versions as a production of cultural stereotypes from different perspectives addresses Americanisation. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the writings on Paramount MLV production are part of a realm of larger cultural criticism: Paramount in Paris embodied American capitalism and cultural “imperialism” as a threat to the alleged diversity and authenticity of European culture.

The images of different cultures represented by the same postcard-like images were perceived as a sign of how Americans re-define culture as such, as well as how they produced a conflated “Americanised” image of European culture. To take an example of Ehrenbourg’s report from the Paramount studios, the writer ventured a lively description of how the Joinville studios produced a false and stereotypical view of his native country Russia:

Russia. Summer. Lots of snow. The director has to think. Wait a minute. Is it possible, that there is snow in summer? The manager comes to the rescue: the manuscript is made in America, what other problems could there be? Without snow, no Russia. Snow, troika, nostalgia. Think, in Joinville, impossible, we must hurry. Two hours of filming snow. Several metres. At the entrance, the Italians are already waiting. They are going to be Russians, in summer, with snow.⁵³²

Until more recent discussions on the MLV-phenomenon, the Ehrenbourg portrayal has dominated the image of the Joinville MLVs in film history. Paramount Paris has always been known as the “sausage-factory” in which films are shaped into one and the same global, or American, culture of mass consumption. What remains of any cultural identity is either a postcard-like

cliché or a neutral representation, either, as in the example above, nostalgic Russians in snow, or objects that “do not know any borders”, chosen with no other aesthetic judgement than “a bed is a bed everywhere, in Sweden as in Italy”.⁵³³ It is significant that the American representations of European culture are described both as a non-identity as well as with exaggerated images, i.e. it is both neutral and a stereotype. These two ideas on how Americans represent Europe are both about falsification, homogenisation and an understanding of Americanisation as a process erasing authentic culture. In Ehrenbourg’s reading, the postcard-like stereotypes and the neutral staging in combination undermine authenticity.

***Marius* as Vernacular Modernism**

This negative interpretation of film production as if on a conveyor belt without consideration of cultural traditions can be related back to an understanding of cultural globalisation as a process of homogenization. Miriam Hansen’s essay on Hollywood cinema as “vernacular Modernism” offers an alternative model for understanding global processes, plus the export of Hollywood film on a market of products that constantly change in relation to specific local reception and production contexts. Opposed to David Bordwell’s cognitive narratology and other theories based on the assumption that the economical expansion of Hollywood cinema can be explained by an inherent universal structure, Hansen claims that “classical Hollywood cinema succeeded as an international modernist idiom on a mass basis, it did so not because of its presumably universal narrative form, but because it meant different things to different people and publics, both at home and abroad.”⁵³⁴ Hansen’s perspective is particularly useful when it comes to the cultural implications of the transition to sound and the MLV phenomenon. The MLVs can be read as a response to what happens when filmed clichés of foreign countries, described by Ehrenbourg, are confronted with the problems of cultural adaptation in terms of language barriers.

A problem with Hansen’s theory might be that it re-establishes the division between Hollywood cinema and the “other” (for example, European) cinema. Hollywood cinema is not defined as transparent narration, but according to a Benjaminian notion of cinema as shock or attraction, that is a sensuous experience rather than a process of narrative make-believe. It is, however, still Hollywood cinema that functions as the norm of cinema. The “vernacular”, etymologically the “vulgar”, is still the “other”; the “vernacular” is the various readings of American cinema, in terms of cinematic influence on local cinema, as well as in terms of reception of American films.⁵³⁵ Nevertheless, since the “vernacular” is about a possible *reading* of the modern, it is embodied in both Hollywood and other cinemas. American cinema

is, moreover, conceptualised as synonymous with the “modern” in a larger sense, and the idea of translating the “American” can be perceived as an idea of translating the “modern” (modernity or modernism) or even the “global”. The concept of the vernacular offers enlightening approaches as to how cultural differentiation interacts with processes of homogenisation in the era of mass communication and modernity by avoiding falling into the theoretical pitfalls of cultural essentialism when discussing cultural differences. Moreover, the “global” images of cultural stereotypes are perceived differently in different reception contexts, meaning that also “universal” attractions, or global phenomena, such as stardom, have to be “translated”. *Star culture* might be considered world wide as audiences from all over the world appreciate both foreign exotic stars and local stars. Whether Garbo represents the local or the foreign, however, differs from one reception context to another.

The MLVs can productively be discussed in relation to “vernacular modernism” because these films embody the homogenisation of film culture as a translation mode as they show how cultural differentiation is linked to an idea of reproducing cultural identities. Many of the MLVs represent cultural identity as an imaginary world of artificial scenery. The MLVs are, furthermore, part of a context of intermediality which is linked to the processes of anchoring a film in a specific local context and, therefore, to the process of translating the “vernacular”. In Ďurovičová’s words, the Joinville MLVs are “following a hybrid logic, that of a theatrical performance from which all leeway from both rehearsal and improvisation [...] has gradually been removed”.⁵³⁶ The theatre is of major significance here as most MLVs were based on plays, sometimes internationally successful plays staged by local theatres all over Europe. Consequently, the theatre context makes these “foreign” films are legible a local context.

By analysing the Swedish Joinville films and, in particular, focusing on the Swedish version of Marcel Pagnol’s *Marius, Längtan till havet* (Longing for the sea, John W. Brunius, 1931), I aim to explore the understanding of the global culture as “vernacular” and thereby question the received interpretation (Ehrenbourg’s and others) of the Joinville MLVs. By examining images of the “foreign” in a local context of intermediality and reception, I discuss the MLV internationalisation project as something heterogeneous, and the MLVs themselves as hybrids between different media and art forms exploring different cultural identities. It is, in particular, the relation between theatre and sound film - the Swedish stage version of *Marius* and the difference between the theatre and film acting of the Swedish Joinville actors which I foreground and discuss in relation to cultural identity.⁵³⁷

I have chosen *Marius* as a case study partly out of necessity, since almost all of the Swedish Paramount films are lost.⁵³⁸ In addition, however, the “Frenchness” of this “Hollywood” film exposes the complex relation between the local and the global more clearly than in other Joinville films. It is one of the few Joinville films that were not based on an original previously

produced in Hollywood. The French “original” version of *Marius* was shot at the same time as the foreign versions (there was also a German version made at the same time). As Charles O’Brien has observed, Paramount Paris quickly developed from being an American company into, stylistically speaking, a French one and it participated in the construction of a national French film style.⁵³⁹ *Marius* is the most revealing example of this process, as it is known as a “chef d’oeuvre” of Pagnol and Raimu (rather than of Paramount). *Marius* is also one of the few films from the early sound era which is still broadly appreciated and considered to be a popular national classic. In the case of the Swedish version, we are thus dealing with two local discourses: the local Swedish reception of a film representing something locally French. The “vernacular” can consequently be traced in both the French and the Swedish context. The American company is transformed into a French company making French films, and this particular film is transformed from a French/American film into a Swedish one.

The Swedish Versions

The “first Swedish talking picture” was a Paramount film, *När rosorna slå ut* (When Roses Bloom, Edvin Adolphson, 1930), a Swedish version of the French original, *Un trou dans le mur* (René Barberis, 1930). The critics noted the irony of the fact that the first Swedish talking picture was an American production of a French play. Even if the result was not an artistic achievement, the audience applauded the novelty with great enthusiasm, if only to hear some of their favourite actors speak their native language on the screen.

This pioneer achievement of the Hollywood major in Sweden says something about the important position of the Paramount films during the early years of sound. The total number of fourteen films produced by Paramount during 1930 and 1931 constituted more than one-third of the total production of Swedish talking pictures of the time, which, in turn, makes Paramount one of the most important production companies of “Swedish” sound film in the early sound period. Swedish was, furthermore, one of Paramount’s more important languages in spite of the relatively small Swedish population. It was placed before languages with larger populations, such as Polish. With their own distribution company, Film AB Paramount, Paramount was established in Stockholm before the first versions were made, and since Swedish was understood and used in some other parts of northern Europe as well, Stockholm functioned as Paramount’s distribution centre for Scandinavia and Finland.

In spite of the important position of Paramount in Sweden, the Swedish Joinville films are a neglected part of Swedish film history. The few film historians who do refer to them tend to focus on various explanations for the failure of the Paramount multiple language project, a failure understood as either a lack of quality or flawed cultural adaptation. Most descriptions follow the frequent “filmed theatre” judgement that can be gleaned from most critics of the time, claiming that the films were too static and too dependent on dialogue. Film historian Leif Furhammar revised this assumption and pointed out that a film such as *Längtan till havet* was more stylistically advanced in terms of sound, montage and camera movement than most Swedish films of the 1930s. According to him, the problem with the Joinville films was not their stylistic quality, but their foreignness: “Apart from the language and the actors, those films were not adapted to Swedish reality, Swedish expectations and Swedish entertainment culture.”⁵⁴⁰

In what ways are the films foreign then? Paradoxically, it is the higher level of cultural adaptation that makes the MLVs specific in relation to other foreign films. Even if the Joinville films were “foreign”, they were more Swedish than other foreign films. It is the inherent combination the national, local and international features that make the MLVs unique.

Significantly, in several articles, the Paramount films were perceived as something very national. Paramount’s important position in the Swedish film market is often mentioned in the press in terms of national pride: “the fact that the American major has shown an interest in the tongue of honour and heroes [=Swedish] will only reinforce our self confidence”,⁵⁴¹ a critic wrote (and added “As if anything like that would be needed!”). Another critic noted more soberly that “it is good news that Sweden, too, will participate in this project [the Paramount MLV project] – the Swedish name has such a good reputation on the international market”.⁵⁴² Naturally, this can be read as a sign of its opposite, as an attempt to deny or speak ironically about the fact that Sweden produced less films in their own language than the American companies. It indicates, however, an awareness of interaction between the national and the international market. On a level of reception, the MLVs are not simply either foreign *or* domestic, they combine foreign and local elements in a process of displacement of a “we” and “the other” relation; they negotiate cultural identity as taking place between curiosity of the foreign and identification with the familiar. The Swedish audience is attracted by the foreign and exotic in a local package, and the Joinville films are excellent examples of how the industry tried to fulfil such a demand (even if it was not always successful).

I do not question the fact that talkies produced by bona-fide Swedish companies were more popular than most of the Joinville films. Instead, I aim to discuss how the Paramount films, and in particular *Marius*, are integrated into a Swedish entertainment culture, and how the films strike a balance between the foreign and local. A balance which in some cases was disturbing

and miscalculated (and thus would explain the failures), but negotiated the contradictory demands of a modern audience. Some of the Paramount films such as *Längtan till havet*, *När rosorna slå ut*, or *Vi två* (The Two of Us, John W. Brunius, 1930), were fairly successful and received positive reviews. Others, however, were audience flops.⁵⁴³ The Joinville films show the very process of cultural adaptation - or the lack of cultural adaptation - explicitly.

As discussed in the previous chapter, recent research has shown that the MLVs were not an isolated phenomenon, but took part in a larger discourse of adaptation and translation of commercial film.⁵⁴⁴ “It is like watching a novel being translated”,⁵⁴⁵ a Swedish critic once wrote after having had the rare opportunity to see both the French and the Swedish version of the same title. It is this process of cultural exchange, embodied in the distribution and reception context that the MLVs overtly reveal.

Production Background

In order to discuss the Paramount films in terms of cultural differentiation as “vernacular”, it is important to stress that, in spite of the fixed sets and the short shooting schedules with quickly translated scripts, there were possibilities to adapt the versions according to domestic needs. In addition, the intermedial relations between the Paramount films and Swedish theatre and record production can generate new meaning to the context of Swedish reception.

The translation process is always a means of cultural differentiation. In the Joinville studios, the translations were made mechanically by translators who were not involved in any other part of film production. This required a script-writer in every national team who would re-work the initial translation which could be developed to include major changes to the original script beyond pure translation.

The schedule of shooting night and day shifts in the Joinville studios, with one version shot during the day, and another during the night opened up for stylistic variation, even if the overall aim was to co-ordinate films stylistically as much as possible. (The unfortunate Swedish crew often had to work between seven in the evening until seven in the morning with an hour for “lunch” at midnight.) Even if eleven or sixteen versions were produced, only two or three versions were shot at the same time. This meant that not only the national teams were changed between the versions, but also the photographers, sound technicians etc. This mode of production allowed for stylistic differences between the versions which were not necessarily centrally controlled. Minor differences in perspective, shot length, actors’ position, number of extras etc. are more frequent in the Joinville films than in the big

budget UFA productions in which a scene from one version was shot directly after the same scene in the other version using the same camera and microphone positions.⁵⁴⁶

The distribution and production structure of Paramount can, according to Nataša Ďurovičová, be described as a “homeostatic” system, meaning that Paramount was a vertically integrated company on the international European market.⁵⁴⁷ In the Stockholm context, the distribution company, Film Paramount AB, was involved in recruiting Swedish national actors, directors and script-writers. This meant that the presence of a local distribution company was necessary for planning the schedules of the Swedish team travelling between Stockholm and Paris. The director of the first Swedish Joinville film, Edwin Adolphson, wrote in his autobiography about the importance of the Stockholm associate company in order to rework the scripts: “The representative for Paramount in Sweden, Carl York, brought me a contract with very advantageous terms, among other things to hire a Swedish script-writer who could pull the dreadfully translated script into shape.”⁵⁴⁸ Finally, and most importantly, it is the replacement of the actors between the versions that makes the MLVs specific in contrast to dubbed or subtitled versions. It is, consequently, in the casting we find the most important differences between MLVs in general, and maybe in the “cheaper” mass-version Joinville productions in particular. The Swedish cast was a relatively small group of well-known film and theatre actors hired by Paramount to act in all the versions and thereby create a continuity between the Paramount MLVs in Sweden. This meant that it was almost impossible to create “star-duplications”, as we see in some UFA films, for instance between Henri Garat and Willy Fritsch in the Lilian Harvey films.⁵⁴⁹ The Swedish actors would often generate meaning beyond the original film and the intentions of Paramount. Ďurovičová offers a good example of this in her analysis of *Vi två* in which the choice of an older actor for a child’s part produced an image of a strange and even perverted American culture.⁵⁵⁰ Comments in reviews such as “the children are typically American; self confident, resolute and precocious”⁵⁵¹ illustrate how the “American” is positioned as “the other”.

Some of the Swedish directors were well known from the Swedish film and theatre scene, such as John W. Brunius who directed *Längtan till havet*. Others, however, such as Gustav Bergman who directed five of the fourteen Swedish versions, were rather inexperienced and his career was over after the Paramount MLV experiment. Edwin Adolphson was chosen to direct, among other films, the pioneer title, *När rosorna slå ut*, mainly because of his experience with the first Swedish sound film *Säg det i toner* (with sound and music and no dialogue). He was, however, much more appreciated as an actor than as a director. (It is also with his performance in the leading role of *Marius* that he made his most memorable contribution for Paramount.) The director’s influence on stylistic and aesthetic devices was in most cases

highly restricted, and his personal contribution is most visible in the differences in acting style.

Marius – Untranslatable but Exportable

The Swedish *Marius* is a film which appears to be a rather strange combination of Swedish acting style and theatrical speech, Hollywood classical story telling, and French folkloristic imagery. This heterogeneity can be read as a means to overcome the different features in *Marius* that might seem “untranslatable”, namely the intertextual references to national genres, the French cultural sphere as a frame of reference, and, most importantly, the Midi accent with which the actors speak in the original French version.

Paramount produced *Marius* in three languages simultaneously: French, Swedish and German (*Zum goldenen Anker*). The production was to a certain extent atypical: there was no “original” produced prior to the “foreign” versions and the film was partly shot on location. *Marius* is an example of a new, more nationally-based production strategy by Paramount in Paris; Robert Kane, the head of the studio, hoped to seduce the French audience by using popular French drama. For this purpose, *Marius* was perfect; the play was both one of the greatest popular successes of the Parisian stage, and also had a story exploiting something so specifically French as the charm of Marseille. This makes the problems of translation, linguistic and cultural, more complicated than for most other Joinville films. The play, *Marius*, can also be placed in a specific national genre of the Mediterranean (méditerranéenne) drama, with features that can be traced through French operetta, music hall, silent film, and even nineteenth-century pastoral.⁵⁵² With the talking film, the Mediterranean drama became more popular than ever, mainly due to the exploitation of the Midi accent. If, as Bazin claims, Pagnol characters “have an accent the way others have a black skin [...]”⁵⁵³, it means that *Marius* is not only local but also untranslatable.

The focus on the accent reveals the previously-discussed discourse of translation in terms of media and body rather than language equivalence. As referred to in chapter two, prior to the film version *Marius* enjoyed great success as a gramophone and radio drama, besides the theatre version.⁵⁵⁴ The combination of speech as words and speech as sound in *Marius* in relation to the representation in several media also concerns the translation. Translation as language equivalence is provided by the word-based character of the film, while the understanding of speech as “grain of the voice” or physical gesture would function as an obstacle to exchangeability of languages, i.e. “untranslatability”.

The local, the untranslatable or the national in *Marius* has a double edge: it is both an obstacle and a potential attraction for a foreign audience. *Marius* was, in its original French film version, an international success. Even if this was partly due to Korda's contribution, the international appeal was part of the story itself and also as a stage version, *Marius* was internationally successful. This is due to the fact that Marseille and southern France in *Marius* is seen from the outside, as a comic, yet exotic, stereotype. In *Marius*, it is obvious that Pagnol's nostalgic longing for his childhood town plays along with the Parisian - and universal - projections of southern France as a rural, family-based society, as a non-modernised "other". The comical effect of the drama emerges from the juxtaposition of this exotic "other", since Marseille is staged as, in Ginette Vincendeau's words, "a coherent self evident norm – to which other cities like Lyon or Paris are comically measured".⁵⁵⁵ In a modernity context, this image can be read both in terms of social power and as an expression of "tourist-cinema". As François de la Bretèque has pointed out, the representation of the south in classical French cinema is a reduced representation from a Parisian relation of power, similar to a colonial discourse, of a variation of cultures into one and the same "midi culture".⁵⁵⁶ This reduction of differentiation opens the text to an audience outside the French context who would recognise the position of "the other" on another level of cultural identification. What is recognised as a specific Midi region to the Parisian audience can be understood as something vaguely Mediterranean or simply French to foreign audiences. In the foreign versions, the exoticism embodied in the original story was thus kept as an important means of attraction.

Between "Dramaten" and the Talkies

Paramount chose Swedish and German as the languages for the foreign versions of *Marius* for the specific reason that Pagnol's play enjoyed great success on the stage before the film versions were made in Stockholm and Frankfurt. The intermedial link between film and theatre was a starting point for the potential successes abroad. This kind of connection to a local entertainment context was not exclusive to *Marius*. For instance, *När rosorna slå ut* included a popular Swedish song as the main attraction of the film that did not occur in other versions. The song's title is also the film's title, and was used to promote it and Edvin Adolphson knew the importance of popular music to attract an audience to sound film. According to his autobiography, "the manuscript to the film that I was about to make in Paris was based on a play with dialogue only. But that did not prevent us from adding a musical theme and a sentimental song."⁵⁵⁷

The Swedish theatre version of *Marius* was produced at the prestigious Kungliga Dramatiska Teatern (Royal Dramatic Theatre), with the well-known actors, Lars Hanson and Carl Barcklind in the leading roles. Pagnol's previous play, *Topazs*, had already enjoyed a great success on the same stage. In theatrical circles, Pagnol was a big name in Sweden at the time, and as in France, the critics compared the stage version with the film version. Even one of Pagnol's highly controversial articles on the talking film and its relation to theatre was published in the Swedish press.⁵⁵⁸

Carl Barcklind, in the role of César on stage, was also cast for the Paramount film version which created a continuity between the stage and film versions which could attract the theatre audience to the film in the same manner as in the French context. In the Swedish case, however, the rest of the cast was recruited from the regular troupe of Paramount actors. Since those actors were famous theatre actors with experience of different genres and well-known from previous Paramount films, the intertextual links between film and stage is more complex and diverse in the Swedish context than in the French. Even if the connection between the stage and film version is strong, the film version is not, however, completely identified with the film version, as was the case in France. Carl Barcklind was an interesting choice from a sound film perspective as Barcklind started his career as an operetta actor and had a well-known voice from records and radio. Additionally, he was one of the actors involved in early sound film experiments from the 1910s.⁵⁵⁹ Barcklind's stardom was thus based on theatre acting and operetta as well as being associated with sound technology and sound experiments.

The Swedish stage version was the main intertextual reference since the French film version was unknown in the Swedish context; the Swedish film version was perceived as a "copy" not of the French film, but of the Swedish play. If any French original was seen by Swedish journalists, it was more likely to have been the famous and more prestigious original Parisian theatre version. The theatre critics, therefore, compared the Swedish and the French stage version, while the film critics compared the (Swedish) stage and film version. The problem of transition is thus not primarily about the translation from a French play to a Swedish one, but an adaptation problem from theatre to film (even as those two, as I will return to later, are related). One of the major complaints of the film is that it was too theatrical, generating remarks such as the script is originally "written for the theatre's limited means of expression"⁵⁶⁰ or that on the screen, in contrast to on stage, "the constant talking is tiring after a while".⁵⁶¹

The merging of film and stage is crucial in order to understand the complex relation between the local and the global of the Joinville film. Almost all of the films were based on popular plays, staged in many countries. From a general perspective, theatre plays embody a paradox between the locally specific and the transposable and exchangeable that preconditions the MLV

phenomenon. Theatre plays are more easily transferable between countries (just a translated script) than films. However, simultaneously, the theatre is also more local, bounded to a specific city and a specific stage. This paradox is embodied in the conception of the theatre as a tension between a live performance and a work of literature, based primarily on words. In semiotic terms, the MLV functions as an “allographic” art work in the same manner as a theatre play; the MLV and the theatre share the quality that permits a text to be materialised in an infinite number of instances without losing its value of originality. This dimension interferes, both in the theatre and in the MLV, with its opposite: the “authographic” dimension of inscription by which the singular, and thus locally grounded stage performance, or the attraction of the original voice of a specific national actor, renders the specific version/performance into a unique original.

The link to the theatre also sheds light on the conception of language and translation in relation to the MLV phenomenon. The untranslatable Midi accent of the French version is, in the Swedish film and theatre versions, replaced by a “neutral” stage accent devoid of regional features. (The only character who has a characteristic “strange” way of talking, a dry academic way, is the “Lyonais”, the man from Lyon, who in the French version speaks with a neutral, or “pointu” accent. On an accent level, the relation between “us” and “the other” is thus reversed.)

Following the idea of “untranslatability” as something linked to modern media representation, the focus on the regional accent in *Marius* renders the stage version filmic. According to Bazin, the representation of the word as voice or accent is purely cinematic and, therefore, the opposite of “filmed theatre”. Because of the accent, “even if *Marius* was a success at the Theatre of Paris before Alexander Korda directed the screen version, it is clear that this work’s basic form is, and will continue to be, cinematic”.⁵⁶² In the Swedish context, the theatre critics noticed the “untranslatable” features of *Marius*. For instance, several critics claimed that the Swedish actors spoke too slowly to represent the liveliness of the French “type”.⁵⁶³ One critic even asked himself whether it was possible to think of Swedish actors representing the inhabitants of Marseille, whilst another claims that the Swedish *Marius* “lacks the sparkling nerve of the southern nature”.⁵⁶⁴ These remarks are rather unusual for the theatre where translation does not pose the same kind of problem as in film, and where the disjunction between diegetic and spoken language is generally perceived as unproblematic. In this case, types, body or “speech physiognomy”, to use Béla Balázs’ term, interfere with the translation.

Concerning the film version, the critics discussed the problem of translation from French to Swedish and the relation between cultural “types” in terms of adaptation from stage to film. The “theatrical” features were hence linked to the “Frenchness” of the play. As reported in *Dagens Nyheter*:

The lines sound unnatural, even sometimes forced, and it almost seems as if the Swedish adaptation is limited to a strictly literal translation of the French manuscript. It is impossible to use stage speech for the movies. It seems false in some way. The whole dramaturgy of the sound film demands naturalness, in particular, where speech is concerned.⁵⁶⁵

This interaction between cultural identity, translation and artistic expression is even more strongly stressed in other reception contexts other than Sweden/Stockholm. For instance, a Swedish-speaking Finnish critic connects the “slow speech” as a sign of cultural adaptation to a “Scandinavian” culture (to which he does not include the Swedish-speaking part of Finland): “The Swedish actors do not have the hot temperament and lively gestures of the Marseille inhabitants, [...] but this version is made for Scandinavians, and they probably understand it better as it is.”⁵⁶⁶

Significantly, the problem of cultural adaptation generates an ethnic reading of the “Swedishness” of the performance in relation to the “Frenchness” of the story. When some of the critics pointed out that Inga Tidblad as Fanny did not suit the fictional context as a “Cool Nordic blonde”⁵⁶⁷ and Lars Hanson in the stage version as being too Nordic as a “type”, the Swedish identity is exposed as a specific “other” identity: a fair, calm and silent character in opposition to the “Frenchness” which is supposed to be represented in the play/film. The juxtaposition between Swedish acting and French content would “make whiteness strange” in Dyer’s terms,⁵⁶⁸ since the problems of adapting Mediterranean southern French ethnicity in Swedish generates a recognition of Swedish identity as something ethnically specific.

The theatre idiom heard on stages and in many Swedish sound films in the 1930s is an example of a specific diction which is “neutral” in the sense that it does not correspond to any region (even if it closer to the Stockholm-Uppsala region than other regions). It is, therefore, an example of the voice as ethnically “colourless”, to use Dyer’s term.⁵⁶⁹ The combination between French ethnicity played by Swedish actors undermined the neutral quality of stage speech. The critics described the slow speech as, on the one hand, theatrical, and on the other, typically Swedish. The “untranslatability” of the French speech made the Swedish stage speech appear as an ethnically significant accent.

The MLV deals with the problem of language and translation in a way that stands between theatre and film. There is both a typically filmic fascination with the materiality of the voice (the interest in the foreign accents of the polyglot actors, or the attraction of the singing voices of the MLV stars etc.) and an exchangeability between bodies and languages, which brings the film closer to the theatrical conception of language. This places the MLV in

a paradoxical position as a mode of translation, albeit a mode of translation of bodies rather than language.

Between the Oscars Theatre and an Imaginary “Far-away”

The interrelations between film and theatre also influenced the relation between foreign and local on a more concrete level as the closeness to the Swedish theatre from which the Paramount actors were known stands in specific relation to the foreign theme understood as a vague “far-away”.

From a French perspective, if the Midi accent is lost, the whole point is lost. From a Swedish perspective, however, the theatrical speech reinforces the serious appeal of the drama and gives a certain universalism to the story. Apart from the accent, many of the specifically local features of the Mediterranean drama are defused. For instance, the lively gestures, which are fundamental to the characterisation of the south which are found in silent films as well as on the stage, are almost absent in the Swedish version. Furthermore, there are several crucial sequences, for example narrative excesses with the talkative César representing the typical southern character which were removed from the Swedish script. For example, the famous card-playing scene in the original French version is a long comic scene of cheating which is reduced in, the Swedish version, to a few lines of thickly-spoken dialogue. Pagnol’s specific humour is closely related to those legendary scenes. Raimu, the “greatest actor ever” (according to Orson Welles) is the central star, and the most “Marseillais” of all the characters in the French version, while Barcklind plays more of a secondary character in the Swedish version. In the reviews, he is often mentioned as the third or fourth name, and his picture is not included on the two-page advertisement with a publicity still from the film.

The focus lies on Marius, his longing for the sea, and his love affair with Fanny, that is, in the story itself, played on the melodramatic side rather than the comic. In the end, the main attraction are the scenes between Edvin Adolphson and Inga Tidblad starring as Marius and Fanny, and as far as those scenes are concerned, the regional, Marseille and southern France come across as an unspecific “far away”. For the ones who appreciate Pagnol’s dialogue and Raimu’s acting style, the Swedish version seems to be watered down. However, to the Swedish audience of the time, the love scenes between Adolphson and Tidblad were probably much more worth while than the dialogue scenes with Barcklind. It was the dialogue sequences with César that gave *Marius* the reputation of “filmed theatre”; the edited Swed-

ish script can be seen as a response to complaints of the Paramount film as being in general too heavy with dialogue.

The French actors, Fresnay, Raimu, and Demazis, all played the same parts on stage and became stars with *Marius* which continued to build their stardom in subsequent Pagnol films (primarily the two sequels, *Fanny* and *César*). Tidblad and Adolphson, on the other hand, lent stardom to the *Marius* production. During this period, they were a well-known theatrical couple in Stockholm, and acted together in a variety of plays from Shakespeare comedies to society dramas. Consequently, the focus on the narrative level rather than on the comical digressions, on the couple rather than the father, does not only reinforce the universal level of the drama, but also adds a local appeal with an intertextual link between the Paramount film and the large number of plays in which Tidblad and Adolphson starred.

This connection between the stage and the Paramount films is also true for the rest of the cast. The status of the actors in the Swedish version create a closeness to the audience that transcends the language problem. They were already an established troupe when they went to Paramount. Most of them were hired from the same theatre in Stockholm, Oscarsteatern (The Oscar's Theatre). After the premiere of *När rosorna slå ut*, a critic noted that "to be at Olympia [the name of the movie theatre] yesterday was just like being at Oscarsteatern. On the stage – that is on the screen and through the loud-speakers – well-known and popular voices of the Oscar ensemble."⁵⁷⁰ The "well-known voices" were an attraction. The audience got pleasure not only from understanding the spoken dialogue but also in vocal recognition which gave the effect of "the grain of the voice" in spite of unauthentic theatrical speech. Later, some critics even thought of the Joinville films as a duplication of the Stockholm stage: "We have Oscarsteatern on Kungsgatan, and on Sveavägen why is not that enough? Why do we need one at Birger Jarlsgatan (Olympia), at Berzelii park (China), at Regeringsgatan (Imperial) [the three addresses where the Paramount films were screened] Why have filmed theatre, when you can have it live?"⁵⁷¹

There are thus two intertextual theatre references involved in the process of adapting this Paramount film to a Sweden/Stockholm context: one to the stage version of Pagnol's play in Stockholm, and the other to the Oscar's troupe. Whether it was a problem or an attraction, the presence of the Oscars's troupe created a combination between the familiarity of the Stockholm stage and the "foreignness" of sets, scripts and locations. Sometimes, the critics even thought of the films as too local and were even a little disappointed in the lack of foreign influence. If some aspects of the Joinville films seem to have been perceived as too foreign in a Swedish context, other aspects were, on the contrary, understood as very local. The pseudonym, "Hara Kiri", wrote in a review of the highly-criticised film, *Den farliga leken* (Dangerous Game, Gustaf Bergman, 1930), that "it seems like the Swedish talking pictures in Paris live in an isolated frozen colony, immune to the

charm of the city by the Seine. There are no Frenchmen of the north who play the 'dangerous game' here. Nobody is having fun, not even on screen. Even the ballroom is a frozen solid ocean, on which snowmen pass slowly in tuxedo together with sneering ladies. The same joy and glamour as in a Swedish post office."⁵⁷² Thus, the interplay between the foreign and the local goes both ways.

Marseille as Real Location or No-Man's-Land

Den farliga leken was also criticised for its anonymous setting, that is, for the neutral "non-location" that Ehrenbourg criticised, typical of the Joinville Hollywood "copies". One critic noted that "the limited set design does not create a milieu, it is only a background to the dialogue".⁵⁷³ Paradoxically, this film is also both too Swedish and culturally unspecific. It is lacking something that the audience apprehends as a representation of culture. The anonymous setting might be the most important miscalculation of the Joinville project, as it is based on some idea on the universalism of film language as something that would work beyond cultural differentiation. It is significant that this critic focused on what is supposed to be invisible, as he says, "a background to the dialogue". The neutrality of the settings in some Joinville films would never be transparent; it would, on the contrary, be understood as either "filmed theatre" or, as in Ehrenbourg's interpretation, American capitalism. The anonymous "non-space" as an image of internationalism and globalisation is, as discussed previously, in other MLVs used rather intelligently: in *F.P.I antwortet nicht* the location is a base in the middle of the ocean, in *Cape Forlorn* the drama takes place in a light-house, in *SOS Eisberg*, in vast Greenland etc. In these films, the drama highlights the tension between the anonymity and the specificity of the location around claustrophobic impressions of being a prisoner in an empty space, which are emphasised as a specific feature.

The problem with trying to represent something culturally unspecific is even more striking in reception contexts without the intertextual references in which the combination between two cultural spheres would be more disturbing. In Czechoslovakia, for example, as described by Petr Szczepanik,⁵⁷⁴ Paramount chose to show the German versions of many Paramount films instead of the American or in the case of *Marius*, the French original to Czech audiences. The double foreignness by the German representation of America/France was unacceptable to the Czech audience. The actors were unknown to the local audience, and the fact that one foreign language was used to represent another foreign language shattered the illusion. Just as the Frenchness of *Längtan till havet* would generate a recognition of Swedish

identity as an ethnic group, the seemingly neutral representation of the German versions generated a discussion on American versus German culture in the Czech context. *Marius/Längtan till havet* is particularly interesting in relation to this problem since the image of the region carries the film to such an extent that it is never reduced to a universal location or a no-man's-land, in spite of the attempts to defuse some of genre elements and other features linked to a representation of the south in a French context. If *Längtan till havet* appealed to the Swedish audience more than a film such as *Den farliga leken*, it was probably because there was a better calculated balance not only between the locally Swedish and an abstract "far away", but also between "Marseille" perceived as a "far-away" and "Marseille" as a real location. In short, "Marseille" in the Swedish version of *Marius* is never anonymous. It was, however, present in a slightly different way than in the French version.

The absence of specific features of the "southern character" and, in particular, the accent as a device of sonic realism is, to some extent, replaced by a focus on the representation of Marseille in terms of filmic realism. In contrast to other Joinville MLVs, *Marius* was partly shot on location in Marseille (a complicated procedure, since all three national teams had to go to Marseille, which shows that this film was an exceptional production). In the Swedish version, the lack of long dialogue scenes makes the location scenes more prominent. There are also a few additional shots on location in the Swedish version. For example, the long introductory tracking shot which shows local extras walking in the streets of Marseille is absent in the French version. (In the French version, there is a short establishing shot of the empty harbour instead.) Or in a crucial scene between Fanny and Marius talking about their future in the harbour area, where there is a close-up of the couple talking in the French version, but in the Swedish version only images of the harbour are shown. The images serve to illustrate Marius' "longing for the sea", which is exclusively revealed by the acting in the French version, and not by location.

As previously mentioned, the specific shooting procedure of the Paramount films permitted stylistic differences, and in the case of *Marius*, it might be significant that the photographer was not the same in the Swedish and French version. There are generally more close-ups in the French version, and longer takes in the Swedish. The long outdoor scene could be a choice of the cinematographer but is also possible that the director, John W. Brunius, might have made a choice according to cultural (or personal) taste. (Korda co-directed some crucial scenes in all three versions, but was mainly in charge of the direction of the French version). What makes these differences significant, regardless of the reasons, is that the outdoor scenes played an important role for the appreciation of the film in Sweden, and were referred to in the Swedish in terms of cinematic quality. In the comparisons between film and theatre versions, the film critics strongly emphasised this

cinematic quality as a feature in favour of the film version. From a review focusing completely on the few location shots in the film, one gets the impression that this closed stage play is turned into a neo-realistic city portrait: “when the camera moves along the sidewalks, passing by the sailor cafés and the market places with fish and vegetables, there are no well-built studios [...], those are real streets, real bars, and real Marseille inhabitants. [...] You can feel the presence of Marseille, the smell of fish, sea and wet wood, you can hear the ocean, the steamboats, the fighting sailors.”⁵⁷⁵

“Marseille” thus has several functions in *Längtan till havet*: it is an exotic location in southern France where family values and traditions are different, it is also an un-specific “far-away”, a setting for a romantic and melodramatic love story between two well-known Swedish actors, and is, finally, also a real location with inhabitants of mixed colours and cultures, both exotic and modern for the Swedish audience. In the French version, the image of Marseille is the image of its inhabitants characterised by the actors which thus gives a perfect fusion between acting and location. In the Swedish version, on the other hand, it is the opposite, as there is a split between the dramatic scenes when the actors are present and the panoramas over the city. It is as if there were two different films, a closed studio drama and a realistic city portrait unevenly linking them together. This stylistic heterogeneity can, in turn, be related to the merge between theatre and film as discussed above; *Längtan till havet* is a particular example of when “filmed theatre” is framed by a cinematic landscape. To a certain extent, this disturbed the critics who, for the most, would liked to have seen more camera movements and more location scenes etc. One critic raved over the introduction: “the camera captures Marseille, the harbour, and the Mediterranean in wide sweeps, it dives down on a main road by the harbour, it stays for a few seconds by the harbour with some character or a situation and then glides on. This is cinema.” Then, however, with some disappointment, he notes that “just a second after that, we are at the Bar de la Marine and we see photographed, even well photographed, theatre”.⁵⁷⁶

The key to an understanding of the MLV phenomenon and, in particular, the Joinville films, lies, as I have attempted to show, in an intermedial or interartial relation, which also highlights the problem of cultural identity. Instead of a homogenisation of film style according to Hollywood standards, different genre traditions and media discourses interfere with specific reception contexts thereby creating a heterogeneous text interacting with the modern imaginary of cultural identity. The heterogeneity in the split between represented and actual language, between the different cultural representations, and the diversity of intertextual links generate an openness in terms of reception. The MLVs show how cultural imagery constantly interferes with the aesthetic questions about different media representation emerging with the coming of sound.

Conclusions

In this study, I have approached translation in early sound film as a media issue, and as a means of constructing cultural and ethnic identity. More specifically, I have outlined the relations between translation practices and a broader discourse on film versions by correlating language versions with sound/silent and intermedia versions. I have approached film speech as a combination of sound, writing and moving images, and discussed how an overall discourse of exchangeability and media materiality intersects with the “dialogue” between languages in translation. If speech representation in sound film is a marker of ethnicity by revealing a “grain of the voice”, translated voices reinforce ethnic differentiation within one and the same “text”. For this approach, I have considered a selection of films in combination with writing on films in various cultural spheres, fan magazines, film theory, trade press and daily press. The film examples, as well as the press material, are predominantly French and German, but also Swedish, British and American. Besides primary sources that I have presented and examined, I have also used examples from the recent increase in scholarship on related issues, and placed these in my overall discussion.

My study adopts a broader perspective on the vicissitudes of translation and sound film media in this period than previous research. This is not because it covers the entire field of translation in Europe or in France and Germany empirically but because of an emphasis on *the relation* between topics previously approached as isolated phenomena: by a number of examples and cases, various kinds of translations in the context of a broader version phenomenon and translation in relation to discussion on speech representation in film. The combination of theoretical approaches, media theory, culture studies and semiotics serve this overall conceptualisation. Moreover, in this study popular reception of version making has been emphasised and how the films thematise and problematise this practice has been highlighted to a greater extent than in previous research, which reveals a discourse of translation as popular attraction. This implies that the demand of “absolute” synchronisation (to which the MLV is a response) in early sound film translation was not, as often argued, a means to avoid or hide translation. Instead, it was a means to emphasise translation as polyglot acting or vocal authenticity which enters a realm of transnational identity as part of a broader cine-

matic culture. I argue for an enlargement of the concept of translation as a result of media reproduction of speech, which influences the practices of translation in the early sound period into a representation of ethnic differentiation or transnationalism. A key to this conclusion is an analysis of the cultural signification of accents, in particular foreign accents, a feature which occasionally has been referred to as a detail in film or star analyses, rarely, however, framed as a theoretical issue. I argue that the accent exposes a split between languages, between speaker and speech and even between words and sounds, and simultaneously maintains synchronisation and vocal authenticity.

The study is divided into six chapters, the first two chapters function, on different levels, as a background discussion for the analyses of versions in the subsequent four chapters. The ambition in the first was to trace a discursive juxtaposition between a utopia of a universal language and linguistic diversity in sound reproduction technology. This media archaeological approach serves to indicate a larger modernity and media discourse of speech representation and film translation. By combining language and media theory with writings on early sound technology, I have suggested that the discourse of media inscription and media separation can be linked to translation. Since “universalism” is understood here in relation to sound media (rather than photography and film) the idea of the conversion to sound film as the fall of the Tower of Babel is in contrast to a silent film “esperanto” reconsidered with regard to a tradition of sonic universalism.

The second chapter is a continuation of the discussion on juxtaposition between various notions of universalism, transnationalism and linguistic diversity, here inscribed in the context of the early sound film. By examining film theoretical writing, film criticism and a selection of early sound films, I have shown examples on how the utopias of “universalism” or “a perfect language” interact with differentiation of languages. I have also described how these discourses partake in various discussions on “European” issues, such as sound film as “art”, the growing impact of American films, and a translinguistic European identity in relation to regional ethnic and cultural identity.

In the following four chapters, the focus is narrower and my analyses rely more on primary sources in the form of press material. In these chapters, I have approached the issue of versions (media versions and translated versions). Chapter three deals with sound and silent versions and part-talkies as a kind of hybrid film form based on speech representation in different media. In this chapter, I have shown how a discourse of exchangeability (and thus a textual dimension of speech representation), by which the same message is repeated in different media, is combined with a discourse of media inscription and media materiality by which each inscription form is perceived as irreplaceable. By correlating discussions of articles on part-talkies and sound, and silent versions with analyses of how the relations between writ-

ing and sound are thematised in early sound films, I have also indicated that the films can be read as allegories of these hybrid film forms.

In chapter four, I continue the analyses of the relations between sound, writing and image and version making, but here as an issue of translation. By accentuating how the discussions on dubbing and titling dovetail with an initial criticism on the conversion to sound, I suggest that translation in this period is indissolubly linked to media. In this chapter, I have indicated that the various forms of translation can be conceptualised according to the same principles as hybrid film forms, that is, in terms of exchangeability and media materiality, media separation and media unification, textuality and body simulation. I base my arguments not only on the discussion in the press, but, more importantly, by stressing the multitude of translation forms and the mixed forms of film translation in this period. Additionally, the plurality in translation modes is fundamental for my discussion of the very concept of translation. I suggested that what traditionally is perceived as translation forms (subtitling, dubbing, etc.) partake in the same discourse as narrative adaptations or intermedial transposition.

The last two chapters deal with the phenomenon of MLVs as a hybrid between translation and remake or between film and other media. Here, the sliding definitions between cultural or media adaptation and translation is even more conspicuous than in other translation modes. In chapter five, I have shown how seemingly minor phenomena, such as the foreign accents of polyglot stars, are important discursive features for intersecting translation and a conception of ethnicity as both “real body” and artificial construction. I have based my arguments on examples from fan magazines and cultural criticism. Additionally, I have analysed how MLVs represent location as imaginary or as a “no-man’s-land”. Translation is exposed as an element of attraction both in magazines and in films, as themes or motifs illustrating cultural identity in the era of modern reproduction.

Chapter six examines the relation between the multiple language film and theatre taking the Swedish version of *Marius* as example. In this chapter, I have shown how the double transposition – adaptation from film to theatre and from French film to Swedish – also involves a level of ethnicity. Most notably, the “dialogue” between film and theatre, between French regional imaginary and Swedish representation, destabilise the otherwise ethnically “neutral” Swedish as spoken on the stage. By analysing the reception of the Swedish stage version and the Swedish film version of the French film, and by comparing the two film versions on a textual level, I outlined a hybrid form between film and theatre which “projects” both the local and the foreign. Consequently, the overall conclusion is that translation in the early sound era, or maybe film translation as such, can only be analysed as part of a larger context of intermedia and version making. Furthermore, since translation is thematised in films - and revealed in the fan press as an element of attraction, translation, in this particular period, functions as representation of

cultural and transcultural identity; it exposes cultural implications of translation concealed in later “invisible” translation practices. The emphasis on translation as attraction in combination with the multimedia dimension involves a representation of ethnicity marked by differentiation.

For my part, this study has incited an interest for further inquiry into the role of translation in a larger realm of cinematic culture. A larger historical approach on the whole interwar period, with focus also on translation with intertitles, would highlight an undiscovered angle of the transnational relations of this crucial era. Another enlargement of the perspective on translation would be to take the industrial practices into account more than has been achieved in this study. Translation is the means by which film is spread internationally and, consequently, is central for understanding conceptual and practical operations of filmic internationalism. The ambition of this dissertation was to highlight certain aspects of how translation operates in cinema culture. Translation is still an “unheard voice” in film studies, and an underestimated dimension in discussions on filmic internationalism, cultural globalisation and regional reception, in particular from an historical perspective. By approaching the “universal” language of film differently, this study attempts to underline to what extent translation is an issue of film theory, film history and media culture.

- ¹ Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits 1954-1988, vol. 3, 1976-1979*, eds. Daniel Denfert and François Edwald, (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), p. 299.
- ² See Tom Gunning, *The Films of Fritz Lang: Allegories of Vision and Modernity* (London: Bfi Publishing, 2000).
- ³ Janet Staiger, *Perverse Spectators: The Practices of Film Reception* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2000), p. 2.
- ⁴ The network of PEC (Popular European Cinema), the “European Cinema” conference and the foundation of NECS (Network of European Cinema Studies) in Amsterdam 2005 are examples of a new interest in European Cinema.
- ⁵ Thomas Elsaesser, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), pp. 35-57.
- ⁶ For example, German Cinegraph has published a number of anthologies about European film production of the 1930s from a transnational perspective. See *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939*, eds. Sibylle M. Sturm, Arthur Wohlge-muth (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1996); *Tonfilmfrieden/Tonfilmkrieg: Die Geschichte der Tobis vom Technik-Syndikat zum Staatskonzern*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2003); *London calling: Deutsche im britischen Film der dreißiger Jahre*, ed. Jörg Schöning (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1993).
- ⁷ Malte Hagener introduces a distinction between “Film Europe” and “Cinema Europe”, the former as “a series of conferences and high-profile contracts”, while the latter refers to “a ‘rhizomatic’ network of contracts and contacts, of travel and communication, of influence and ex-change”. Malte Hagener, “Prix de Beauté as Multiple Intersection”, *Cinema & Cie: Inter-national Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), p. 107.
- ⁸ See, for example, Robert Burgoyne, *Film Nation Hollywood looks at U.S. History* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1997).
- ⁹ The concept of “imaginative geography” was introduced by Edward Said, *Orientalism* [1978] (New York: Vintage Books Edition, 1979), pp. 49-73.
- ¹⁰ For the notion of national identity as an “imagined community”, see: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1993).
- ¹¹ Elsaesser (2005), p. 21.
- ¹² Jean-Michel Frodon, *La projection national: Cinéma et nation* (Paris: Odile Jakob, 1998), p. 12.
- ¹³ Miriam Hansen, “The Mass Production of Senses: Classical Cinema as Vernacular Modernism”, *Reinventing Film Studies*, eds. Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams (London: Arnold, 2000), pp. 332-350.
- ¹⁴ Richard Dyer, *White* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- ¹⁵ See Martin Barnier, *En route vers le parlant: histoire d'une évolution technologique, économique et esthétique du cinéma (1926-1934)* (Liège: Éditions du Céfal, 2002); Corinna Müller, *Vom Stummfilm zum Tonfilm* (Munich: Fink, 2003); Charles O’Brien, *Cinema’s Conversion to Sound: Technology and Film Style in France and the U.S.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005); James Lastra, *Sound Technology and the American Cinema: Perception, Representation, Modernity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Wolfgang Mühl-Benninghaus, *Das Ringen um den Tonfilm: Strategien der Elektro- und der Filmindustrie in den 20er und 30er Jahren* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1999).
- ¹⁶ See recent editions of Cinema and Cie:International Film Studies Journal (no. 4-7); Il film e i suoi multipli/Film and Its Multiples, IX Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema, ed. Anna Antonini (Udine: Forum, 2003); Chris Wahl, *Das Sprechen des Spielfilms: Über die Auswirkungen von hörbaren Dialogen auf Produktion und Rezeption, Ästhetik und Internationalität der siebten Kunst* (Luxemburg: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2005); Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006).
- ¹⁷ Forthcoming Anna Sofia Rossholm, “Ein schwedisches Marseille: Die schwedischen Mehrsprachenversionen aus Joinville im lokalen Rezeptionskontext”, *Babylon in FilmEu-*

ropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 51-64.

¹⁸ For instance, recent DVD-editions of films such as *Metropolis*, *Der blaue Engel/The Blue Angel*, *The Phantom of the Opera* or *M* contain several versions or parts of versions.

¹⁹ Rick Altman, "Penser l'histoire du cinéma autrement: un modèle de crise", *Vingtième siècle*, no. 46 (1995), pp. 65-74.

²⁰ These controversies are outlined by O'Brien (2005), pp. 44-52.

²¹ Altman (1995), p. 73.

²² Ibid. pp. 68f.

²³ Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (Minneapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 1976), pp. 112ff.

²⁴ *Cinema/Sound*, ed. Rick Altman, *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980).

²⁵ Rick Altman, "General Introduction: Cinema as Event", *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 1-14.

²⁶ Robert Stam, *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).

²⁷ Hon. Will H. Hays Welcomes Vitaphone in an Address, part of Opening Night Vitaphone Program (6 August, 1927).

²⁸ André Bazin, "Le mythe du cinéma total" [1946], *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000), pp. 19-24.

²⁹ Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association.

³⁰ See Tom Gunning, "Doing for the Eye What the Phonograph Does for the ear", *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), pp. 13-31.

³¹ Jean-Louis Comolli, "Profondeur de champ: la double scène", *Cahiers du Cinéma*, no. 231 (August-September 1971), p. 49.

³² As Ben Singer points out, "modernity" as historical period is defined differently, either as a limited period of urbanisation and communication beginning in the early nineteenth century or as a period beginning in the late fourteenth century. However, the turn of the century 1800/1900 is an intensified period in which issues of modernisation, perception and media are intensively debated and revealed in various discourses. See Ben Singer, *Melodrama and Modernity: Early Sensational Cinema and Its Contexts* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), pp. 17-35.

³³ Roland Gelatt, *The Fabulous Phonograph: The Story of the Gramophone From Tin Foil to High Fidelity* (London: Cassell, 1956), pp. 10f.

³⁴ This is partly due to the fact that Edison focuses on potential social utilities for his invention. Music has a value of entertainment or art, noise reproduction has a value of technological attraction or documentation. Speech reproduction, on the other hand, can be used in offices and schools and as a means of communication. Therefore it is speech rather than other sounds which Edison considered to be suitable for sound recording.

³⁵ Lastra (2000); Giusy Pisano, *Une archéologie du cinéma sonore* (Paris: CRNS Éditions, 2004).

³⁶ Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, "The Cinema After Babel: Language, Difference, Power", *Screen*, vol. 26, no. 3-4 (May-August, 1985), p. 35.

³⁷ Michel Chion's uses the term "vococentric" to describe sound track in film. See Michel Chion, *La voix au cinéma* [1982] (Paris: Éditions de l'Étoile, 1993), pp. 18ff.

³⁸ Stam (1989); also Shohat and Stam (1985).

³⁹ Friedrich Kittler [1985] *Discourse Networks* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1990), pp. 265-273.

⁴⁰ See Roy Harris, *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein* (London: Routledge, 1988).

⁴¹ Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaue, trans. Roy Harris (Chicago, IL: Open Court, 1986), p. 118.

⁴² See Peter Ives, *Gramsci's Politics of Language: Engaging the Bakhtin Circle and the Frankfurt School* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 53-96.

- ⁴³ Mikhail Bakhtin, "The Discourse of the Novel", *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), p. 270.
- ⁴⁴ Stam (1989), p. 68.
- ⁴⁵ George Steiner, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* [1974] (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992). According to Steiner (p. 50), the complex process of transferring one language into another was "already present in the first moment of human speech."
- ⁴⁶ Bakhtin (1986), pp. 171f.
- ⁴⁷ Mikhail Bakhtin, "Towards a Methodology for the Human Sciences", *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), p. 169.
- ⁴⁸ Mikhail Bakhtin, "The Problem of Speech Genres", *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 60-102. A "speech genre" is defined (p. 60.) as a "relatively stable type of verbal utterance and is characterised by its stylistic 'heterogeneity'".
- ⁴⁹ Stam (1989), p. 60.
- ⁵⁰ Lastra (2000), pp. 16-60.
- ⁵¹ The breakdown of the discourse networks 1800/1900 is emphasised in Kittler (1990), while discourse networks 1900 is analysed in detail in *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter* [1986] (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999).
- ⁵² Béla Balázs, *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art* (London: Dobson 1952), p. 216; Béla Balázs, *Schriften zum Film, Bd. 2, Der Geist des Films: Artikel und Aufsätze 1926-1931* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1984), p. 161.
- ⁵³ Lastra (2000), pp. 124-128.
- ⁵⁴ Jean-Louis Baudry, "The Apparatus", *Apparatus*, ed. Therese Hak Kyung Cha (New York: Tanam, 1980), p. 47.
- ⁵⁵ Christian Metz, "Aural Objects", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), p. 29.
- ⁵⁶ Alan Williams, "Is Sound Recording Like a Language?", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), p. 58.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 53.
- ⁵⁸ Rick Altman, "Sound Space", *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), p. 55.
- ⁵⁹ Thomas Levin, "The Acoustic Dimension: Notes on Cinema Sound", *Screen*, vol. 25, no. 3 (May-June 1984) pp. 66f.
- ⁶⁰ Levin discusses Theodor W. Adorno and Hanns Eisler, *Composing for the Films* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).
- ⁶¹ I develop this topic in Anna Sofia Rossholm, "Hearing, Speech and Language in the Film Theory of Béla Balázs", *I cinque sensi del cinema. XI Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema*, eds. Alice Autelitano and Veronica Innocenti (Udine: Forum, 2004), pp. 235-241.
- ⁶² Balázs (1984), p. 158. My trans. "Wie unser Auge mit dem Objektiv, so wird unser Ohr mit der Membran identifiziert."
- ⁶³ Jesper Svenbro has elaborated on "speaking" texts in ancient Greece. See, Jesper Svenbro, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993).
- ⁶⁴ Ideas devolved most famously in *De la grammatologie: Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967).
- ⁶⁵ Walter J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Methuen, Routledge, 1982), p. 3.
- ⁶⁶ Lastra (2000), p. 28.
- ⁶⁷ See Pisano (2004), pp. 124f.
- ⁶⁸ Lastra (2000), p. 29.
- ⁶⁹ Lady Elizabeth Eastlake, quoted by Lastra (2000), p. 73.
- ⁷⁰ Vachel Lindsay, "Hieroglyphics", *The Art of the Moving Picture* [1915] (New York: Modern Library 2000), pp. 116-125.

- ⁷¹ Gelatt (1956), pp. 10f.
- ⁷² Roland Barthes, "The Grain of the Voice" [1972], *Image-Music-Text*, ed. and trans. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), pp. 179-189.
- ⁷³ Barthes (1996), p. 184.
- ⁷⁴ The elaborations on sound in the avant-garde from the early 20th century take various forms. Douglas Kahn describes sonic avant-garde as figures of "vibration", "inscription" and "transmission". See "Introduction: Histories of Sound Once Removed", *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*, eds. Douglas Kahn and Gregory Whitehead (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press, 1992), pp. 1-29.
- ⁷⁵ Guillaume Apollinaire, "The New Spirits of the Poets" [1918], in Francis Steegmuller, *Apollinaire: A Poet Among the Painters* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), p. 282. See Kahn (1992), p. 9.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 281.
- ⁷⁷ Goergen (1989), p. 13.
- ⁷⁸ Jerrold Northrup Moore, *A Voice in Time* (London 1976), pp. 149f; Goergen (1989), p. 15.
- ⁷⁹ Dziga Vertov, Lecture (5 April, 1935), Manuscript held in the Österreichischen Filmmuseum, Vienna. Quoted by Jeanpaul Goergen, *Walter Ruttmann: eine Dokumentation* (Berlin: Freunde der Dt. Kinemathek, 1989) p. 14.
- ⁸⁰ Gelatt (1956), pp. 8f.
- ⁸¹ Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2003), pp. 31-86.
- ⁸² Lastra (2000), p. 31.
- ⁸³ Alexander Graham Bell, "Prehistoric Telephone Days", *National Geographic* vol. 41, no. 3 (March 1922), p. 228. Quoted by Lastra (2000), p. 31.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁵ Pisano has devolved this topic further, see Pisano (2004), p.130ff.
- ⁸⁶ Emily Thompson, "Sound Effects: The Production and Meaning of Incidental Sound in the American Film Industry, 1925-1930", unpublished paper at *Sonic Interventions: Pushing the Boundaries of Cultural Analysis*, ASCA Conference (Amsterdam, 29-31 March, 2005).
- ⁸⁷ Pierre Lagarde, "Le passé réssuscité aux archives de la parole" (3 April, 1927), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997). My trans. "On ne peut pas dire qu'elle chante juste, mais elle chante d'une façon locale!"
- ⁸⁸ See Umberto Eco, *The Search for the Perfect Language* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995).
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 304ff.
- ⁹⁰ In 1903, the field was important enough to a history of the universal languages: Louis Couturat and Léopold Leau, *Histoire de la langue universelle* (Paris: Hachette, 1903).
- ⁹¹ See Eco (1995), pp. 305f.
- ⁹² Miriam Hansen, "Universal Language and Democratic Culture: Myths of Origin in Early American Cinema", *Mythos und Aufklärung in der Amerikanischen Literatur/Myth and Enlightenment in the American Literature*, eds. Dieter Meindl and Friedrich W. Horlacher (Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg e.V., 1985), p. 325.
- ⁹³ Lastra (2000), p. 29.
- ⁹⁴ Lastra (2000), p. 30.
- ⁹⁵ See, for example, Hansen (1985); Hansen elaborates further on the "Tower of Babel" in relation to movie palaces in *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1991).
- ⁹⁶ Kittler (1990), pp. 229f.
- ⁹⁷ Kittler (1990), p. 265, quote from Rilke, "Primal Sound", p. 55.
- ⁹⁸ I refer to Georges Dumeny's *Phonoscope*. See Laurent Mannoni, *Georges Dumeny, Pionnier du cinéma* (Douai: Editions Pagine, 1997).
- ⁹⁹ Thomas Edison, Caveat 110 (8 October, 1888, filed 17 October, 1888), patent records, NjWOE. Qouted and analysed in Gunning (2001).

- ¹⁰⁰ F. Nadar, "Daguerréotype acoustique", *Les mémoires du géant* (Paris: Éditions Ed. Dentu, 1864).
- ¹⁰¹ See Lastra (2000), pp. 16ff. See also Jacques Perriault, *Mémoire de l'ombre et du son: une archéologie de l'audio-visuel* (Paris: Flammarion, 1981), pp. 133ff.
- ¹⁰² Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (London: Sphere, 1973), pp. 43-50.
- ¹⁰³ This is frequently discussed in contemporary media theory, addressing transformations of digital media, see for example Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1999).
- ¹⁰⁴ Kittler (1990), pp. 265-346.
- ¹⁰⁵ Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003), p. 138.
- ¹⁰⁶ Hansen (1985), p. 338.
- ¹⁰⁷ Lindsay (2000), pp. 116ff.
- ¹⁰⁸ Bazin (2000).
- ¹⁰⁹ See Jean Mitry, *Histoire du cinéma: art et industrie. vol. 4, Les années trente* (Paris: J.P. Delarge, 1980), pp. 52ff.
- ¹¹⁰ Kittler (1990), pp. 70-77.
- ¹¹¹ See *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph Graham (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985).
- ¹¹² Steiner (1992), especially chapter six (pp. 436-495) in which Steiner outlines "topologies of culture".
- ¹¹³ Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere, "The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies", *Translation, History and Culture*, eds. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere (London: Pinter Publisher, 1980), pp. 1-13.
- ¹¹⁴ Stam and Shohat (1985), p. 41.
- ¹¹⁵ See Ives (2004), p. 99.
- ¹¹⁶ Jacques Derrida, "Des tours de Babel", *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph Graham (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 165-205; Paul De Man, "'Conclusions': Walter Benjamin's 'The Task of the Translator'", *Yale French Studies*, no. 69 (1985), pp. 25-46.
- ¹¹⁷ Walter Benjamin, "The Task of the Translator" [1923], *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (London: Fontana Press, 1992), p. 75.
- ¹¹⁸ Antonio Gramsci, *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Derek Boothman (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), p. 306. Also see Ives (2004), pp. 100-108.
- ¹¹⁹ Walter Benjamin, "On Language as Such and on the Language of Man" [1916], *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, ed. Peter Demenz (New York: Schocken Books, 1978).
- ¹²⁰ Benjamin (1992), p. 69.
- ¹²¹ Gramsci (1995), p. 307.
- ¹²² See Lastra (2000), pp. 16-60.
- ¹²³ Kittler (1999), pp. 136f.
- ¹²⁴ For a reading of the phonoscope as precursor of cinema, see Mannoni (1997).
- ¹²⁵ Jacques Derrida, *La voix et le phénomène* (Paris: Presse Universitaire de France, 1967), p. 96.
- ¹²⁶ "Nouveau Phonographe de voyage", *Le Pêle-Mêle* (20 March, 1901), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- ¹²⁷ "La petite chochette", *Sans-Gêne* (24 July, 1904), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- ¹²⁸ Apollinaire (1971).
- ¹²⁹ Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces", *Diacritics* (Spring 1986), p. 24.
- ¹³⁰ Ibid., p. 26.
- ¹³¹ Gelatt (1956), p. 10.

¹³² See Jonathan Sterne, "Preserving Sound in Modern America", *Hearing History: A Reader*, ed. Mark M. Smith (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), pp. 295-298.

¹³³ G. Lenotre, "Courrier de l'exposition XV: Edison et le phonographe", *Le Monde Illustré* (17 August, 1889), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997). My trans. "Cet instrument merveilleux parle ainsi toutes les langues. Le prince Taieb-bey lui a adressé la parole en arabe, et Mistral en provençal: le phonographe a répété leur conversation avec toute les inflexions de voix et l'accent de chacun de ses interlocuteur. [...] [C]e sera pas un des moindres prodiges de l'avenir que celui de faire parler les morts."

¹³⁴ Burkhard Stangl, *Ethnologie im Ohr: Die Wirkungsgeschichte des Phonographen* (Vienna: WKV Universitätsverlag, 2000), p. 159.

¹³⁵ Lagarde (1927), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997). My trans. "transportera en plein période préhistorique."

¹³⁶ Gaston Dissandier, "Application du phonographe à la conservation du langue des indiens d'Amérique", *La nature* (26 April, 1890), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997). My trans. [...] Plusieurs des légendes enregistrées sont les plus curieuses, car elles sont entrecoupées des mots archaïques, d'imitations de cris d'animaux, jeunes et vieux, etc."

¹³⁷ Lastra (2000), pp. 138-153.

¹³⁸ See, for example, Mary Ann Doane, "The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 33-50. For an analysis of women's voices in film from a psychoanalytic perspective, see Kaja Silverman, *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press), 1988.

¹³⁹ Amy Lawrence, *Echo and Narcissus: Women's Voices in Classical Hollywood Cinema* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), p. 31. See also Anne McKay, "Speaking up: Voice Amplification and Women's Struggle for Public Expression", *Technology and Women's Voices: Keeping in Touch*, Cheris Kramarae ed. (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988), pp. 187-206

¹⁴⁰ C. E. McCluer "Telephone Operators and Operating Room Management", *American Telephone Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2 (12 July, 1902), pp. 31f. Quoted by Lana F. Rakow, "Women and the Telephone: the Gendering of a Communications Technology", *Technology and Women's Voices: Keeping in Touch*, ed. Cheris Kramarae (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988), pp. 214f.

¹⁴¹ "Une poupée Edison chez les cannibals", *Arlequin* (9 April, 1892), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).

¹⁴² For example, see *Journal de Paris* (22 May, 1902), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).

¹⁴³ Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 1993), p. 207.

¹⁴⁴ Stangl (2000), 160.

¹⁴⁶ See Erika Brady, *The Spiral Way: How the Phonograph Changed Ethnography* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999).

¹⁴⁷ Stam and Shohat (1985), pp. 35-58.

¹⁴⁸ See Hansen (1991), pp. 16ff and 183-193. See also Hansen (1985).

¹⁴⁹ Hansen (2000), p. 340

¹⁵⁰ Béla Balázs, *Schriften zum Film, Bd. 1, Der sichtbare Mensch: Kritiken und Aufsätze 1922-1926* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1982), p. 57.

¹⁵¹ Translated from Russian on the Bfi DVD-edition of *Chelovek s kino-apparatom* (1929).

- ¹⁵² Miriam Hansen (1985), pp. 321-240. See also Peter Decherney, *Hollywood and the Culture Elite: How the Movies Became American* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), pp. 14ff.
- ¹⁵³ Lilian Gish, *Dorothy and Lilian Gish* (New York: Scribner's 1973), p. 60. Quoted by Hansen (1985), p. 323.
- ¹⁵⁴ O'Brien (2005), p. 1.
- ¹⁵⁵ David Bordwell, Janet Staiger and Kristin Thompson, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), p. 298-308; Douglas Gomery, "Economic Struggle and Hollywood Imperialism: Europe Converts to Sound", *Cinema/Sound*, ed. Rick Altman, *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 80-93; Douglas Gomery, "Towards an Economic History of Cinema: The Coming of Sound to Hollywood", *The Cinematic Apparatus*, eds. Teresa de Lauretis and Stephen Heath (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 38-46.
- ¹⁵⁶ See Thomas Elsaesser, *Weimar Cinema and After: Germany's Historical Imaginary* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 129ff.
- ¹⁵⁷ For example, in Sweden, domestic film rose during the early 1930s, while foreign import diminished. See Leif Furhammar, *Stockholmspublikens biopreferenser under 1930-talet*, Institutionen för film och teatervetenskap (Stockholm University, 1990).
- ¹⁵⁸ See 'Film Europe' and 'Film America': *Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939*, eds. Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby (University of Exeter Press, 1999).
- ¹⁵⁹ For recent approaches to the impact of Tobis, see Distelmeyer, ed. (2003).
- ¹⁶⁰ Thomas Elsaesser and Malte Hagener, "Walter Ruttmann: 1929", 1929: *Beiträge zur Archäologie der Medien*, eds. Stefan Andriopoulos and Bernhard J. Dotzler (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2002), p. 329. My trans. "Nie zuvor herrschte ein solch reger Austausch von Filmen und Ideen, eine so emsige Zusammenarbeit auf der Ebene von Institutionen." An example of this transnationalism was the creation of "International Liga for independent film" at the international avant-garde congress at La Sarraz. The ambition of the Liga was to be a link "between different national organisations which are working for a practical and theoretical development of the 'commercially, politically and religiously independent film'". Quoted in: Oksana Bulgakowa, "Der Kannibalismus des Films: Eisenstein in La Sarraz", *Film und Fernsehen*, no. 1 (1988), pp. 32f.
- ¹⁶¹ Outlined by O'Brien (2005), pp. 44-52.
- ¹⁶² See forthcoming Leonardo Quaresima, "Mehrsprachenversion/Dubbing?" *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachigen Versionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006), pp. 19-38.
- ¹⁶³ Altman (1995).
- ¹⁶⁴ For instance, the early sound films of Walter Ruttmann (*Melodie der Welt*, 1929, and *Deutscher Rundfunk/Tönende Welle*, 1928) can be traced to sonic avant-garde experiments of the 1910s and the 1920s and were also distributed in other media than film. See Goergen (1989), pp. 13ff and (about *Weekend*) pp. 2ff.
- ¹⁶⁵ Altman (1995), p. 68.
- ¹⁶⁶ See, for example, Jerzy Toeplitz, *Geschichte des Films, Bd. 2, 1928-1933* (Berlin, 1976), pp. 68-82.
- ¹⁶⁷ S. M. Eisenstein, V. I. Pudovkin, G. V. Alexandrov, "A Statement" [1928], *Film Sound: Theory and Practice/Sergei Eisenstein*, eds. Elisabeth Weis and John Belton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), p. 84.
- ¹⁶⁸ Jean-Marie Pilet, "Anmerkungen zum internationalen Kongreß des Unabhängigen Films", *Festivalrekonstruktion: CICI La Sarraz, 1929* (1988) p. 212.
- ¹⁶⁹ "Du hörst ein Explosion, du siehst: das entsetzte Gesicht einer Frau. Du siehst: einen Boxkampf. Du hörst: die tobende Menge." Walter Ruttmann, *Reichsfilmblatt* (September, 1928). Quoted by Goergen (1989), p. 84 and Elsaesser/Hagener (2002), p. 338.
- ¹⁷⁰ Abel Gance, "Images of Yesterday, Voices of Tomorrow" [1930], *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology (1907-1939)*, vol. 2., 1929-1939, ed. Richard Abel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 41.

¹⁷¹ George Altman, "The Spirits of Film" [1931], *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology (1907-1939)*, vol. 2., 1929-1939, ed. Richard Abel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 83.

¹⁷² Hans Stahl, "Triumph der Photomontage/Melodie der Welt", *Der Montag Morgen*, no. 11 (18 March, 1929). My trans. "Die Geräusche der Schiffmaschine, [...] die Sirenen, das Raseln, Stampfen, Stoßen an Deck – der Tonfilm als Wochenschau, als Instrument der Reportage wird sichtbar. Hier liegen ihre Zukunftsmöglichkeiten." See also Bur [Erich Burger], "Ruttmanns Melodie der Welt" *Berliner Tageblatt*, no. 125 (14 March, 1929): "Wenn Schiffsirenen heulen, Ankerketten knarren, wenn die Melodie der Welt wirklich für Sekunden aufbraust, in Bild und Ton, dann sind erregende und faszinierende Wirkungen zu spüren, die zu Sinn und Möglichkeit des Tonfilms überzeugend eine Brücke schlagen."; Rudolf Kurtz, "Die Melodie der Welt", *Lichtbild-Bühne*, no. 61 (13 March, 1929): "Wenn Ruttmann sie [sound effects] einsetzt, sind sie von stärkster Wirkung. Das Schreien einer Masse, die Geräusche von Maschinen, das ist von außerordentlicher Wirkung."

¹⁷³ Elsaesser/Hagener (2002), p. 341. My trans. "In einem universalistischen Gestus, in dem sich die Allgemeinverständlichkeit der Massenkultur mit dem Eurozentrismus der touristischen Ethnographie verbindet, verwandelt Ruttmann zunächst eine Stadt in eine Sinfonie, danach die ganze Welt in eine Melodie."

¹⁷⁴ O'Brien (2005), p. 65.

¹⁷⁵ Marcel Pagnol, *Cinématurgie de Paris, Les Cahiers du Film* (1933-1934). Quoted by Christian Metz "The Cinema: Language or Language System", *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*, translated by Michael Taylor (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 53.

¹⁷⁶ Chion (1993), p. 77.

¹⁷⁷ Balázs (1984), p. 165.

¹⁷⁸ Balázs (1952), p. 227.

¹⁷⁹ Balázs (1984), p. 165. My trans. "Ein Beweis dafür ist, daß es uns im Tonfilm nicht stört, wenn wir unverständliche, fremde Sprachen hören [...]."

¹⁸⁰ Walter Steinthal, "Melodie der Welt" *Neue Berliner Zeitung, Das 12 Uhr Blatt*, no. 61 (Berlin, 13 March, 1929). My trans. "Es gibt sehr wenige Dinge in dieser Welt, eigentlich immer dasselbe Ding, Völkerunterschiede, Hautfarbe, rhythmische Nuancen sind Kostüm desselben Dramas, das Menschliche ist unvariabel."

¹⁸¹ Marcel Mauss, *Sociologie et Anthropologie* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1968). Mauss states (p. 477): "Enfin, une nouvelle forme de communication, de tradition, de description, d'enregistrement des choses, même les choses du sentiment et de l'habitude, deviennent universelles: c'est le cinéma." For an analysis, see Erhard Schüttpeitz, "Der Fetischismus der Nationen und die Durchlässigkeit der Zivilisationen: Globalisierung durch technische Medien bei Marcel Mauss", *Beiträge zur Archäologie der Medien*, eds. Stefan Andriopoulos and Bernhard J. Dotzler (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2002), pp. 158-172.

¹⁸² Siegfried Kracauer, "The Mass Ornament" [1923] *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*, ed. and trans. Thomas Levin (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press 1995), p. 84.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid. Kracauer states that the ornaments' "patterns are mute" in the sense that the escape meaning.

¹⁸⁵ Maurice Bardèche and Robert Brasillach, *The History of Motion Pictures*, ed. and trans., Iris Barry (New York: W. W. Norton & company, inc. and the Museum of modern art, 1938) p. 312f.

¹⁸⁶ Rudolf Arnheim, *Film als Kunst* [1932] (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag 1991), pp. 239f.

¹⁸⁷ Béla Balázs (1984), p. 165.

¹⁸⁸ Béla Balázs, *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art*, trans. Edith Bone (London: Dennis Dobson LTD, 1952), p. 227.

¹⁸⁹ Stam (1989), p. 60.

¹⁹⁰ Christopher Faulkner, "René Clair, Marcel Pagnol and the Social Dimension of Speech", *Screen*, vol. 35, no. 2 (Summer 1994), p. 166.

- ¹⁹¹ Marcel Pagnol, "The Talkie Offers the Writer New Resources" [1930], *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology (1907-1939)*, vol. 2, 1929-1939 ed. Richard Abel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 56.
- ¹⁹² Faulkner (1994), p. 164.
- ¹⁹³ Ibid., pp. 164f.
- ¹⁹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁵ Christian Metz (1991), p. 51.
- ¹⁹⁶ Olivier Barrot, *René Clair, ou, le temps mesuré* (Renens: 5 Continents, Paris: Hatier, 1985), p. 33.
- ¹⁹⁷ See R.C. Dale, *The Films of René Clair, vol. 1, Exposition and Analysis* (Metuchen, NJ and London: The Scarecrow Press Inc., 1986), pp. 140f.
- ¹⁹⁸ Michel Marie, "'Let's Sing it One More Time': René Clair's *Sous les toits de Paris*" (1930), *French Film: Texts and Contexts*, eds. Susan Hayward and Ginette Vincendeau, (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 57.
- ¹⁹⁹ Pagnol (1988), p. 56.
- ²⁰⁰ Christopher Beach, *Class, Language and American Film Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 18.
- ²⁰¹ Lastra (2000), pp. 138-153.
- ²⁰² Bakhtin (1986), pp. 60-102.
- ²⁰³ François de la Bretèque, "Images of 'Provence': Ethnotypes and Stereotypes of the South in French Cinema", *Popular European Cinema*, eds. Richard Dyer and Ginette Vincendeau (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 69.
- ²⁰⁴ Dyer (1997), p. 10.
- ²⁰⁵ Arne Lunde, "'Garbo Talks': Scandinavians in Hollywood, the Talkie Revolution, and the Crisis of Foreign Voice", *Screen Culture: History and Textuality*, ed. John Fullerton (Eastleigh: John Libbey, 2004) p. 22.
- ²⁰⁶ André Bazin, "The Case of Marcel Pagnol" [1959], *Bazin at Work: Major Essays and Reviews from the Forties and the Fifties*, ed. Bert Cardullo (New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 54f.
- ²⁰⁷ Claudette Peyrusse, *Le cinéma méridionale: Le Midi dans le cinéma français 1929-1944* (Toulouse: Eché, 1986), pp. 23ff.
- ²⁰⁸ The relation between speech as construction of an ethnic stereotype and an inevitable trace of an individual body is also revealed Raimu's famous acting style, constantly shifting from the exaggerated to sober realism, from the aesthetics of theatre to sound cinema. See Ginette Vincendeau, "In the Name of the Father: Marcel Pagnol's 'Trilogy': *Marius* (1931), *Fanny* (1932), *César* (1936)", *French Film: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Susan Hayward and Ginette Vincendeau (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 73.
- ²⁰⁹ Dyer (1997), p. 49.
- ²¹⁰ Ibid., p. 44-49.
- ²¹¹ Vincendeau (1990), p. 73.
- ²¹² Raimu's speech as a fusion between his on and off-screen "persona" has remained one of his most important characteristics, and it is emphasised in biographies about the actor. An example is Daniel Lacotte, *Raimu: Biographie* (Paris: Editions Ramsay, 1988), in which a chapter is entitled "Je parle comme à la maison" (p. 101).
- ²¹³ Marcel Pagnol, *Confidences, mémoires* (Paris: Julliard, 1981). Pagnol (p. 161) quotes Raimu: "C'est toujours très difficile de prendre l'accent marseillais dans un rôle si long. Pour un Alsacien protestant de la Comédie Française, c'est impossible."
- ²¹⁴ Significantly, the project of writing a "universal film history" emerges in this period. See Bernard Eisenschitz, "Die Utopie einer Weltfilmgeschichte: Französische Ansätze der Filmhistoriografie", *Recherche: Film: Quellen und Methoden der Filmforschung*, eds. Hans-Michael Bock and Wolfgang Jacobsen (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1997), pp. 120-130.
- ²¹⁵ Bardèche and Brasillach (1938), p. 325.
- ²¹⁶ The nationalism and the suspicious attitude towards the foreign in Bardèche and Brasillach's writing on film, is due to political nationalist and fascist political climate in Europe of the 1930s in which the two writers take part. See Alice Yaeger Kaplan, *Reproductions of*

Banality: Fascism, Literature, and French Intellectual Life (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).

²¹⁷ For the bi-lingual question in Switzerland, see Rié Kitada, "Chacun parle sa langue: de la naissance du parlant international à l'essor du cinéma Suisse multilingue", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), p. 103-121; Rié Kitada, "L'exploitation et la réception des films à Lausanne (Suisse) au moment du passage du muet au parlant: Une histoire de la naissance des sous-titres (v.o.) et du doublage (v.f.)", *CineMagaziNet! Online Research Journal of Cinema*, no. 4 (8 September, 2000). About the same issue in Luxembourg, see Paul Lesch, "The Transition from Silent to Sound Film in a Small Multilingual Country: Luxembourg as a Case Study", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 6 (Spring, 2005), pp. 42-54.

²¹⁸ For example, Elia, "Lettre d'Alsace-Lorraine: Les salles sonorisées, le problème bilingue", *La cinématographie française*, no. 625 (25 October, 1930); Roger Klingelsmitt, "En Alsace: Il faut surtaxer les films allemands et détaxer les films français", *La cinématographie française*, no. 696 (5 March, 1932).

²¹⁹ M. Colin-Reval, "Des Films pour Alsace", *La cinématographie française*, no. 631 (6 December, 1930), p. 7.

²²⁰ Charles Hahn, "La question bilingue en Alsace: Deux avis différents", *La cinématographie française*, no. 609 (5 July, 1930). My trans. "[...] tout docement vers le chemin de la langue nationale [...]."

²²¹ For example, in an article in *La cinématographie française*, *Kameradschaft* is mentioned as an example of international success for French talking pictures: Pierre Autré, "L'exportation des films parlants français à l'étranger", *La cinématographie française*, no. 660 (27 June, 1931): "La seule solution est actuellement une combinaison franco-allemande, comme celle qui permet de faire La tragédie de la mine en français par G.F.F.A. et en allemand par Nero-Film."

²²² Bálazs (1984), p. 165.

²²³ Bardèche and Brasillach (1938), p. 311.

²²⁴ Wahl (2005) describes the polyglot film as a transhistorical "genre", pp. 144f.

²²⁵ There are however subtitles in contemporary screenings of this film (for example as the film was shown by Arte), which undermines the interests in the bi-lingual structure of the film.

²²⁶ Ginette Vincendeau, "Les films en version multiples un échec édifiant", *Le passage du muet au parlant: Panorama mondial de la production cinématographique, 1925-1935*, ed. Christian Belaygue (Toulouse: Editions Milan, 1988), p. 31.

²²⁷ See Chion (1993), pp. 64-67.

²²⁸ Many films of the 1930s feature "telephonic" intrigues; for example, in *Grand Hotel* (Edmund Goulding, 1932) the telephone nearly takes the role of Garbo's absent lover, in *Bride of Frankenstein* (James Whale, 1935) the doctor invents a telephone-like machine in order to communicate with the monster's victims, and in *Reaching for the Moon* (Edmund Goulding, 1930), Douglas Fairbanks falls in love with an absent laughter on the other side of the line.

²²⁹ For the gender implications of telephony, see McKay (1988); Rakow (1988).

²³⁰ See Rick Altman, "The Technology of the Voice", *Iris: La parole au cinéma/Speech in Film*, no. 1 (Spring 1985), pp. 3-20.

²³¹ Jan Olsson, "Framing Silent Calls: Coming to Cinematographic Terms with Telephony", *Allegories of Communication: Intermedial Concerns from Cinema to the Digital*, eds. John Fullerton and Jan Olsson (Rome: John Libbey Publishing, 2004), pp. 157-192.

²³² *La cinématographie française*, no. 692 (6 February, 1932). My trans. "La Tragédie de la mine s'adresse autant à un public sélectionné qu'à la foule immense des hommes du monde entier",

²³³ *Film-Kurier* no. 269 (10 December, 1931), quoted by Wahl (2005), p. 149. My trans. "Das Vorbeireden, Mißverstehen, Mißtrauen und eine Trennung, die nur die gemeinsame Not überwindet."

²³⁴ Elsaesser (2005), p. 35-57.

²³⁵ Elsaesser (2005), p. 72.

²³⁶ Eco (1995), p. 351.

²³⁷ Barthes (1996), p. 188.

²³⁸ Victoria de Garzia, "Americanism for Export", *Wedge*, no. 7-8 (Winter/Spring, 1985), p. 73. Quoted by Hansen (2000), p. 341. Also see Victoria de Garzia, "Mass Culture and Sovereignty: The American Challenge to European Cinemas, 1920-1960", *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 61, no. 1 (March, 1989), pp. 53-87.

²³⁹ Alf Lütke, Inge MarBolek and Adelheid von Saldern, "Einleitung: Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts", *Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, eds. Alf Lütke, Inge MarBolek and Adelheid von Saldern (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996) pp. 7f.

²⁴⁰ Miriam Hansen, "America, Paris and the Alps: Kracauer and Benjamin on Cinema and Modernity", *Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum in Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, eds. Alf Lütke, Inge MarBolek and Adelheid von Saldern (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996), p. 168.

²⁴¹ Quoted by Elsaesser, 2005. p. 43 (from the Channel 4 program "Pictures of Europe", 1992).

²⁴² Saunders (1994), p. 224

²⁴³ Thomas J. Saunders, *Hollywood in Berlin: American Cinema and Weimar Germany* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1994), p. 225

²⁴⁴ Gong, "Die Arche Noah", *Deutsche Republik*, no. 3 (1929), p. 1452. Quoted by Saunders (1994), p. 227.

²⁴⁵ Saunders (1994), p. 230. (Hans Spielhofer, "Hoffnung auf Film als Gesamtkunstwerk", *Deutsche Filmzeitung*, 17 May, 1929.)

²⁴⁶ "Show Boat", *Bioscope* (10 April, 1929).

²⁴⁷ "Close Harmony", *Kine Weekly* (16 May, 1929).

²⁴⁸ "Sony Boy", *Bioscope* (1 May, 1929), pp. 31f.

²⁴⁹ "Noah's Ark", *Kine Weekly* (21 March, 1929).

²⁵⁰ Donald Crafton, *The Talkies: American Cinema's Transition to Sound, 1926-1931, History of the American Cinema* ed. Charles Harpole (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1999), p. 456.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 456-459.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 459.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 460ff.

²⁵⁴ For the notion of the American "melting pot" as overall "white" identity, see Dyer (1997), p. 19.

²⁵⁵ The objective of an "international film" was, with Erich Pommer's words to "find subjects, motives and happenings which are of typically local character" with "thoughts and events which will equally impress the feeling and thinking of all nations and countries", Erich Pommer, "The International Picture: A Lesson on Simplicity" [1928], *'Film Europe' and 'Film America': Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939*, eds. Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby (University of Exeter Press, 1999), p. 392f.

²⁵⁶ For example, see Celcius [Carl von Ossietzky], "Der Film gegen Heinrich Mann" [1930] *Der blaue Engel: Drehbuchentwürfe*, eds. Luise Dirscherl and Gunther Nickel (St Ingbert: Röhrig Universitätsverlag, 2000). Celcius claims (p. 9) that "*Der blaue Engel* hat mit Heinrich Manns *Professor Unrat* so wenig zu tun wie der amerikanische Sintflut-film mit der richtigen Sintflut." See also Rudolf Arnheim, "Josef von Sternberg" [1934], *Sternberg*, ed. Peter Baxter, (BFI 1980), pp. 35-41. Also in later interpretations of the film after, this theme has dominated (however, from a different perspective). For instance, in Lotte Eisner's and Siegfried Kracauer's post-war classical readings, respectively, *Der blaue Engel* emerges as a Weimar film par excellence, a film displaying a "German chiaroscuro" (*The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt* [1952], Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973, p. 314) and "German immaturity" (*From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* [1947] Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974, p. 218). In more recent scholarship, the "Germanness" of *Der blaue Engel* has been questioned repeatedly, by, for example, Gertrud Koch and Andrew

Sarris. See Gertrud Koch, "Between Two Worlds: von Sternberg's *The Blue Angel*", *German Film and Literature: Adaptations and Transformations*, ed. Eric Rentschler (New York: Methuen, 1986), pp. 60-72; Andrew Sarris, *The Films of Josef von Sternberg* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1966).

²⁵⁷ Marlene Dietrich, *Marlène D.* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1984), p. 66; My trans. "[...] ce langage coloré, imagé, utilisé par les petits gens des quartiers populaires de Berlin."

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 10f.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

²⁶¹ Stam and Shohat (1985), p.53.

²⁶² See, for instance, Georges Sadoul, *Le cinéma: son art, sa technique, son économie* (Paris: La Bibliothèque Française, 1948), p 221.

²⁶³ Alexandre Arnoux, "L'Anglais: langue internationale du cinéma", *Pour Vous*, no. 66 (20 February, 1930). My trans. "[...] prononcée [...] avec l'accent yankee."

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.* My trans. "Les États-Unis nous battent sur notre propre terrain. Nous nous soumettons grammaticalement: nous rédigeons [...] dans le dialecte des vainqueurs, les termes de la capitulation."

²⁶⁵ J. Smile, *Pour Vous*, no. 32 (27 June, 1929), reprinted Roger Icart, *La révolution du parlant, vue par la presse française* (Perpignan: Institut Jean Vigo, 1988), pp. 300f. My translation: "Of course, ce n'est pas la langue de Shakespeare ou celle, plus récente, de Tomas Hardy, ou encore celle d'un gentleman de Londres mais c'est l'une des qualités les plus attachantes de *Broadway Melody*. [...] C'est exactement comme si on se trouvait de plein pied avec des américains, qui sans doute hurlent 'Gosh' quand leur coeur leur dicte."

²⁶⁶ Richard W. McCormick, *Gender and Sexuality in Weimar Modernity: Film, Literature and New Objectivity* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 152-157.

²⁶⁷ See Elisabeth Bronfen, *Heimweh: Illusionsspiele in Hollywood* (Berlin: Volk & Welt, 1999), pp. 17-19.

²⁶⁸ These German insults are observed by Wahl (2005), p. 176.

²⁶⁹ Quoted by Mario Quagnolo, "Le cinéma bâillonné: le massacre des films étrangers en Italie au début du parlant", *Le passage du muet au parlant: panorama mondial de la production cinématographique 1925-1935*, eds. Christian Belaygue (Toulouse: Éditions Milan, 1988), p. 42. My trans. "[...] ne sera plus accordée l'autorisation de projeter des films qui contiennent un *dialogue en langue étrangère* même dans une *toute petite mesure*."

²⁷⁰ Even if the European perspective is my main focus, I have chosen to present material from *Variety* since this chapter has a more general approach to speech and media, and that *Variety*, reflecting Hollywood's fast conversion to sound, gives insightful information on the part-talkie phenomenon.

²⁷¹ Pierre Billard, for example, describes the French initial "defeat" during the introduction of sound (*L'âge classique du cinéma français: Du cinéma parlant à la Nouvelle Vague* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995) pp. 19-39.

²⁷² For example, Barnier (2002) or Müller (2003).

²⁷³ Recent scholarship has often placed focus on sound in the "silent" era, see for instance: *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001); Müller (2003), pp. 85-107; *Le muet à la parole: cinéma et performances à l'aube du XXe siècle*, eds. de Giusy Pisano and Valérie Pozner (Paris: AFRHC, 2005).

²⁷⁴ Chion (1993), pp. 20ff.

²⁷⁵ Michel Chion, *Un art sonore, le cinéma: histoire, esthétique, poétique* (Paris: Cahiers du Cinéma, 2003), p. 11.

²⁷⁶ Bazin (2000), pp. 19-25.

²⁷⁷ The term comes from the early days when titles were more like chapter headings to different scenes or acts in the film, consequently *subordinated* to the main *title*, and therefore a "subtitle".

- ²⁷⁸ André Gaudreault, "Des cris du bonimenteur aux chuchotements des intertitres...", *Scrittura e immagine: la didascalia nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima, (Udine: Forum, 1997), pp. 53-64.
- ²⁷⁹ The explanatory intertitles are also a representation of speech, i.e. in the sense that literature and writing as such is perceived as an image of a speaking voice. In most cases, explanatory title can be understood as a narrating voice that talks directly to the audience on a non-diegetic level. The dialogue title on the other hand is diegetic and corresponds to the talking situation embodied in the film narrative itself.
- ²⁸⁰ Goodman (1976), p. 113.
- ²⁸¹ François Jost, Unpublished paper at *Film and its Multiples* (Spring School, Gradisca, 2002); Marie-France Chambat-Houillon, "Entre le même et l'autre: la place de l'auteur", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal* (Spring 2005), pp. 17-32.
- ²⁸² Since Jost's reading was based on only one or two sources, the interesting aspect is not the results but the semiotic approach.
- ²⁸³ Metz (1991), p. 51. See also Jean Mitry, *La sémiologie en question: langage et cinéma* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1987), pp. 161ff.
- ²⁸⁴ Jacques de Baroncelli, "Les sous-titres sont-ils nécessaires?", *Écrits sur le cinéma: Suivi de mémoires*, ed. Bernard Bastide (Perpignan: Collection Jean Vigo, 1996), pp. 57f. My trans. "[P]ourquoi, lorsqu'on a la lumière et le mouvement, l'action et la vie, il reste nécessaire de recourir à la parole écrite [...]"
- ²⁸⁵ This argument is part of the advocating of "silent film" based on "musical" model in a French film context of the 1910s. See, François Jost, "The Voices of Silence", *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), pp. 48-56.
- ²⁸⁶ See Irmbert Schenk, "'Titelloser Film' im deutschen Kino der Zwanziger Jahre", *Scrittura e immagine: la didascalia nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima, (Udine: Forum 1997), pp. 225-246.
- ²⁸⁷ Translated from Russian on the Bfi DVD-edition of the film.
- ²⁸⁸ Rudolf Arnheim, *Film als Kunst* [1932] (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1974), p. 324.
- ²⁸⁹ Rudolf Arnheim, "The New Laocoön", *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, eds. Elisabeth Weis and John Belton (Columbia University Press 1985), pp. 114f.
- ²⁹⁰ Louis Delluc, "La Parole", *Écrits cinématographiques I, Le cinéma des cinéastes* (Paris: Cinémathèque française, 1985), pp. 58f. My trans. "L'ennuyeux c'est que le spectateur voit sur l'écran le mouvement des lèvres. Il entend parler les comédiens."
- ²⁹¹ Balázs (1982), p. 69. My trans. "Sobald uns aber das Akustische einfällt, weil wir sehen, wie der Mund die Vokale formt, dann ist es mit der mimischen Wirkung aus. Dann merken wir erst, daß wir den Schauspieler nicht hören, was uns bisher nicht aufgefallen ist [...]"
- ²⁹² This has been pointed out to me by Thomas Elsaesser. My own ability to "read" silent speech is however limited and I am not able to give any exact examples.
- ²⁹³ Isabelle Raynauld, "Dialogues in Early Silent Screen Plays: What Actors Really Said", *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), p. 69.
- ²⁹⁴ Balázs (1952), p. 227.
- ²⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 183.
- ²⁹⁶ See David Bordwell, Janet Staiger and Kristin Thompson, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960* (London: Routledge, 1985), pp. 183-189.
- ²⁹⁷ Philippe Dubois, "L'écriture figurale dans le cinéma muet des années 20", *Scrittura e immagine: la didascalia nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima, (Udine: Forum, 1997), p. 72. My trans. "La figure opère à la fois dans l'ordre du lisible (ou elle définit un régime de signification que j'appelle le 'figuré'), du visible (ou elle définit ce que je nommerais le 'figuratif') et de quelque chose d'autre [...] que je désignerais comme le 'figurale'."
- ²⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 73 My trans. "[...]expérience passant par la matière imageante de l'oeuvre."
- ²⁹⁹ See Crafton (1997), pp. 168-174.
- ³⁰⁰ See Icart (1988), p. 110.

- ³⁰¹ Pierre Leprohon, "'Talkie' devenu muet pour l'Europe", *Pour Vous* (4 July, 1929). My trans. "Devant *Le chant d'amour*, le spectateur le mois averti soupçonne que cette bande muette cache un 'talkie'. [...] [L]a version muette nous propose quelques remarques sur un genre avec lequel nous devons désormais compter: le film parlant américaine européanisé par le silence. On sait que de nombreux producteurs d'Hollywood tournent fréquemment deux versions pour des besoins d'exportation. Cela nous donnera une forme d'hybride [...]. Le silence que nous aimons encore nous paraîtra faux par la suite de l'abus des scènes dialoguées figurant dans la véritable versions. [...] On pourrait appeler *Le chant d'amour* un film de transition."
- ³⁰² W., "Quand le 'Chanteur de jazz' était muet", *Pour Vous* (24 January, 1929). My trans. "Nous n'entendons pas sa voix, mais son visage la fait pressentir."
- ³⁰³ Louis Saurel, "Ce que pense le public parisien des films parlants", *Cinéma* no. 49 (26 September, 1929). My trans. "Nous entendons alors un dialogue entre deux artistes. Soudain, une porte s'ouvre; le père de Jackie paraît. Subitement, on n'entend plus le moindre de parole".
- ³⁰⁴ Ibid., My trans. "Pourquoi avoir coupé ce dialogue au moment le plus intéressant?"
- ³⁰⁵ See *Variety* (8 May, 1929).
- ³⁰⁶ "The perfect crime", *Variety* (8 August, 1928)
- ³⁰⁷ Rick Altman, "Films sonores/cinéma muet ou Comment le cinéma hollywoodien apprit à parler et à se taire", *Cinégraphie*, no. 6 (1993), pp. 137-158.
- ³⁰⁸ Müller (2003), pp. 278ff.
- ³⁰⁹ Altman (1995), p. 68. My trans. "Non seulement *Le Chanteur du Jazz* n'est pas le premier parlant, mais tout le monde ne le considère même pas comme un film. [...] Selon John S. Sprago, critique de Exhibitor's Herald, *Le Chanteur du Jazz* n'est guère un film; c'est bien plutôt un enregistrement d'une demi-douzaine de chansons d'Al Jolson sur disque Vitaphone agrandi (15 October, 1927)."
- ³¹⁰ "The perfect crime", *Variety* (8 August, 1928).
- ³¹¹ "The Last Warning", *Variety* (8 January, 1929).
- ³¹² "Girl Overboard", *Variety* (14 August, 1929).
- ³¹³ Lastra (2000), p. 148.
- ³¹⁴ Crafton (1997), p. 172.
- ³¹⁵ Barnier (2002), pp. 54-58. Barnier claims that Crafton's example is historically inaccurate and that the film is an anachronistic mix between a silent and a talking version. (Barnier, 2002, pp. 57f).
- ³¹⁶ Valérie Pozner, "Les cartons du parlant: Quelques cas d'expérience soviétiques d'intertitres dans des films sonores du début des années trente", *1895*, no. 40 (July 2003), pp. 41-57.
- ³¹⁷ See Valérie Pozner, "La dimension littéraire des intertitres dans le cinéma muet soviétique", *Scrittura e immagine: la didascalia nel cinema muto*, *Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima, (Udine: Forum, 1997), pp. 220f.
- ³¹⁸ See, for example, Chion (1993), pp. 29-39.
- ³¹⁹ Rick Altman, "Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 67-79.
- ³²⁰ Doane (1980).
- ³²¹ See Thomas Elsaesser, "'Going live' – Körper und Stimme im frühen Tonfilm am Beispiel von *Das Lied einer Nacht*", *Zauber der Bohème: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 271-298.
- ³²² Lastra (2000), p. 149.
- ³²³ Ibid.
- ³²⁴ The term "contract" is introduced by Michel Chion, *L'Audio-vision* (Paris: Nathan, 1990), p. 5.
- ³²⁵ Malte Hagener (2004), pp. 102-116.
- ³²⁶ Gelatt (1956), p. 10.
- ³²⁷ Theorised by Roland Barthes in *La chambre claire: note sur la photographie* (Paris: Gallimard Seuil, 1980).
- ³²⁸ DVD-commentary track by Scott MacQueen, Milestone Edition, 2003.

- ³²⁹ See, for example “This Star Can’t have his Picture in the Papers! Famous ‘Forbidden Face’ Contract bars Chaney’s ‘Ghost’ Photos”. Published press material reprinted in: *The Phantom of the Opera: The Classic Silents*, vol. 1, Philip J. Riley (Absecon, NJ: MagicImage Film-books, 1999), p. 222.
- ³³⁰ Ibid. pp. 289f.
- ³³¹ “The Phantom of the Opera, sound re-issue”, *Variety* (12 February, 1930).
- ³³² Kittler (1990), pp. 265-273.
- ³³³ Olsson (2004), pp. 167ff.
- ³³⁴ Bordwell, Staiger, Thompson (1985), p. 188.
- ³³⁵ This is discussed by Friedrich Kittlers in his interpretation of the typewriter. See Kittler (1999), pp. 183-263.
- ³³⁶ For an analysis of the “modern” in the UFA operetta (and in particular *Die Drei von der Tankstelle*), see Leonardo Quaresima, “Tankstelle und Hinterhof: ‘Genre’-Entwicklung und Modernisierungsprogramm”, *Als die Filme singen lernten: Innovation und Tradition im Musikfilm 1928-1938* eds. Malte Hagener and Jan Hans (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1999), pp. 61-71.
- ³³⁷ See Eric Rentschler, “Mountains and Modernity: Relocating Der Bergfilm”, *New German Critique*, no. 51 (1990), pp. 137-161.
- ³³⁸ Sterne (2003), pp. 154-177.
- ³³⁹ Ibid., p. 138.
- ³⁴⁰ Tom Gunning elaborates the figure of the trace of the hand also by pointing out how Lang labels himself as *Handwerker*. See Gunning (2000), pp. 1ff.
- ³⁴¹ Walter Benjamin, “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” [1936], *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (London: Fontana Press, 1992), pp. 211-244. Benjamin notes (p. 213) that “photography freed the hand of the most important artistic functions which henceforth developed only upon the eye looking into a lens”.
- ³⁴² Lastra (2000), p. 150.
- ³⁴³ The use of synthetic sound in order to expose the synaesthetical relation between sound and image follows Fischinger’s earlier interest in the graphic aspects of writing, for instance, by an installation of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* as a visual object, as “a graphic absolute expression”, or his work with special effects by writing on the photographic image (most famously in Fritz Lang’s *Frau im Mond*, 1929). For the notion of writing as “graphic absolute expression”, see Oskar Fischinger, “My Statements are in My Work” [1947], William Moritz, *Optical Poetry, The Life and Work of Oskar Fischinger* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004), p. 173.
- ³⁴⁴ Thomas Levin, “Töne aus dem Nichts: Rudolf Pfenninger und die Archäologie des synthetischen Tons”, *Zwischen Rauschen und Offenbarung: Zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Stimme*, eds. Friedrich Kittler, Thomas Macho and Siegrid Wiegel (Berlin: AkademieVerlag, 2002), pp. 313-355.
- ³⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 313ff.
- ³⁴⁶ See, for instance, *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph F. Graham (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985).
- ³⁴⁷ Philip E. Lewis, “The Measure of Translation Effects”, *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph F. Graham (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 36.
- ³⁴⁸ Benjamin (1992), p. 75.
- ³⁴⁹ Stam and Shohat (1985); Stam (1989), pp. 68-77.
- ³⁵⁰ Stam and Shohat (1985), p. 47.
- ³⁵¹ Leonardo Quaresima, “Versions multiples/Doublage?”, *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 13-28.
- ³⁵² For example Joseph Garncarz’s reading of the subtitling, dubbing and version making as responses to different cultural predispositions. See forthcoming Joseph Garncarz, “Untertitel, Sprachversion, Synchronisation: Die Suche nach optimalen Übersetzungsverfahren”, *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachigenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 9-18.

- ³⁵³ See *Translation, History and Culture*, eds. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere (New York: Pinter 1990); *Les transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels*, ed. Yves Gambier (Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996); *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*, ed. Andre Lefevere (New York: Routledge, 1992).
- ³⁵⁴ Bassnett and Lefevere (1990), p. 12.
- ³⁵⁵ Antje Ascheid, "Speaking Tongues: Voice Dubbing in Cinema as Cultural Ventriloquism", *The Velvet Light Trap*, no. 40 (Fall 1997), p. 32.
- ³⁵⁶ Stam (1989), p. 68.
- ³⁵⁷ Ascheid (1997), p. 32.
- ³⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 31.
- ³⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 32.
- ³⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 35.
- ³⁶¹ Steiner (1992), p. 49.
- ³⁶² Jan Ivarsson, *Subtitling for the Media: A Handbook of an Art* (Stockholm: Transedit, 1992), pp. 46-51.
- ³⁶³ Candace Whitman-Linsen, *Through the Dubbing Glass: The Synchronization of American Motion Pictures into German, French and Spanish* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992), p. 20.
- ³⁶⁴ For subtitling, see Ivarsson (1992), pp. 46-51. About strict synchronisation fidelity in dubbing, see István Fodor, *Film Dubbing. Phonetic, Semiotic, Esthetic and Psychological Aspects* (Hamburg: Buske, 1976).
- ³⁶⁵ Abé Mark Nornes, "For an Abusive Subtitling", *Film Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 3 (Spring, 1999), pp. 17-34. Nornes notes (p. 17) that "in the 1990s we are witnessing the emergence of a new form of subtitling which is by nature positively *abusive*."
- ³⁶⁶ Trinh T., Minh-Ha, *Framer Framed* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), p. 102. Quoted by Nornes (1999) p. 18.
- ³⁶⁷ Simon Laks, *Le sous-titrage de films, sa technique, son esthétique* (1957), p. 12 "Il est souhaitable que la traduction corresponde exactement au fragment de texte prononcé durant l'apparition du sous-titre. Nous verrons par la suite que ce n'est pas toujours possible. Par contre, ce qui est absolument obligatoire, c'est que l'apparition du sous-titre se produit simultanément (en synchronisme) avec la première syllabe du texte parlé, et sa disparation simultanément avec la dernière syllabe du même texte."
- ³⁶⁸ Stam (1989), p. 61.
- ³⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 68.
- ³⁷⁰ Laks (1957), p. 32. My trans. "Il est donc expressivement recommandé aux repéreurs de ne jamais faire chevaucher un même sous-titre sur deux plans 'cut' [...]."
- ³⁷¹ Ivarsson (1992), p. 47.
- ³⁷² Ibid., p. 51.
- ³⁷³ Laks (1957), p. 24.
- ³⁷⁴ J. Dietmar Müller, *Die Übertragung fremdsprachlichen Filmmaterials: eine Untersuchung zu sprachlichen und außersprachlichen Einflußfaktoren, Rahmenbedingungen, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen* (Ph.D. diss., Regensburg, 1982). Quoted by Whitman-Linsen (1992), p. 21.
- ³⁷⁵ Whitman-Linsen (1992), p. 21. Also see Otto Hesse-Quack, *Der Übertragungsprozeß bei der Synchronisation von Filmen: Eine interkulturelle Untersuchung* (Munich, Basel: Ernst Reinhardt, 1969), p. 99.
- ³⁷⁶ Fragmentary subtitles are, however, rare. For a discussion with Claire Denis about these kinds of experimental titles, see Atom Egoyan, "Outside myself – Claire Denis interviewed by Atom Egoyan", *Subtitles: On the Foreignness of Film*, eds. Atom Egoyan and Ian Balfour (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press Ltd, 2004), pp. 67-78.
- ³⁷⁷ Rick Altman (1995), pp. 65-74.
- ³⁷⁸ Nataša Đurovičová, "Local Ghosts: Dubbing Bodies in Early Sound Cinema", *Il film e i suoi multipli/Film and Its Multiples, IX Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul cinema*, ed. Anna Antonini (Udine: Forum, 2003), p. 84.
- ³⁷⁹ For example, the different standpoints of the Swedish debate are resumed in "Ljudet ska vara prickat över i'et", *Filmjournalen*, no. 10-11 (24 May, 1931), p. 30.

- ³⁸⁰ Saurel (1929). My trans. "Je trouve qu'il est vraiment pénible d'écouter ce que disent les acteurs et de lire en même temps la traduction de ses paroles sur l'écran, affirma avec force un spectateur. Oh! Oui, c'est fatigant et cela nuit à l'émotion, répliqua un monsieur âgé aux cheveux grisonnants."
- ³⁸¹ "Om filmtexter", *Biografägaren*, vol. 6, no. 13 (12 September, 1931), p. 35. My trans. "Innan aktören hunnit komma med sin replik har textförfattaren levererat den [...] och publikens skratt - om det under sådana förhållanden blir något - kommer ett gott stycke för tidigt."
- ³⁸² "Gabbo le Ventriloque (The Great Gabbo)", *La cinématographie française*, no. 653 (9 May, 1931).
- ³⁸³ See Altman, "Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism" (1980).
- ³⁸⁴ "Hors du Gouffre (The man who came back)", *La cinématographie française* (5 November, 1931).
- ³⁸⁵ Raymond Berner, "Le vrai point faible des films étrangers doublés", *La cinématographie française*, no. 673 (26 September, 1931). Berner notes: "Les films parlés étaient plus 'récités' que 'parlés', comme sur la scène, avec emphase [...]. [...] cette souplesse de l'élocution est la chose qui manque le plus au 'doublage'."
- ³⁸⁶ George Lewin, "Dubbing and its Relation to Sound Picture Production", *Journal of the Society of Motion Picture*, vol. 16, no. 1 (January 1931), p. 48.
- ³⁸⁷ René Lehmann, "A propos du 'dubbing'", *Pour Vous*, no. 133 (4 January, 1931). My trans. "[...] la possibilité de 'choisir' librement le timbre de la voix d'un interprète [...]" "[...] corriger les défaillances de la nature et donner à un acteur cette chose rare qu'est 'la voix de son physique'."
- ³⁸⁸ X, "La pente (Dance, Fools, Dance)", *La cinématographie française*, no. 685 (19 December, 1931).
- ³⁸⁹ Pierre Autré, "Attention au dubbing! Le mauvais dubbing doit être impitoyablement condamné car il chasse les spectateurs", *La cinématographie française*, no. 691 (30 January, 1932). Concerning *La Résurrection* and *Ourang*, it is stated: "On a, dans ces films, évité dans le montage français les premiers plans et souvent on entend les personnages parler sans les voir [...]."
- ³⁹⁰ See Ivarsson (1992), pp. 16f.
- ³⁹¹ At the Berlin screening of the sound and silent versions of the film, a survey took place. From 1800 invited spectators, 685 voted for the silent version, while 439 voted for the sound version. See *Der Film der Weimarer Republik: Ein Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Kritik, 1929*, ed. Gero Gandert (Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), p. 793.
- ³⁹² Kitada (2000), pp. 18 ff.
- ³⁹³ Ibid., p. 19.
- ³⁹⁴ "Hallelujah", *Gazette de Lausanne* (20 March, 1931) My trans. "[...] la version actuelle, sonore et chanté en anglais avec sous-titres français et allemands", and "entièrement parlé en anglais avec quelques mots de texte allemand en surimpression".
- ³⁹⁵ For example, in her reading of the cultural resistance of subtitling in France Martine Danan does not take into account that what was termed subtitling, i.e. intertitling, only translated a fragment of the dialogue. See "A la Recherche d'une stratégie internationale: Hollywood et le marché français des années trente", *Les transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels*, ed. Yves Gambier (Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996), pp. 113-117).
- ³⁹⁶ Kitada (2000), pp. 14f.
- ³⁹⁷ Ibid. p. 16.
- ³⁹⁸ See Danan (1996), p. 115; Icart (1988), pp. 110f.
- ³⁹⁹ Hansen (1985), p. 329. Hansen refers to Mary Heaton Vorse, "Some Picture Show Audiences", *The Outlook*, no. 97 (24 June, 1911).
- ⁴⁰⁰ See "The King of Jazz", *Variety* (7 January, 1931).
- ⁴⁰¹ Jean Lenauter, "Deux films musicaux: 'Le chemin du paradis' et 'La féerie du Jazz'", *Pour Vous*, no. 100 (16 October, 1930).

- ⁴⁰² Yves Gambier, "La traduction audiovisuelle – un nouveau genre?", *Les transferts linguistiques dans les medias audiovisuels*, ed. Yves Gambier (Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996), pp. 8ff.
- ⁴⁰³ Pierre Autré, "L'Exportation des films parlants français à l'étranger", *La cinématographie française*, no. 660, (27 June, 1931). My trans. "peu bavard, avec de l'action, du mouvement, beaucoup de musique et de chansons".
- ⁴⁰⁴ Jeanpaul Goergen, "Lebenswahrheit im Musikfilm: René Clair's *Sous les toits de Paris*", *Als die Filme singen lernten: Innovation und Tradition im Musikfilm 1928-1938*, eds. Malte Hagener and Jan Hans (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1999), p. 78.
- ⁴⁰⁵ Advertising, DIF-archive, Goergen (1999), p. 80.
- ⁴⁰⁶ Ďurovičová (2003), pp. 85ff.
- ⁴⁰⁷ Ascheid (1997), p. 32.
- ⁴⁰⁸ Hansen (2000).
- ⁴⁰⁹ Massimiliano Gaudiosi, "Which Mabuse? Multiple Bodies, Multiple Voices", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 95-102.
- ⁴¹⁰ "Miss Europa", *Kinematograph*, vol. 24, no. 187 (12 August, 1930), "Es geht eben nicht an, einen französischen gesprochenen Dialog später hin mit deutschen Worten synchronisieren zu wollen." Quoted and trans. by Hagener (2004), p. 106.
- ⁴¹¹ -go, "Miss Europa", *Reichfilmsblatt*, vol. 8, no. 33 (16 August, 1930). Quoted and trans. by Hagener (2004), p. 106. "Gespielt wird französisch, gesprochen wird Deutsch mit mäßiger Redekunst."
- ⁴¹² Balázs (1952), pp. 228f.
- ⁴¹³ Advertisement in *La cinématographie française*, no. 578 (30 November, 1929).
- ⁴¹⁴ On the transnational in *Prix de beauté*, see Hagener (2004), pp. 106ff.
- ⁴¹⁵ "Défense de doubler – un film UFA n'est PAS un film doublé", *La cinématographie française*, no. 702 (16 August, 1932).
- ⁴¹⁶ Ďurovičová (2003), pp. 93ff.
- ⁴¹⁷ For this discussion on American dubbing, see: P.A.H., "Dubbing ou contingentement", *La cinématographie française*, no. 697 (12 March, 1932); Pierre Autré, "Pourquoi dénigrer le dubbing? On ferait mieux de l'utiliser en France", *La cinématographie française*, no. 687-688 (2-9 January, 1932); "A propos du doublage: N.C.F. Tavano, Général de Synchro-Ciné, nous adresse la lettre ici-dessous", *La cinématographie française*, no. 696 (5 March, 1932); Jean Toulout, Philippe Hériot, (Délégués de l'Union des Artistes), "L'Union des artistes contre le doublage", *La cinématographie française*, no. 696 (5 March, 1932); LUX, "Le dubbing en Allemagne", *La cinématographie française*, no. 697 (12 March, 1932); Marcel Colin-Reval, "Contingentement, dubbing et accords franco-allemands", *La cinématographie française*, no. 698 (19 March, 1932); Georges Carrière, "Today's trade position in France", *La cinématographie française*, no. 699 (March, 1932).
- ⁴¹⁸ Chamine, "Jeunes filles en uniforme", *Pour Vous*, no. 179 (21 April, 1932). My trans. "Mme Colette a fait – avec sa terrible verve – les dialogues français. En effet, il y a similitude de situations entre *Madchen in uniform* [sic.] et *Claudine à l'école*."
- ⁴¹⁹ "Métro double 'Grand Hotel' en français et en allemand", *La cinématographie française*, no. 707 (21 May, 1932). My trans. "[...] possède exactement la même voix que l'actrice suédoise"
- ⁴²⁰ "Procédés divers de doublage de voix", *La cinématographie française*, no. 699 (26 March, 1932).
- ⁴²¹ Ďurovičová (2003), pp. 85f.
- ⁴²² Kenneth F. Morgan, "Dubbing", *Recording Sound for Motion Pictures*, ed. Cowan, Lester, New York: McGraw-Hill 1931, pp. 145-154; Crafton (1999), pp. 240f.
- ⁴²³ Ďurovičová (2003), p. 90.
- ⁴²⁴ For a full description of the Rhytmograph method, see Paul Hatschek, "Die Rhytmographie," *Filmtechnik/Filmkunst*, vol. 7, no. 7 (7 February, 1931), pp. 6-8. See also Ďurovičová (2003), p. 92.
- ⁴²⁵ Louis Saurel, "La question du doublage", *La cinématographie française*, no. 712 (25 January, 1932).

- ⁴²⁶ Kittler (1990), p. 265.
- ⁴²⁷ Lastra (2000), p. 149.
- ⁴²⁸ A part of the English version was screened and at the Cinegraph conference *Babylon in FilmEuropa* (Hamburg 2006). On this occasion, it was also compared with the original and the French version by Robert Fischer.
- ⁴²⁹ *The Physical History of M*, written and edited by Issa Clubb, restoration consultant: Martin Koerber.
- ⁴³⁰ Topics frequently discussed in interpretations of *M*, most recently by Gunning (2000), esp. pp. 163-174.
- ⁴³¹ "Comment Roger Goupillères a réalisé la version française du Film de Fritz Lang *M le Maudit*", *La cinématographie française* (16 April, 1932).
- ⁴³² Ibid.
- ⁴³³ For a more detailed description, see: Michaela Krützen, "Esperanto für den Tonfilm: Die Produktion von Sprachversionen für den frühen Tonfilm-Markt", *Positionen deutscher Filmgeschichte: 100 Jahre Kinematographie, Strukturen, Diskurse, Kontexte*, ed. Michael Schandig (Munich: Diskurs-Film-Verl. Schaudig und Ledig, 1996), pp. 149f.
- ⁴³⁴ Nataša Đurovičová, "Introduction", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal* no. 4 (Spring 2004), p. 7.
- ⁴³⁵ Ginette Vincendeau, "Hollywood Babel", *Screen*, vol. 29, no. 2 (1988), p. 27.
- ⁴³⁶ See Danan (1996) p. 117.
- ⁴³⁷ Friedrich Kittler, "Das Werk der Drei: Vom Stummfilm zum Tonfilm", *Zwischen Rauschen und Offenbarung: Zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Stimme*, eds. Friedrich Kittler, Thomas Macho and Siegrid Wiegel (Berlin: AkademieVerlag, 2002), pp. 369f. My trans. "[...] von jeder Bildtonfilmszene im Atelier hintereinander Aufnahmen in mehreren Idiomen [...]."
- ⁴³⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴³⁹ Ibid., p. 370. My trans. "Die Stimme war keine Musik in Ohren und Herzen mehr, sondern eine Semantik in den Köpfen."
- ⁴⁴⁰ François Jost, Unpublished paper at *Film and its Multiples* (Spring School, Gradisca, 2002).
- ⁴⁴¹ Barnier (2002), p. 126.
- ⁴⁴² See Vincendeau (1988), p. 24.
- ⁴⁴³ See, for example, *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4-7; Antonini, ed. (2003); Wahl (2005); Distelmeyer, ed. (2006).
- ⁴⁴⁴ Wahl (2005), p. 61.
- ⁴⁴⁵ For a more detailed information MLVs in Germany, see Joseph Garncarz, "Making Films Comprehensible and Popular Abroad: The Innovative Strategy of Multiple-language Versions", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 72-80.
- ⁴⁴⁶ See forthcoming Horst Claus, "'Geschäft ist Geschäft' oder: Warum die UFA lieber französische als englische Versionen dreht", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachigen Versionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 133-144.
- ⁴⁴⁷ Francis Courtade, "Les co-productions franco-allemandes et versions multiples des années 30", *Tendres Ennemis: Cent ans de cinéma entre la France et l'Allemagne*, eds. Heike Hurst and Heiner Gassen (Paris: Editions L'Harmattan, 1991), pp. 173-184.
- ⁴⁴⁸ For instance, Pierre Sorlin notes that "many multilingual versions were made in Babelsberg but only a few were produced by Die UFA", in Pierre Sorlin, "Multilingual Films, or What We Know about a Seemingly Bright Idea", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), p. 19.
- ⁴⁴⁹ See Wahl (2005), p. 66.
- ⁴⁵⁰ Charles O'Brien, "Multiple Versions in France: Paramount-Paris and National Film Style", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 80-88.
- ⁴⁵¹ For the latter, see Chris Wahl, *Das Sprechen der Filme: Über verbale Sprache im Spielfilm*, Ph.D, Ruhr Universität-Bochum (2003), pp. 179-182.
- ⁴⁵² Vincendeau (1988), pp. 24-39.

⁴⁵³ Nataša Đurovičová, "Translating America: The Hollywood Multilinguals 1929-1933", *Sound Theory/Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), p. 144.

⁴⁵⁴ As an example of an interest in versions in contemporary research on silent film, see Thomas Elsaesser, *Metropolis* (London: Bfi Publishing, 2000).

⁴⁵⁵ Joseph Garncarz, "Die bedrohte Internationalität des Films: Fremdsprachige Versionen deutscher Tonfilme", *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939*, eds. Sibylle M. Sturm, Arthur Wohlgemuth (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1996), pp. 127-140. The "Tonbilder" with Henny and Franz Porten were post-synchronised. The actors had to "die Platten textlich und musikalisch, oft in drei Sprachen, beherrschen, damit unsere Bewegungen mit ihnen übereinstimmten", Henny Porten, *Vom 'Kintopp' zum Tonfilm. Ein Stück miterlebte Filmgeschichte* (Berlin: Carl Reissner, 1932), p. 46. Quoted by Garncarz (1996), p. 136.

⁴⁵⁶ For a case study emphasising the relation between records, film and MLV, see Charles O'Brien, "Film, Gramophone, and National Cinema: Die 3-Groschenoper and L'opéra de quat'sous", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 35-47.

⁴⁵⁷ *Sunshine Susie* (Victor Saville, 1931), *La dactylo* (Wilhelm Thiele, 1931), *La segretaria private* (Goffredo Alessandrini, 1931).

⁴⁵⁸ Sorlin (2004), p. 18.

⁴⁵⁹ On Vienna as cliché and "melting-pot" city, see Elsaesser (2000), pp. 372ff.

⁴⁶⁰ "Sunshine Susie", *Film Weekly* (15 April, 1932).

⁴⁶¹ Leonardo Quaresima, "Versions multiples/Doublage?", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), p. 24. My trans. "Le doublage ne doit donc pas être interprété en tant que pratique alternative à celle des versions multiples, en tant que mode de production fondé sur des principes, intrinsèquement différent, qui rivalise avec les MLVs avant de les supplanter. Au contraire: le doublage n'est qu'une variante interne de la solution des versions multiples."

⁴⁶² Ginette Vincendeau, "Films en versions multiples", *L'histoire du cinéma: Nouvelles approches*, eds. Jacques Aumont, André Gaudreault, Michel Marie (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1989), p. 110.

⁴⁶³ L. Delaprée "Un bon exemple de film polyglotte", *Pour Vous*, no. 66 (20 February, 1930). My trans. "Voici donc que les films se mettent à parler comme les imprudents constructeurs de la tour de Babel après la confusion des langues. Un homme demande des nouvelles de santé à un autre dans le plus pur slang américain: cet autre lui répond en français, prenant à témoin un troisième larron qui ne parle que l'espagnol. [...] Berlitz school devient multiple. Bientôt nous parlerons tous six ou sept langues."

⁴⁶⁴ Ilya Ehrenbourg, *Usine de rêve*, trans. Madeleine Etard (Paris: Gallimard, 1932), p. 118. My trans. "Nom d'un chien – en onze langues. En douze: les Américains sont ici les maîtres. Ils parlent leur langue. Tout le monde les comprend: ils ont des dollars. [...] Shakespeare au chômage. Ils traduisent des dialogues aux profondeurs lyriques: 'Mary vous m'avez remis dans le droit chemin.'"

⁴⁶⁵ Most famously by Antonio Gramsci, "Americanism and Fordism", *Selection from the Prison Notebooks* [1929-1935], eds. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York, International Publishers, 1971), pp. 277-318.

⁴⁶⁶ Ehrenbourg (1932), p. 120. My trans. "Nous fabriquons les films à la chaîne. Ford, les automobiles. Gillette – les rasoirs. Paramount – les rêves. Le cinéma produit le nouveau siècle. Son âme, la vitesse. Regarder vite. Fabriquer vite. Les poètes et leurs chevaux sont évanouis. A leur place, les 40 CV. et les films Paramount."

⁴⁶⁷ Nataša Đurovičová, unpublished introduction to the second edition of the Spring School seminars about multiple language versions (Gradisca, 2004).

⁴⁶⁸ Roger Régent, "France, Allemagne, Italie...", *Pour Vous*, no. 97 (25 September, 1930). My trans. "[D]ans la même ambiance, assis sur les mêmes coussins ayant exprimé les mêmes sentiments, l'Allemande, l'Italienne et la Française sont chacune très différentes des deux autres. [...] La Française est habillée plus légèrement. [...] L'Italienne par contre a une robe

de tragédienne! [The German] robe n'est ni trop légère, ni trop lourde, juste ce qu'il faut [...]."

⁴⁶⁹ Mauss (1969), pp. 599ff. See also Schüttpelz (2002).

⁴⁷⁰ Ascheid (1997), p. 32.

⁴⁷¹ See J. Vincent-Bréchnac, "Die Drei von der Tankstelle", *Pour Vous*, no. 142 (6 August, 1931).

⁴⁷² See Vincendeau (1988), p. 27. According to Vincendeau, this unawareness of the other versions constitutes the principal difference between MLV and remake.

⁴⁷³ This information came to my knowledge from French reviews of the film. I have, however, not seen the film.

⁴⁷⁴ On the discourse of "film tourism" in German cinema, see Elsaesser (2000), pp. 242ff.

⁴⁷⁵ Jean Dumas, "Le chemin du Paradis", *Cinéma*, no. 109 (20 November, 1930). My trans. "Le chemin du Paradis, que l'on ne peut dire ni allemande, ni française, car c'est de l'opérette; un point, c'est tout."

⁴⁷⁶ Aros, *Lilian Harvey: Ein Querschnitt durch ihr Werden und Wirken* (Berlin: Verlag Scherl, 1932). My trans. "Frisuren à la Greta Garbo zu tragen oder [...] schnurrbarttragende Männer wie Adolphe Menjou kopieren."

⁴⁷⁷ See Richard Dyer, *Stars* (London: Bfi Publishing, 2002), especially, pp. 33ff and 87ff.

⁴⁷⁸ Edgar Morin, *Les Stars* (Paris: Galilée, 1984), p. 83. My trans. "Dévaluée par son double, fantôme de son fantôme" "[...] imitant son double, en mimant sa vie de cinéma."

⁴⁷⁹ Dyer (2002), p. 20.

⁴⁸⁰ See Dyer (2002), p. 47ff. Dyer uses the concept "type" to describe stardom. I use the term slightly differently: while Dyer focuses on "social types", my categorisation outlines "version types" and is based on the issues embodied in version making, such as copy/original, "authentic" speech or foreign.

⁴⁸¹ *Murgalie, Hinter Schloss und Riegel, Los Presidarios, Sous les verrous* (James Parrott, 1931).

⁴⁸² See forthcoming Daniel Otto, "Andalusische Nächte in Babelsberg: Mehrsprachsversionen aus Gründen der Staatsraison", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachsversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 157-173.

⁴⁸³ See forthcoming Charles O'Brien, "Versionen, Radio und Grammophon: Die 3-Groschen-Oper und L'opéra de quat'sous", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachsversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 123-131. O'Brien even suggests that the small differences in lighting that appear in these otherwise stylistically similar versions are due to the differences between the star persona of Forster and Préjean, respectively.

⁴⁸⁴ The rather vague term "atmosphere" was frequently used in the press in order to describe the differences between versions. See Wahl (2005), p. 97-100.

⁴⁸⁵ This is argued in a study of reception of German Paramount stars in a local Czech context. See forthcoming Petr Szczepanik, "Tief in einem deutschen Einflussbereich: Die Aufführung und Rezeption deutschsprachiger Filme in der Tschechoslowakei in den frühen 1930er Jahren", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachsversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 89-101.

⁴⁸⁶ E.J. "Der Kongreß tanzt", *Film-Kurier*, no. 250 (1931).

⁴⁸⁷ The "doppelgänger" motif is established already in Harvey's early silent films. For example, in two of Harvey's silent films *Die tolle Lola* (Richard Eichberg, 1927) and *Ihr dunkler Punkt* (Johannes Guter, 1929), for example, she acts two "versions" of herself: one who is sweet and innocent and the other who is dangerous and vamp-like.

⁴⁸⁸ Antje Ascheid, *Hitler's Heroins: Stardom and Womanhood in Nazi Cinema* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003), pp. 99-107. Also see Antje Ascheid, "Nazi Stardom and the 'Modern Girl': The Case of Lilian Harvey", *New German Critique*, no. 74 (Spring/Summer 1998), pp. 57-89.

⁴⁸⁹ See, for example, K.W., "Lilian über Willy – Willy über Lilian: ein Dialog", *Mein Film*, no. 221 (1930): "Immer wenn Lilian lacht, kann man sich plötzlich ganz genau vorstellen wie sie als dreijähriges Baby ausgesehen hat." See also "Lilian gibt Autogramme und nebenbei

ein Interview", *Mein Film*, no. 302 (1931): In this article, Harvey's smile is described as: "[...] die entzückenden Kinderzähnnchen zwischen den lächelnd geöffneten Lippen."

⁴⁹⁰ Karsten Witte, *Lachende Erben, Toller Tag: Filmkomödie im Dritten Reich* (Berlin: Verlag Vorwerk, 1995), p. 16. "Diese Sirene sang nie, sie plärrte von einer eingebauten Sprechwalze. Ihre Gesten waren gestochen, ihre Tanzschritte eingedrillt." Trans. and quoted in Ascheid (2003), p. 104.

⁴⁹¹ See Richard Dyer "A Star is Born and the Construction of Authenticity", *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, ed. Christine Gledhill (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), pp. 132-140.

⁴⁹² Lilian Harvey was, according to a survey organised by *Pour Vous* in 1931, the most popular foreign star in France. See Garncarz (1996), p. 134.

⁴⁹³ Ascheid (2003), pp. 110ff.

⁴⁹⁴ Katja Uhlenbrok, "Verdoppelte Stars – Pendants in den deutschen und französischen Versionen", *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939*, eds. Sibylle M. Sturm, Arthur Wohlgemuth (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1996), pp. 155-168.

⁴⁹⁵ Jean Lenauter, "Lilian Harvey et ses deux soupirants", *Pour Vous*, no. 101 (23 October, 1930). My trans. "Pareille amitié font plaisir à voir", "La petite Lilian et ses deux amoureux [...] - version française et allemande – s'affronteront de nouveau les lumières fatigantes du studio."

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid. My trans. "Pendent que je parle avec Lilian Harvey, il [Willy Fritsch] s'entretient avec Henri Garat. D'une manière drôle d'ailleurs. Henri Garat lui parle en un anglais dans lequel il glisse quelques expressions allemandes. Willy Fritsch lui parle en allemand et y introduit prudemment quelques expressions anglaises."

⁴⁹⁷ Using the real name of the actors in the films was frequent in the Lilian Harvey films. For example, in *Die Drei von der Tankstelle*, Harvey's fictional name is Lilian.

⁴⁹⁸ Elsaesser (2005), p. 21.

⁴⁹⁹ Edith Hamann, *Die Filmwoche*, no. 3 (1931). My trans. "Denn wenn der Tonfilm für so viele Filmdarsteller eine Einschränkung ihrer internationalen Tätigkeit bedeuten musste, brachte er für sie die Erweiterung ihrer Popularität über die ganze Welt. Ihre Tonfilme liefen nicht nur in allen deutschsprachigen Ländern, sondern in den französischen und englischen Fassungen auch in Frankreich, Italien auf dem Balkan, in England, Amerika, Afrika, Indien, Australien, Japan und China."

⁵⁰⁰ "Amerikanisches von Lilian Harvey", *Mein Film*, no. 383 (1932), p. 7. "[...]der Cocktail vom Kontinent", wahrscheinlich weil sie in England das Licht der Welt erblickte, in Deutschland und in der Schweiz aufgewachsen ist, in Wien für den Film entdeckt wurde und ihre freie Zeit meist in ihrer Villa in Cap d'Antibes an der Riviera verbringt."

⁵⁰¹ See Malte Hagener and Jan Hans, "Der Sängerstar im Zeitalter seiner technischen Diversifizierbarkeit", *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 311ff.

⁵⁰² Hans Joachim Schlamp, *Käthe von Nagy* (Berlin: Hans Joachim Schlamp, Verlag Robert Mölich), p. 38. My trans. "Frau von Nagy hat – trotz ihre französische Adresse [...] - keinen festen Wohnsitz".

⁵⁰³ "Streit um Jan Kiepura: Er soll gleichzeitig in Europa und Amerika filmen", *Mein Film*, no. 395 (1932). My transl. "Seit sieben Jahren wohne ich immer in Hotelzimmern, alle paar Tage in einem anderen."

⁵⁰⁴ *Die Filmwoche*, no. 37 (1932) "Man spielt doch eben zwei Menschen, denn man spricht in dem ungarischen Film nicht nur anders als in dem deutschen, sondern man denkt und gestaltet auch ganz anders. [...] Mit bloßem 'Übersetzen' ist da nichts getan."

⁵⁰⁵ Aros, *Hans Albers – wie er ist und wie er wurde* (Berlin: Verlag Scherl, 1930). "Er spielt ja nicht nur für Deutschland, denn er beherrscht die englische Sprache heute genau so gut wie die verschiedensten deutschen Dialekte. Er wird dadurch zum Universalschauspieler, der genauso wie Harvey und Fritsch für die englische und französische Version keinen Ersatz braucht, sondern seine Hauptrolle in allen drei Weltsprachen nebeneinander verkörpern kann." Significantly, in contemporary film research, a completely different image of Albers is presented as he later was known to be one of the most national heroes of the German film. Michaela Krützen writes in *Hans Albers, eine Deutsche Karriere* (Berlin: Quadriga Verlag,

1995, p. 85) about the fact that Albers did *not* speak any foreign languages that “kaum ein Kollege moderne Fremdsprachen beherrscht; Lilian Harvey bleibt die Ausnahme, und für sie wird gerade mit ihrer Internationalität geworben. Fast alle deutschen Darsteller werden durch Muttersprachler ersetzt.”

⁵⁰⁶ Jean Dumas, “Le chemin du paradis”, *Cinémonde*, no. 109 (20 November, 1930). My trans. “Anglaise, elle a les finesses de sa race [...]”

⁵⁰⁷ Aros (1932). “daß in dieser Schauspielerin, die in England geboren ist, heute das deutsche Gefühl, der Sinn für deutsche Mentalität, genau so überwiegt, als ob sie an der Spree oder and der Panke das Licht der Welt erblickt hätte.”

⁵⁰⁸ See Ascheid (2003), p. 111.

⁵⁰⁹ Dyer (1997), p. 19. Dyer also notes that “equivalent histories of white consciousness in European countries have not been undertaken [...], but need to be.”

⁵¹⁰ Aros (1932). “Sie musste ihre Rollen doppelt und dreifach lernen, weil ja in jeder Fassung die Szenen nicht nur anders arrangiert sind, sondern auch weil deutsche französische oder englische Mentalität sprachlich genau so wie bildlich im ganz anderen Licht erscheinen.”

⁵¹¹ Horst Claus and Anne Jäckel, “‘Der Kongreß tanzt’: Revisited”, *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 6 (Spring, 2005), pp. 76-95.

⁵¹² Alain Fleischer, “L’accent au cinéma ou la langue fantôme”, *L’image et la parole*, ed. Jacques Aumont (Paris: Cinémathèque française, 1999) p. 221.

⁵¹³ Ibid. My trans. “une sorte de langue fantôme, ou de hors-champs pour celui qui l’entend.”

⁵¹⁴ Ascheid (1997), p. 35.

⁵¹⁵ Barry King, “Articulating Stardom”, *Screen*, vol. 26, no. 5 (September-October, 1985) p. 42.

⁵¹⁶ A. B., “Le Cinéma? Terrible! dit Camilla Horn”, *Pour Vous*, no. 120 (5 March, 1931).

⁵¹⁷ Yvan Noë, “Brigitte Helm parle français” *Pour Vous*, no. 138 (9 July, 1931). My trans. “Poètes allemands, français, anglais, tous sont ses amis [...] Elle repète deux fois, dix fois, vingt fois la même phrase avec une application de petite fille sage et toute à coup l’intonation juste jaillit.” See also “En prenant un cocktail, et en parlant français”, *Cinémonde*, no. 145 (1931): “Beaucoup se croient obligés de lui parler dans un allemand de dictionnaire. –Zut! Finit-elle par murmurer, on ne parle qu’allemand à Paris! [...] Elle parle français en s’appliquant, et devient toute rose de plaisir lorsqu’on lui dit, sans courtoisie, que son accent et son vocabulaire sont, l’un et l’autre, excellents [...]. Si elle ne m’avait pas juré avoir appris ce français à l’école. Je n’aurais jamais cru que l’étude des langues vivantes soit aussi efficace dans des lycées allemands [...]”

⁵¹⁸ René Lehmann, “Soyons Gais” *Pour Vous*, no. 127 (23 April, 1931). My trans. “[...] parle français avec son curieux et gras accent américain.”

⁵¹⁹ Odette Bardon, “Portrait du jour: Lilian Harvey”, *Pour Vous*, no. 132 (28 May, 1931). My trans. “Quand Lilian parle en notre langue, l’on entend une drôle de petite voix amusante de petite fille bien sage et appliquée.”

⁵²⁰ Ibid., My trans. “Elle est également une actrice très intelligente et méritante puisque en s’exprimant elle peut nous donner l’illusion qu’elle comprend notre vieux français compliqué [...] alors que réellement elle l’ignore totalement.”

⁵²¹ See Lawrence (1991).

⁵²² René Lehmann, “Lilian Harvey et Henri Garat... dans ‘Le congrès s’amuse’”, *Pour Vous*, no. 154 (23 October, 1931). My trans. “[...] impossible de résister à cette petite jolie fille qui parle français avec un une pointe d’exquise d’accent anglo-saxon.”

⁵²³ R., “Le chemin du paradis”, *Pour Vous*, no. 105 (20 November, 1930). My trans. “Lilian Harvey parle-t-elle avec un fort accent allemande.”

⁵²⁴ “Kate de Nagy – vedette franco-hongroise”, *Pour Vous*, no. 176, 1931. Von Nagy says in an interview: “Je suis hongroise, dit-elle, mais je parle le français avec un accent russe, ainsi que l’allemand d’ailleurs.”

⁵²⁵ See Yvan Noë (1931).

⁵²⁶ Hagener and Hans (2002), p. 315.

⁵²⁷ “Kate de Nagy – vedette franco-hongroise” (1931). Von Nagy states: “C’est que j’ai appris toute jeune ses deux langues avec un professeur russe: il m’a donné son accent slave chantant comme vous dites! Je m’attache donc, depuis quelque temps, à réapprendre le français.”

⁵²⁸ See Hagener and Hans (2002), p. 304.

⁵²⁹ For the notion of the tenor in musicals from the early 1930s as erotic attraction, see Donata Koch-Haag, “Che Faro Senza Euridici...: Die Stimme als Bühne der *gender politics*”, *Als die Filme singen lernten: Innovation und Tradition im Musikfilm 1928-1938* eds. Malte Hagener and Jan Hans (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1999), pp. 186-191. Also Martha Eggerth’s voice was frequently discussed in terms of erotic attraction, see Francesco Bono, “Augen, die bezaubern: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der italienische Regisseur Carmine Gallone”, *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 335ff.

⁵³⁰ Mathias Spohr, “Austauschbar oder unverwechselbar? Person und Funktion in die Filmop-erette”, *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musik-film* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), p. 426. My trans. “Gesangstechnik macht die Stimme trennbar vom Sänger als Privatperson. Sie ist stets eine öffentliche Artikulation, eine Funktion im Unterschied zur Person des Sängers.”

⁵³¹ Fleischer (1999), p. 227 “ [...] l’accent ne devient-il pas alors, au même titre que la musique, le chant d’une langue – on parle bien d’accents *chantants* – à partir d’un état qui serait un dans sa mélodie *naturelle* d’origine [...]”

⁵³² Ehrenbourg (1932), p. 120. My trans. “La Russie. Haute neige. Une minute d’hésitation. Est-il possible, qu’en été, il y ait de la neige? Le metteur en scène veut réfléchir. Le directeur arrive à la rescousse: l’original est établie en Amérique, quel problème pourrait encore se passer? Sans neige, pas de Russie. Neige, troika, nostalgie. Penser, à Joinville, impossible, il faut se dépêcher. Prise de vue de la neige - deux heures. Tant de mètres. À la porte, les Itali-ens attendent déjà. Ils vont être des Russes, en été, au milieu des neiges.”

⁵³³ Ibid. My trans. “ne connaissent pas de frontières” and “un lit est partout un lit, en Suède comme en Italie”

⁵³⁴ Hansen (2000).

⁵³⁵ This American approach to “vernacular” reception is, to a certain extent, noticeable in Miriam Hansen, “Fallen Women, Rising Stars, New Horizons: Shanghai Silent Film as Vernacular Modernism”, *Film Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 1 (Fall 2000), pp. 10-22.

⁵³⁶ Ďurovičová (1992), p. 144.

⁵³⁷ I here use the term “medium” also for the theatre, since theatre and film are discussed as parallel forms of speech mediation.

⁵³⁸ Except *Marius*, only *Vi två* (John Brunius, 1929), the Swedish version of *A Lady Lies* (Hobart Henley, 1929) is preserved in the Stockholm film archive.

⁵³⁹ O’Brien (2004). See also O’Brien (2005), pp. 107-137.

⁵⁴⁰ Leif Furhammar, *Filmen i Sverige: En historia i tio kapitel* (Höganäs: Förlag AB Wiken, 1991), p. 134. My trans. “Utöver språket och skådespelarna var dessa filmer inte på något sätt anpassade till svensk verklighet, svenska förväntningar eller svenska underhållningsbehov.”

⁵⁴¹ “När rosorna slå ut” – svensk talfilm på Olympia”, *Dagens Nyheter* (31 July, 1930). My trans. “Det faktum att den stora amerikanska officinen även gått in för årans och hjältarnas språk är ju bara ägnat att stärka vår självkänsla. Om nu något mer i den vägen skulle behö-vas!”

⁵⁴² *Svensk filmtidning* (1 April, 1930). My trans. “Det är glädjande att även Sverige får deltaga i detta arbete – det svenska namnet har ju så god klang på den internationella filmmarkna-den.”

⁵⁴³ For more detailed information, see Furhammar (1990).

⁵⁴⁴ See Quaresima (2005).

⁵⁴⁵ Robin Hood, “China: Vi två”, *Stockholms tidningen* (19 September, 1930). My trans. “Det var som att bevittna översättningen av en bok.”

⁵⁴⁶ See Claus and Jäckel (2005).

- ⁵⁴⁷ Forthcoming Nataša Đurovičová, "Paramount und das homöostatische Moment: MLV-Produktion in Joinville", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 65-77
- ⁵⁴⁸ Edvin Adolphson, *Edvin Adolphson berättar om sitt liv med fru thalia, fru filmia och andra fruar* (Stockholm: Bonniers, 1972), p. 172. My trans. "Representanten för Paramount i Sverige, Carl York, hade förmedlat underhandlingarna och jag hade fått mycket fördelaktiga villkor, bland annat att få engagera en svensk manuskriptförfattare som kunde sätta lite fason på de eländiga, från engelskan mycket illa översatta manuskripten." This autobiography is in most cases not a reliable source. It is obvious that Adolphson exaggerates his independence at Paramount.
- ⁵⁴⁹ As described in previous chapter. See also Uhlenbrok (1996).
- ⁵⁵⁰ Đurovičová (1992), p. 147.
- ⁵⁵¹ Jerome, "China-premiär" (Vi två), *Dagens Nyheter* (19 December, 1930). My trans. "Barren äro av modernaste amerikanska snitt: självsäkra, beslutsamma och brådmogna."
- ⁵⁵² de la Bretèque (1992), p. 60.
- ⁵⁵³ Bazin (1997), p. 54.
- ⁵⁵⁴ See Peyrusse (1986).
- ⁵⁵⁵ Vincendeau (1990), p. 73.
- ⁵⁵⁶ de la Bretèque (1992), p. 69.
- ⁵⁵⁷ Adolphson (1972), p. 173. My trans. "Manuskriptet till den film jag skulle börja i Paris var byggt på en ren talpjäs. Men det hindrade inte att det skulle läggas in en genomgående melodi och en känslig sång. Pjäsen hette 'Un trou dans le mur', alltså 'Hålet i muren'. Men inte kan man kalla en sång som ska bli en schlager för 'Hålet i muren'. Av de förslag som kom in fastnade vi för Sonja Sahlberg. Den var svärmisk och tjusig. Hon kallade den 'När rosorna slå ut', och det blev namnet på den första talfilmen på det svenska språket."
- ⁵⁵⁸ Marcel Pagnol, "Varför jag låtit omarbeta 'Marius' (Längtan till havet) för talfilmen", *Dagens Nyheter* (11 November, 1931).
- ⁵⁵⁹ Janson, "Calle Barcklind", *Filmfavoriter*, no. 9 (Stockholm: Figaros Förlag, 1919), p. 3.
- ⁵⁶⁰ Eveo, "Längtan till havet", *Svenska Dagbladet*, (13 November, 1931).
- ⁵⁶¹ "Svensk premiär på China", *Aftonbladet* (13 November 1931).
- ⁵⁶² Bazin, p. 54.
- ⁵⁶³ See, for example, reviews in *Sydsvenska dagbladet* (3 November, 1930); *Uppsala Nya Tidning* (6 November, 1930); *Veckojournalen* (9 November, 1930).
- ⁵⁶⁴ "Marius – en ny Topaz", *Stockholms-tidningen* (1 November, 1930). My trans. "[...] icke hade det sydländska lynnets sprakande nerv."
- ⁵⁶⁵ -dén, "'Längtan till havet' på China", *Dagens Nyheter* (13 November, 1931). My trans. "Replikerna falla onaturliga, till och med krystat onaturliga på sina ställen, och det verkade nästan som om den svenska bearbetningen endast inskränkt sig till en ordagrann översättning av det franska manuskriptet. Det går inte att använda teaterspråk för ljudfilm. Det verkar oäkta på något sätt. Ljudfilmens hela dramaturgi fordrar naturlighet, i synnerhet vad talet beträffar."
- ⁵⁶⁶ -t, "Marius på Bio Bio", *Hufvudstadsbladet* (20 January, 1932). My trans. "Marseillarnas hetsiga temperament och livliga gester ha dessa litet tunga svenska skådespelare ju icke [...], men denna version är gjord för skandinaver, och dessa förstå den helt säkert bättre sådan den är."
- ⁵⁶⁷ -dén (13 November, 1931).
- ⁵⁶⁸ Dyer (1997), p. 10.
- ⁵⁶⁹ Ibid. (1997), pp. 44ff.
- ⁵⁷⁰ Jerome, "Biopremiär 'När rosorna slå ut' – svensk talfilm på Olympia", *Dagens Nyheter* (31 July, 1930). My trans. "[...] att sitta på Olympia i går var nästan som att befinna sig i Oscarsteaterns salong. På scenen, d.v.s. på duken och i högtalarna – välkända och populära röster ur Oscars ensemble: [...]."
- ⁵⁷¹ Robin Hood, "Olympia och Imperial: 'Doktors hemlighet'", *Stockholms-tidningen* (5 November, 1930). My trans. "Vi har ju Oscarsteater endels vid Kungsgatan, endels vid Sveavägen, varför inte nöja sig därmed, varför ha Oscarsteater också på Birger Jarlsgatan (Olym-

pia), i Berzelii park (China), på Regeringsgatan (Imperial)? Varför ha filmad teater, när man har livs levande teater?”

⁵⁷² Hara Kiri, “Den farliga leken”, *Stockholmsstidningen* (27 December, 1930). My trans. “Det verkar fortfarande som om de svenska talfilmerna i Paris levde i en liten avskild infryst koloni, immuna mot [...] seinestadens charm. Ty inte är det några nordens fransmän som gett sig in på den ‘Farliga leken’. [...] Ingen har roligt, inte ens på vita duken – till och med balsalen är ett bottenfruset hav, på vilket snögubbar i smoking skrida av och an med fångrinande isbrudar. Samma glädje och grandessa som på ett svenskt postkontor.”

⁵⁷³ G_a, “‘Den farliga leken’ på Olympia och Imperial”, *Dagens Nyheter* (27 December, 1930). My trans. “De begränsade interiörerna bilda inte miljö, endast bakgrund till dialogerna, vilket tillsammans med kamerans orörlighet bidrar till att man ej förmått skapa illusion av liv och verklighet.”

⁵⁷⁴ Forthcoming Szczepanik (2006).

⁵⁷⁵ Robin Hood, *Stockholmsstidningen* (13 November, 1931). My trans. “[...] när kameran glider utmed trottoarena, förbi sjömanskaféerna, över fisk- och grönsakstorgen, så är det inga väluppbyggda, väl-drillade ateljéscener där utväntade, söndergäspade statister anstränga sig att verka pigga och franska och Marseillesiga det är verkliga gator, krogar, torg och verkliga Marseillebor.”

⁵⁷⁶ den, (13 November, 1931). My trans. “I vida svep fångar kameran Marseille, hamnen och Medelhavet, dyker ner på ett trafikstråk vid hamnen, dröjer för en sekund kvar vid en typ eller en situation och glider vidare. Detta är film. Men sekunden efter är man inne på Bar de la Marine, och ser och hör fotograferad, för all del mycket väl fotograferad, teater.”

Acknowledgements

My supervisor professor Jan Olsson has offered insightful and constructive readings, for which I am very grateful. His knowledge of film history, theoretical insights, as well as his encouragement has been indispensable for the progress of my study. I would also like to thank all colleagues and friends at the Department of Cinema Studies at Stockholm University for inspiring discussions over the years. I am particularly grateful to Eirik Frisvold Hanssen who has offered valuable comments and enlightening readings of the early drafts of the manuscript.

Research for this dissertation has been financed by a doctoral position at Stockholm University. The Department of Cinema Studies at Stockholm University has provided finance for travel and accommodation, and given me the opportunity to present my research at conferences in Udine, Hamburg, and Amsterdam. Holger and Thyra Lauritzens stiftelse för främjande av filmhistorisk verksamhet has generously provided a grant for the printing of the dissertation.

A number of libraries and archives have been helpful in my research. I would like to express my gratitude to the staff of the Filmhusets bibliotek in Stockholm and the Stockholm Film Archive, the staff at La Bibliothèque de film in Paris, as well as the staff at Deutsche Kinemathek in Filmhaus Berlin. I would also like to thank Bertil Friberg in the Department of Cinema Studies at Stockholm University for technical support.

The workshop “Gradisca Spring School” in Italy gave me the opportunity to see a number of films which were indispensable for my study. I am grateful to scholars and friends participating in Gradisca who have been helpful and generously offered me advice and provided references.

In the final editing of the manuscript, a number of people, including family and friends, have generously offered their help. I would like to thank Elaine King who has copy edited the manuscript, Katrin Peters, Åsa Sandzén and my husband Jérôme Vallet who have been looking over sources and references in German and French, my sister Elisa Rossholm who designed the cover and edited the filmography, and Roussina Roussinova who has edited the bibliography. I would also like to thank my parents for all kinds of support and encouragement.

Bibliography

- “A propos du doublage: N.C.F. Tavano, Général de Synchro-Ciné, nous adresse la lettre ici-dessous”, *La cinématographie française*, no. 696 (5 March, 1932).
- A. B., “Le Cinéma? Terrible! dit Camilla Horn”, *Pour Vous*, no. 120 (5 March, 1931).
- Abel, Richard and Rick Altman (eds.), *The Sounds of Early Cinema* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001).
- Adolphson, Edvin, *Edvin Adolphson berättar om sitt liv med fru thalia, fru filmia och andra fruar* (Stockholm: Bonniers, 1972).
- Adorno, Theodor W. and Hanns Eisler, *Composing for the Films* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).
- Altman, George, “The Spirits of Film” [1931], *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology (1907-1939)*, vol. 2, 1929-1939, ed. Richard Abel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 80-86.
- Altman, Rick, “Moving Lips: Cinema as Ventriloquism”, *Yale French Studies*, no. 60, (1980), pp. 67-79.
- Altman, Rick, “The Technology of the Voice”, *Iris: La Parole au cinéma/Speech in Film*, no. 1 (Spring 1985), pp. 3-20.
- Altman, Rick, “General Introduction: Cinema as Event”, *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 1-14.
- Altman, Rick, “Sound Space”, *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 46-64.
- Altman, Rick (ed.), *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, (New York and London: Routledge, 1992).
- Altman, Rick, “Films sonores/cinéma muet ou comment le cinéma hollywoodien apprit à parler et à se taire”, *Cinégraphie*, no. 6, 1993, pp. 137-158.
- Altman, Rick, “Penser l’histoire du cinéma autrement: un modèle de crise”, *Vingtième siècle: Revue d’histoire*, no. 46 (April-June, 1995), pp. 65-74.
- “Amerikanisches von Lilian Harvey”, *Mein Film*, no. 383 (1932).
- Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).
- Antonini, Anna (ed.), *Il film e i suoi multipli/Film and Its Multiples, IX Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema* (Udine: Forum, 2003).
- Apollinaire, Guillaume, “The New Spirits of the Poets” [1918], in Francis Steegmuller, *Apollinaire: A Poet Among the Painters* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971).
- Arnheim, Rudolf, *Film als Kunst* [1932] (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1974).
- Arnheim, Rudolf, “Josef von Sternberg” [1934], *Sternberg*, ed. Peter Baxter (London: Bfi Publishing: 1980), pp. 35-41.

-
- Arnheim, Rudolf, "The New Laocoön" [1938], *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, eds. Elisabeth Weis and John Belton (New York: Columbia University Press 1985), pp. 114-115.
- Arnoux, Alexandre, "L'Anglais: langue internationale du cinéma", *Pour Vous*, no. 66 (20 February, 1930).
- Aros, *Lilian Harvey: Ein Querschnitt durch ihr Werden und Wirken* (Berlin: Verlag Scherl, 1932).
- Aros, *Hans Albers – wie er ist und wie er wurde* (Berlin: Verlag Scherl, 1930).
- Ascheid, Antje, "Speaking Tongues: Voice Dubbing in Cinema as Cultural Ventriloquism", *The Velvet Light Trap*, no. 40 (Fall 1997), pp. 32-41.
- Ascheid, Antje, "Nazi Stardom and the 'Modern Girl': The Case of Lilian Harvey", *New German Critique*, no. 74 (Spring/Summer 1998), pp. 57-89.
- Ascheid, Antje, *Hitler's Heroins: Stardom and Womanhood in Nazi Cinema* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2003).
- Autré, Pierre, "L'exportation des films parlants français à l'étranger", *La cinématographie française*, no. 660 (27 June, 1931).
- Autré, Pierre, "Pourquoi dénigrer le dubbing? On ferait mieux de l'utiliser en France", *La cinématographie française*, no. 687-688 (2-9 January, 1932).
- Autré, Pierre, "Attention au dubbing! Le mauvais dubbing doit-être impitoyablement condamné car il chasse les spectateurs", *La cinématographie française*, no. 691 (30 January, 1932).
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986).
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986).
- Balázs, Béla, *Schriften zum Film, Bd. 1, Der Sichtbare Mensch: Kritiken und Aufsätze 1922-1926* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1982).
- Balázs, Béla, *Schriften zum Film, Bd. 2, Der Geist des Films: Artikel und Aufsätze 1926-1931* (Munich: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1984).
- Balázs, Béla, *Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art*, trans. Edith Bone (London: Dobson, 1952).
- Bardèche, Maurice and Robert Brasillach, *The History of Motion Pictures*, ed. and trans. Iris Barry (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. and the Museum of Modern Art, 1938).
- Bardon, Odette, "Portrait du jour: Lilian Harvey", *Pour Vous*, no. 132 (28 May, 1931).
- Barnier, Martin, *En route vers le parlant: Histoire d'une évolution technologique, économique et esthétique du cinéma (1926-1934)* (Liège: Éditions du Céfal, 2002).
- Baroncelli, Jacques de, "Les sous-titres sont-ils nécessaires?", *Écrits sur le cinéma: Suivi de mémoires*, ed. Bernard Bastide (Perpignan: Institut Jean Vigo, 1996), pp. 57-58.
- Barrot, Olivier, *René Clair, ou, le temps mesuré* (Renens: 5 Continents, Paris: Hatier, 1985).
- Barthes, Roland, *La chambre claire: Note sur la photographie* (Paris: Gallimard Seuil, 1980).
- Barthes, Roland, "The Grain of the Voice", *Image-Music-Text*, ed. Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), pp. 179-189.

- Bassnett, Susan and Andre Lefevere, "The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies", *Translation, History and Culture*, eds. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere (London: Pinter Publisher, 1990), pp. 1-13.
- Baudry, Jean-Louis, "The Apparatus", *Apparatus: Cinematographic Apparatus*, ed. Therese Hak Kyung Cha (New York: Tanam, 1980), pp. 41-62.
- Bazin, André, "The Case of Marcel Pagnol", *Bazin at Work: Major Essays and Reviews from the Forties and the Fifties*, ed. Bert Cardullo, trans. Alain Piette and Bert Cardullo (New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 53-59.
- Bazin, André, "Le mythe du cinéma total" [1946], *Qu'est-ce que le cinéma?* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000), pp. 19-24.
- Beach, Christopher, *Class, Language and American Film Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Bell, Alexander Graham, "Prehistoric Telephone Days", *National Geographic*, vol. 41, no. 3 (March 1922).
- Benjamin, Walter, "The Task of the Translator" [1923], *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (London: Fontana Press, 1992), pp. 70-82.
- Benjamin, Walter, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" [1936], *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (London: Fontana Press, 1992), pp. 211-244.
- Benjamin, Walter, "On Language as Such and on the Language of Man" [1916], *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, ed. Peter Demetz (New York: Schocken Books, 1978), pp. 314-332.
- Berner, Raymond, "Le vrai point faible des films étrangers doublés", *La cinématographie française*, no. 673 (26 September, 1931).
- Billard, Pierre, *L'âge classique du cinéma français: Du cinéma parlant à la Nouvelle Vague* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995).
- Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1999).
- Bono, Francesco, "Augen, die bezaubern: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der italienische Regisseur Carmine Gallone", *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 335-363.
- Bordwell, David, Janet Staiger and Kristin Thompson, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
- Brady, Erika, *The Spiral Way: How the Phonograph Changed Ethnography* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1999).
- Bretèque, François de la, "Images of 'Provence': Ethnotypes and Stereotypes of the South in French Cinema", *Popular European Cinema*, eds. Richard Dyer and Ginette Vincendeau (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 58-71.
- Bronfen, Elisabeth, *Heimweh: Illusionsspiele in Hollywood* (Berlin: Volk & Welt, 1999).
- Bulgakowa, Oksana, "Der Kannibalismus des Films: Eisenstein in La Sarraz", *Film und Fernsehen*, no. 1 (1988), pp. 32-33.
- Bur [Erich Burger], "Ruttmanns Melodie der Welt", *Berliner Tageblatt*, no. 125 (14 March, 1929).
- Burgoyne, Robert, *Film Nation: Hollywood looks at U.S. History* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1997).
- Carrière, Georges, "Today's Trade Position in France", *La cinématographie française*, no. 699 (March, 1932).

- Celcius [Carl von Ossietzky], "Der Film gegen Heinrich Mann" [1930], in *Der Blaue Engel: Drehbuchentwürfe*, eds. Luise Dirscherl and Gunther Nickel (St. Ingbert: Röhrig Universitätsverlag, 2000).
- Chambat-Houillon, Marie-France, "Entre le même et l'autre: la place de l'auteur", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal* (Spring, 2005), pp. 17-32.
- Chamine, "Jeunes filles en uniforme", *Pour Vous*, no. 179 (21 April, 1932).
- Chion, Michel, *La voix au cinéma* [1982] (Paris: Éditions de l'Étoile, 1993).
- Chion, Michel, *L'Audio-vision: Son et image au cinéma* (Paris: Nathan, 1990).
- Chion, Michel, *Un art sonore, le cinéma: histoire, esthétique, poétique* (Paris: Cahiers du Cinéma, 2003).
- La cinématographie française*, no. 692 (6 February, 1932).
- Claus, Horst and Anne Jäckel, "'Der Kongreß tanzt': Revisited", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 6 (Spring, 2005), pp. 76-95.
- Claus, Horst, "'Geschäft ist Geschäft' oder: Warum die UFA lieber französische als englische Versionen dreht", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 133-144.
- "Close Harmony", *Kine Weekly* (16 May, 1929).
- "Comment Roger Goupillères a réalisé la version française du film de Fritz Lang *M le Maudit*", *La cinématographie française* (16 April, 1932).
- Colin-Reval, Marcel, "Des Films pour Alsace", *La cinématographie française*, no. 631 (6 December, 1930).
- Colin-Reval, Marcel, "Contingemment, dubbing et accords franco-allemands", *La cinématographie française*, no. 698 (19 March, 1932).
- Comolli, Jean-Louis, "Profondeur de champ: la double scène", *Cahiers du Cinéma*, no. 231 (August-September 1971), pp. 43-49.
- Courtade, Francis, "Les co-productions franco-allemandes et versions multiples des années 30", *Tendres Ennemis: Cent ans de cinéma entre la France et l'Allemagne*, eds. Heike Hurst and Heiner Gassen (Paris: Editions L'Harmattan, 1991), pp. 173-184.
- Couturat, Louis and Léopold Leau, *Histoire de la langue universelle* (Paris: Hachette, 1903).
- Crafton, Donald, *The Talkies: American Cinema's Transition to Sound, 1926-1931. History of the American Cinema 4*, ed. Charles Harpole (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1999).
- Dale, R.C., *The Films of René Clair, vol. 1. Exposition and Analysis* (Metuchen, NJ and London: The Scarecrow Press Inc., 1986).
- Danan, Martine, "A la recherche d'une stratégie internationale: Hollywood et le marché français des années trente", *Les transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels*, ed. Yves Gambier (Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996), pp. 109-130.
- Decherney, Peter, *Hollywood and the Culture Elite: How the Movies Became American* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).
- "Défense de doubler – un film UFA n'est PAS un film doublé", *La cinématographie française*, no. 702 (16 August, 1932).
- Delaprée, L., "Un bon exemple de film polyglotte", *Pour Vous*, no. 66 (20 February, 1930).
- Delluc, Louis, "La Parole", *Écrits cinématographiques 1, Le cinéma et les cinéastes* (Paris: Cinémathèque française, 1985), pp. 58-59.

- De Man, Paul, "'Conclusions': Walter Benjamin's 'The Task of the Translator'", *Yale French Studies*, no. 69 (1985), pp. 25-46.
- '-dén', "'Längtan till havet' på China", *Dagens Nyheter* (13 November, 1931).
- Derrida, Jacques, *De la grammatologie: Introduction au problème du signe dans la phénoménologie de Husserl* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967).
- Derrida, Jacques, *La voix et le phénomène* (Paris: Presse Universitaire de France, 1967).
- Derrida, Jacques, "Des Tours de Babel", *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph Graham (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 165-205.
- Dietrich, Marlene, *Marlène D.* (Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1984).
- Dissandier, Gaston, "Application du phonographe à la conservation de langue des indiens d'Amérique", *La nature* (26 April, 1890), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- Distelmeyer, Jan (ed.), *Tonfilmfrieden/Tonfilmkrieg: Die Geschichte der Tobis vom Technik-Syndikat zum Staatskonzern* (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2003).
- Distelmeyer, Jan (ed.), *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre* (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006).
- Doane, Mary Ann, "The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 33-50.
- Dubois, Philippe, "L'écriture figurale dans le cinéma muet des années 20", *Scrittura e immagine: la didascalica nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima (Udine: Forum, 1997), pp. 71-104.
- Dumas, Jean, "Le chemin du paradis", *Cinéma*, no. 109 (20 November, 1930).
- Đurovičová, Nataša, "Translating America: The Hollywood Multilinguals 1929-1933", *Sound Theory, Sound Practice*, ed. Rick Altman (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 138-153.
- Đurovičová, Nataša, "Local Ghosts: Dubbing Bodies in Early Sound Cinema", *Il film e i suoi multipli/Film and Its Multiples, IX Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema*, ed. Anna Antonini (Udine: Forum, 2003), pp. 83-98.
- Đurovičová, Nataša, "Introduction", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 7-16.
- Đurovičová, Nataša, "Paramount und das homoöstatistische Moment: MLV-Produktion in Joinville", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006), pp. 65-77.
- Dyer, Richard, "A Star is Born and the Construction of Authenticity", *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, ed. Christine Gledhill (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 132-140.
- Dyer, Richard, *White: Essays on Race and Culture* (London: Routledge, 1997).
- Dyer, Richard, *Stars* [1979] (London: Bfi Publishing, 2002).
- E.J., "Der Kongreß tanzt", *Film-Kurier*, no. 250 (1931).
- Eco, Umberto, *The Search for the Perfect Language*, trans. James Fentress (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1995).
- Edison, Thomas, *Caveat 110* (8 October, 1888, filed 17 October, 1888), patent records, NjWOE.
- Egoyan, Atom, "Outside Myself: Claire Denis Interviewed by Atom Egoyan", *Subtitles: on the Foreignness of Film*, eds. Atom Egoyan and Ian Balfour (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press Ltd, 2004), pp. 67-78.

- Ehrenbourg, Ilya, *Usine de rêve*, trans. Madeleine Etard (Paris: Gallimard, 1932).
- Eisenschitz, Bernard, "Die Utopie einer Weltfilmgeschichte: Französische Ansätze der Filmhistoriografie", *Recherche: Film: Quellen und Methoden der Filmforschung*, eds. Hans-Michael Bock and Wolfgang Jacobsen (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1997), pp. 120-130.
- Eisenstein, S. M., V. I., Pudovkin and G. V. Alexandrov, "A Statement" [1928], in *Film Form: Essays in Film and Theory/Sergei Eisenstein*, ed. Jay Leyda (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949), pp. 83-85.
- Eisner, Lotte, *The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt* [1952], trans. Roger Greeves (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973).
- Elia, "Lettre d'Alsace-Lorraine: Les salles sonorisées, le problème bilingue", *La cinématographie française*, no. 625 (25 October, 1930).
- Elsaesser, Thomas, *Metropolis* (London: Bfi Publishing, 2000).
- Elsaesser, Thomas, *Weimar Cinema and After: Germany's Historical Imaginary* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).
- Elsaesser, Thomas, "'Going live': Körper und Stimme im frühen Tonfilm am Beispiel von *Das Lied einer Nacht*", *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 271-298.
- Elsaesser, Thomas and Malte Hagener, "Walter Ruttmann: 1929", *1929: Beiträge zur Archäologie der Medien*, eds. Stefan Andriopoulos and Bernhard J. Dotzler (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2002), pp. 316-349.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005).
- "En prennant un cocktail, et en parlant français", *Cinéma*, no. 145 (1931).
- Eveo, "Längtan till Havet", *Svenska Dagbladet* (13 November, 1931).
- Faulkner, Christopher, "René Clair, Marcel Pagnol and the Social Dimension of Speech", *Screen*, vol. 35, no. 2 (Summer 1994), pp. 157-170.
- Die Filmwoche*, no. 37 (1932).
- Fischinger, Oskar, "My Statements are in My Work" [1947], in William Moritz, *Optical Poetry: The Life and Work of Oskar Fischinger* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2004), pp. 173-175.
- Fleischer, Alain, "L'accent au cinéma ou la langue fantôme", *L'image et la parole*, ed. Jacques Aumont (Paris: Cinémathèque française, 1999), pp. 221-240.
- Fodor, István, *Film Dubbing. Phonetic, Semiotic, Esthetic and Psychological Aspects* (Hamburg: Buske, 1976).
- Foucault, Michel, "Of Other Spaces", *Diacritics* (Spring, 1986), pp. 22-27.
- Foucault, Michel, *Dits et écrits 1954-1988, vol. 3, 1976-1979*, eds. Daniel Denfert and François Edwald, (Paris: Gallimard, 1994).
- Frodon, Jean-Michel, *La projection nationale: Cinéma et nation* (Paris: Odile Jakob, 1998).
- Furhammar, Leif, *Stockholmspublikens biopreferenser under 1930-talet*, Institutionen för film och teatervetenskap (Stockholm University, 1990).
- Furhammar, Leif, *Filmen i Sverige: En historia i tio kapitel* (Höganäs: Förlag AB Wiken, 1991).
- 'G_a', "'Den farliga leken' på Olympia och Imperial'", *Dagens Nyheter* (27 December, 1930).
- "Gabbo le Ventriloque (The Great Gabbo)", *La cinématographie française*, no. 653 (May 9, 1931).

- Gambier, Yves, "La traduction audiovisuelle, un genre nouveau?", *Les transferts linguistiques dans les médias audiovisuels*, ed. Yves Gambier (Villeneuve-d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, 1996), pp. 7-12.
- Gance, Abel, "Images of Yesterday, Voices of Tomorrow" [1930], in *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology (1907-1939)*, vol. 2, 1929-1939, ed. Richard Abel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 41-42.
- Gandert, Gero (ed.), *Der Film der Weimarer Republik: Ein Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Kritik, 1929* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997).
- Garncarz, Joseph, "Die bedrohte Internationalität des Films: Fremdsprachige Versionen deutscher Tonfilme", *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939* (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1996), pp. 127-140.
- Garncarz, Joseph, "Making Films Comprehensible and Popular Abroad: The Innovative Strategy of Multiple-language Versions", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 72-79.
- Garncarz, Joseph, "Untertitel, Sprachversion, Synchronisation: Die Suche nach optimalen Übersetzungsverfahren", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 9-18.
- Garzia, Victoria de, "Americanism for Export", *Wedge*, no. 7-8 (Winter/Spring, 1985), pp. 74-81.
- Garzia, Victoria de, "Mass Culture and Sovereignty: The American Challenge to European Cinemas, 1920-1960", *Journal of Modern History*, vol. 61, no. 1 (March, 1989), pp. 53-87.
- Gaudiosi, Massimiliano, "Which Mabuse? Multiple Bodies, Multiple Voices", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 95-102.
- Gaudreault, André, "Des cris du bonimenteur aux chuchotements des intertitres...", *Scrittura e immagine: la didascalia nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima (Udine: Forum, 1997), pp. 53-64.
- Gelatt, Roland, *The Fabulous Phonograph: The Story of the Gramophone From Tin Foil to High Fidelity* (London: Cassell, 1956).
- "Girl Overboard", *Variety* (14 August, 1929).
- Gish, Lilian, *Dorothy and Lilian Gish* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973).
- '-go', "Miss Europa", *Reichfilmblatt*, vol. 8, no. 33 (16 August, 1930).
- Goergen, Jeanpaul, *Walter Ruttmann: eine Dokumentation* (Berlin: Freunde der Deutschen Kinemathek, 1989).
- Goergen, Jeanpaul, "Lebenswahrheit im Musikfilm: René Clair's *Sous les Toits de Paris*", *Als die Filme singen lernten: Innovation und Tradition im Musikfilm 1928-1938*, eds. Malte Hagener and Jan Hans (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1999), pp. 72-85.
- Gomery, Douglas, "Economic Struggle and Hollywood Imperialism: Europe Converts to Sound", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 80-93.
- Gomery, Douglas, "Towards an Economic History of the Cinema: The Coming of Sound to Hollywood", *The Cinematic Apparatus*, eds. Teresa de Lauretis and Stephen Heath (London: Macmillan, 1980), pp. 38-46.
- Gong, "Die Arche Noah", *Deutsche Republik*, no. 3 (1929).
- Goodman, Nelson, *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (Minneapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 1976).

-
- Graham, Joseph (ed.), *Difference in Translation* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1985).
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Selection from the Prison Notebooks* [1929-1935], eds. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971).
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Further Selections from the Prison Notebooks* [1929-1935], ed. Derek Boothman (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995).
- Gunning, Tom, *The Films of Fritz Lang: Allegories of Vision and Modernity* (London: Bfi Publishing, 2000).
- Gunning, Tom, "Doing for the Eye What the Phonograph Does for the Ear", *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), pp. 13-31.
- Hagener, Malte and Jan Hans, "Der Sängerstar im Zeitalter seiner technischen Diversifizierbarkeit", *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 299-333.
- Hagener, Malte, "Prix de Beauté as Multiple Intersection", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 102-115.
- Hahn, Charles, "La question bilingue en Alsace: Deux avis différents", *La cinématographie française*, no. 609 (5 July, 1930).
- "Hallelujah", *Gazette de Lausanne* (20 March, 1931).
- Hamann, Edith, *Die Filmwoche*, no. 3 (1931).
- Hansen, Miriam, "Universal Language and Democratic Culture: Myths of Origin in Early American Cinema", *Mythos und Aufklärung in der Amerikanischen Literatur/Myth and Enlightenment in the American Literature*, eds. Dieter Meindl and Friedrich W. Horlacher (Erlangen: Universitätsbund Erlangen-Nürnberg e.V., 1985), pp. 321-351.
- Hansen, Miriam, *Babel and Babylon: Spectatorship in American Silent Film* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press, 1991).
- Hansen, Miriam, "America, Paris and the Alps: Kracauer and Benjamin on Cinema and Modernity", *Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum in Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, eds. Alf Lüdtke, Inge MarBolek and Adelheid von Saldern (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996).
- Hansen, Miriam, "Fallen Women, Rising Stars, New Horizons: Shanghai Silent Film as Vernacular Modernism", *Film Quarterly*, vol. 54, no. 1 (Fall 2000), pp. 10-22.
- Hansen, Miriam, "The Mass Production of Senses: Classical Cinema as Vernacular Modernism", *Reinventing Film Studies*, eds. Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams (London: Arnold, 2000), pp. 332-350.
- 'Hara Kiri', "Den farliga leken", *Stockholmsstidningen* (27 December, 1930).
- Harris, Roy, *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein: How to Play Games With Words* (London: Routledge, 1988).
- Hatschek, Paul, "Die Rhytmographie," *Filmtechnik/Filmkunst*, vol. 7, no. 7 (7 February, 1931).
- Hesse-Quack, Otto, *Der Übertragungsprozess bei der Synchronisation von Filmen: Eine interkulturelle Untersuchung* (Munich, Basel, Ernst Reinhardt, 1969).
- Higson, Andrew and Richard Maltby (eds.), *'Film Europe' and 'Film America': Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999).
- "Hors du Gouffre (The man who came back)", *La cinématographie française* (5 November, 1931).

- Icart, Roger, *La révolution du parlant, vue par la presse française* (Perpignan: Institut Jean Vigo, 1988).
- Ivarsson, Jan, *Subtitling for the Media: A Handbook of an Art*, trans. Robert Craft (Stockholm: Transedit, 1992).
- Ives, Peter, *Gramsci's Politics of Language: Engaging the Bakhtin Circle and the Frankfurt School* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2004).
- Janson, "Calle Barcklind", *Filmfavoriter*, no 9 (Stockholm: Figaros Förlag, 1919).
- Jerome, "Biopremiär, 'När rosorna slå ut' – svensk talfilm på Olympia", *Dagens Nyheter* (31 July, 1930).
- Jerome, "China-premiär" (Vi två), *Dagens Nyheter* (19 December, 1930).
- Jost, François, "The Voices of Silence", *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), pp. 48-56.
- Journal de Paris* (22 May, 1902), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- K.W., "Lilian über Willy – Willy über Lilian: ein Dialog", *Mein Film*, no. 221 (1930).
- Kahn, Douglas, "Introduction: Histories of Sound Once Removed", *Wireless Imagination: Sound, Radio, and the Avant-Garde*, eds. Douglas Kahn and Gregory Whitehead (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press, 1992), pp. 1-29.
- Kaplan, Alice Yaeger, *Reproductions of Banality: Fascism, Literature, and French Intellectual Life* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).
- "The King of Jazz", *Variety* (7 January, 1931).
- King, Barry "Articulating Stardom", *Screen*, vol. 26, no. 5 (September-October, 1985) pp. 27-50.
- Kitada, Rié, "L'exploitation et la réception des films à Lausanne (Suisse) au moment du passage du muet au parlant: Une histoire de la naissance des sous-titres (v.o.) et du doublage (v.f.)" *CineMagaziNet! Online Research Journal of Cinema*, no. 4 (8 September, 2000)
- Kitada, Rié, "Chacun parle sa langue: De la naissance du parlant international à l'essor du cinéma Suisse multilingue", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 103-121
- Kittler, Friedrich, *Discourse Networks* [1985] (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1990).
- Kittler, Friedrich, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter* [1986] (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999).
- Kittler, Friedrich, "Das Werk der Drei: Vom Stummfilm zum Tonfilm", *Zwischen Rauschen und Offenbarung, zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Stimme*, eds. Friedrich Kittler, Thomas Macho and Siegrid Wiegel (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2002), pp. 357-370.
- Klingelsmitt, Roger, "En Alsace: Il faut surtaxer les films allemands et détaxer les films français", *La cinématographie française*, no. 696 (5 March, 1932).
- Koch, Gertrud, "Between Two Worlds: von Sternberg's *The Blue Angel*", *German Film and Literature: Adaptations and Transformations*, ed. Eric Rentschler (New York: Methuen, 1986), pp. 60-72.
- Koch-Haag, Donata, "Che Faro Senza Euridici...: Die Stimme als Bühne der gender politics", *Als die Filme singen lernten: Innovation und Tradition im Musikfilm*

-
- 1928-1938, eds. Malte Hagener and Jan Hans (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1999), pp. 186-191.
- Kracauer, Siegfried, "The Mass Ornament" [1927], *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*, ed. and trans. Thomas Levin (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press 1995), pp. 75-89.
- Kracauer, Siegfried, *From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film* [1947] (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).
- Krützen, Michaela, *Hans Albers, eine deutsche Karriere* (Berlin: Quadriga Verlag, 1995).
- Krützen, Michaela, "Esperanto für den Tonfilm: Die Produktion von Sprachversionen für den frühen Tonfilm-Markt", *Positionen deutscher Filmgeschichte: 100 Jahre Kinematographie, Strukturen, Diskurse, Kontexte*, ed. Michael Schandig (Munich: Diskurs-Film-Verl. Schandig und Ledig, 1996), pp. 119-154.
- Kurtz, Rudolf, "Die Melodie der Welt", *Lichtbild-Bühne*, no. 61 (13 March, 1929).
- Lacotte, Daniel, *Raimu: Biographie* (Paris: Editions Ramsay, 1988).
- Lagarde, Pierre, "Le passée réssuscité aux archives de la parole" (3 April, 1927), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- Laks, Simon, *Le sous-titrage dans de films: Sa technique, son esthétique* (Paris: unpublished manuscript, 1957).
- "The Last Warning", *Variety* (8 January, 1929).
- Lastra, James, *Sound Technology and the American Cinema: Perception, Representation, Modernity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).
- Lawrence, Amy, *Echo and Narcissus: Women's Voices in Classical Hollywood Cinema* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991).
- Lefevere, Andre (ed.), *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 1992).
- Lehmann, René, "A propos du 'dubbing'", *Pour Vous*, no. 133 (4 January, 1931).
- Lehmann, René, "Soyons Gais", *Pour Vous*, no. 127 (23 April, 1931).
- Lehmann, René, "Lilian Harvey et Henri Garat... dans 'Le Congrès s'amuse'", *Pour Vous*, no. 154 (23 October, 1931).
- Lenauter, Jean, "Deux films musicaux: 'Le chemin du paradis' et 'La féerie du Jazz'", *Pour Vous*, no. 100 (16 October, 1930).
- Lenauter, Jean, "Lilian Harvey et ses deux soupirants", *Pour Vous*, no. 101 (23 October, 1930).
- Lenotre, G., "Courrier de l'exposition XV: Edison et le phonographe", *Le Monde Illustré* (17 August, 1889), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- Leprohon, Pierre, "'Talkie' devenu muet pour l'Europe", *Pour Vous* (4 July, 1929).
- Lesch, Paul, "The Transition from Silent to Sound Film in a Small Multilingual Country: Luxemburg as a Case Study", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 6 (Spring 2005), pp. 42-54.
- Levin, Thomas, "The Acoustic Dimension: Notes on Cinema Sound", *Screen*, vol. 25, no. 3 (May-June 1984), pp. 55-68.
- Levin, Thomas, "'Töne aus dem Nichts: Rudolf Pfenninger und die Archäologie des syntetischen Tons", *Zwischen Rauschen und Offenbarung, zur Kultur- und Mediengeschichte der Stimme*, eds. Friedrich Kittler, Thomas Macho and Siegrid Wiegel (Berlin: AkademieVerlag, 2002), pp. 313-355.
- Lewin, George, "Dubbing and its Relation to Sound Picture Production", *Journal of the Society of Motion Picture*, vol. 16, no. 1 (January 1931).

- Lewis, Philip E., "The Measure of Translation Effects", *Difference in Translation*, ed. Joseph F. Graham (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 31-62.
- Lindsay, Vachel, *The Art of the Moving Picture* [1915] (New York: Modern Library 2000).
- "Lilian gibt Autogramme und nebenbei ein Interview", *Mein Film*, no. 302 (1931).
- "Ljudet ska vara prickat över i't", *Filmjournalen*, no. 10-11 (24 May, 1931).
- Lüdtke, Alf, Inge Marßolek and Adelheid von Saldern, "Einleitung: Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum in Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts", *Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum in Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts*, eds. Alf Lüdtke, Inge Marßolek and Adelheid von Saldern (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996).
- Lunde, Arne, "'Garbo Talks': Scandinavians in Hollywood, the Talkie Revolution, and the Crisis of Foreign Voice", *Screen Culture: History and Textuality*, ed. John Fullerton (Eastleigh: John Libbey, 2004), pp. 21-39.
- LUX, "Le Dubbing en Allemagne", *La cinématographie française*, no. 697 (12 March, 1932).
- Mannoni, Laurent, *Georges Dumenil, Pionnier du Cinéma* (Douai: Éditions Pagine, 1997).
- Marie, Michel, "'Let's Sing It One More Time': René Clair's *Sous les Toits de Paris* (1930)", *French Film: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Susan Hayward and Ginette Vincendeau, (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 51-65.
- "Marius – en ny Topaz", *Stockholms Tidningen* (1 November, 1930).
- Mauss, Marcel, *Sociologie et Anthropologie* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969).
- McCluer, C. E., "Telephone Operators and Operating Room Management", *American Telephone Journal*, vol. 6, no. 2 (12 July, 1902).
- McCormick, Richard W., *Gender and Sexuality in Weimar Modernity: Film, Literature and New Objectivity* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).
- McKay, Anne, "Speaking up: Voice Amplification and Women's Struggle for Public Expression", *Technology and Women's Voices: Keeping in Touch*, ed. Cheris Kramarae (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988), pp. 187-206.
- McLuhan, Marshall, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* [1964] (London: Sphere, 1973).
- "Métro double 'Grand Hotel' en français et en allemand", *La cinématographie française*, no. 707 (21 May, 1932).
- Metz, Christian, "Aural Objects", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 24-32.
- Metz, Christian, "The Cinema: Language or Language System?" [1971], trans. Michael Taylor, *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), pp. 31-91.
- "Miss Europa", *Kinematograph*, vol. 24, no. 187 (12 August, 1930).
- Mitry, Jean, *Histoire du cinéma: Art et industrie. vol. 4, Les années trente* (Paris: J.P. Delarge, 1980).
- Mitry, Jean, *La sémiologie en question: Langage et cinéma* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1987).
- Morgan, Kenneth F., "Dubbing", *Recording Sound for Motion Pictures*, ed. Lester Cowan (New York: McGraw-Hill 1931).
- Morin, Edgar, *Les Stars* (Paris: Galiée, 1984).
- Mühl-Benninghaus, Wolfgang, *Das Ringen um den Tonfilm: Strategien der Elektro- und der Filmindustrie in den 20er und 30er Jahren* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1999).
- Müller, Corinna, *Vom Stummfilm zum Tonfilm* (Munich: Fink, 2003).

-
- Müller, J. Dietmar, *Die Übertragung fremdsprachlichen Filmmaterials: Eine Untersuchung zu sprachlichen und außersprachlichen Einflußfaktoren, Rahmenbedingungen, Möglichkeiten und Grenzen* (Ph.D, diss., Regensburg, 1982).
- Nadar, F., "Daguerréotype acoustique", *Les mémoires du géant* (Paris: Éditions Ed. Dentu, 1864).
- "Noah's Ark", *Kine Weekly* (21 March, 1929).
- "När rosorna slå ut" – svensk talfilm på Olympia", *Dagens Nyheter* (31 July, 1930).
- Noë, Yvan, "Brigitte Helm parle français" *Pour Vous*, no. 138 (9 July, 1931).
- Nornes, Abé Mark, "For an Abusive Subtitling", *Film Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 3 (Spring, 1999), pp. 17-32.
- "Nouveau Phonographe de voyage", *Le Pêle-Mêle* (20 March, 1901), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- O'Brien, Charles, "Multiple Versions in France: Paramount-Paris and National Film Style", *Cinema and Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, ed. Nataša Đurovičová, no. 4 (Spring, 2004), pp. 80-88.
- O'Brien, Charles, *Cinema's Conversion to Sound: Technology and Film Style in France and the U.S.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005).
- O'Brien, Charles, "Film, Gramophone, and National Cinema: Die 3-Groschenoper and L'Opéra de quat'sous", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 35-47.
- O'Brien, Charles, "Versionen, Radio und Grammophon: Die 3-Groschen-Oper und L'Opéra de quat'sous", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munic: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006), pp. 123-131.
- Olsson, Jan, "Framing Silent Calls: Coming to Cinematographic Terms with Telephony", *Allegories of Communication: Intermedial Concerns from Cinema to the Digital*, eds. John Fullerton and Jan Olsson (Rome: John Libbey Publishing, 2004), pp. 157-192.
- "Om filmtexter", *Biografägaren*, vol. 6, no. 13 (12 September, 1931).
- Ong, Walter J., *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (London and New York: Methuen, Routledge, 1982).
- Otto, Daniel, "Andalusische Nächte in Babelsberg: Mehrsprachversionen aus Gründen der Staatsraison", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006), pp. 157-173.
- P.A.H., "Dubbing ou contingentment", *La cinématographie française*, no. 697 (12 March, 1932).
- Pagnol, Marcel, "The Talkie Offers the Writer New Resources" [1930], *French Film Theory and Criticism: A History/Anthology (1907-1939): vol. 2, 1929-1939*, ed. Richard Abel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 55-57.
- Pagnol, Marcel, "Varför jag låtit omarbete 'Marius' (Längtan till Havet) för talfilmen", *Dagens Nyheter* (11 November, 1931).
- Pagnol, Marcel, *Cinématurgie de Paris, Les Cahiers du Film* (1933-1934).
- Pagnol, Marcel, *Confidences, mémoires* (Paris: Julliard, 1981).
- "The perfect crime", *Variety* (8 August, 1928).
- Perriault, Jacques, *Mémoire de l'ombre et du son: Une archéologie de l'audio-visuel* (Paris: Flammarion, 1981).

- “La petite chochette”, *Sans-Gêne* (24 July, 1904), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- Peyrusse, Claudette, *Le cinéma méridionale: Le Midi dans le cinéma français 1929-1944* (Toulouse: Eché, 1986).
- “The Phantom of the Opera, sound re-issue”, *Variety* (12 February, 1930).
- Pilet, Jean-Marie, “Anmerkungen zum internationalen Kongreß des Unabhängigen Films”, *Festivalrekonstruktion: CICI La Sarraz, 1929* (1988).
- Pisano, Giusy, *Une archéologie du cinéma sonore*, (Paris: CRNS Editions, 2004).
- Pisano, Giusy and Valérie Pozner (eds.), *Le muet à la parole: Cinéma et performances à l'aube du XXe siècle*, (Paris: AFRHC, 2005).
- Pommer, Erich, “The International Picture: A Lesson on Simplicity” [1928], in *‘Film Europe’ and ‘Film America’: Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939*, eds. Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999), pp. 392-393.
- Porten, Henny, *Vom ‘Kintopp’ zum Tonfilm. Ein Stück miterlebte Filmgeschichte* (Berlin: Carl Reissner, 1932).
- “Une poupée Edison chez les cannibals”, *Arlequin* (9 April, 1892), in Gilbert Humbert, *Le phonographe en son enfance: articles parus de 1878 à 1927 avec illustrations d'époque* (Paris: Fuveau, 1997).
- Pozner, Valérie, “La dimension littéraire des intertitres dans le cinéma muet soviétique”, *Scrittura e immagine: La didascalia nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima, (Udine: Forum 1997), pp. 211-224.
- Pozner, Valérie, “Les cartons du parlant: Quelques cas d'expérience soviétiques d'intertitres dans des films sonores du début des années trente”, *1895*, no. 40 (July 2003), pp. 41-57.
- “Prix de beauté”, *La cinématographie française*, no. 578 (30 November, 1929).
- “Procédés divers de doublage de voix”, *La cinématographie française*, no. 699 (26 March, 1932).
- Quaresima, Leonardo, “Tankstelle und Hinterhof: ‘Genre’-Entwicklung und Modernisierungsprogramm”, *Als die Filme singen lernten: Innovation und Tradition im Musikfilm 1928-1938*, eds. Malte Hagener and Jan Hans (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1999), pp. 61-71.
- Quaresima, Leonardo, “Versions multiples/Doublage?”, *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 7 (Fall 2005), pp. 13-28.
- Quaresima, Leonardo, “Mehr Sprachenversion/Dubbing?” *Babylon in Film Europa. Mehr Sprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006), pp. 19-38.
- Quargnolo, Mario, “Le cinéma bâillonné: Le massacre des films étrangers en Italie au début du parlant”, *Le passage du muet au parlant – panorama mondial de la production cinématographique 1925-1935*, eds. Christian Belaygue (Toulouse: Éditions Milan, 1988), pp. 42-45.
- R., “Le chemin du paradis”, *Pour Vous*, no. 105 (20 November, 1930).
- Rakow, Lana F., “Women and the Telephone: the Gendering of a Communications Technology”, *Technology and Women's Voices: Keeping in Touch*, ed. Cheris Kramarae (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988), pp. 207-228.
- Raynauld, Isabelle, “Dialogues in Early Silent Screen Plays: What Actors Really Said”, *The Sounds of Early Cinema*, eds. Richard Abel and Rick Altman (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), pp. 69-78.

-
- Régent, Roger, "France, Allemagne, Italie...", *Pour Vous*, no. 97 (25 September, 1930).
- Riley, Philip J., *Phantom of the Opera: The Classic Silents*, vol. 1 (Absecon, NJ: MagicImage Filmbooks, 1999).
- 'Robin Hood', "China: Vi Två", *Stockholmsstidningen* (19 September, 1930).
- 'Robin Hood', "Olympia och Imperial: 'Doktors hemlighet'", *Stockholmsstidningen* (5 November, 1930).
- 'Robin Hood', *Stockholmsstidningen* (13 November, 1931).
- Rossholm, Anna Sofia, "Hearing, Speech and Language in the Film Theory of Béla Balázs", *I cinque sensi del cinema: XI Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema*, eds. Alice Autelitano and Veronica Innocenti (Udine: Forum, 2004), pp. 235-241.
- Rossholm, Anna Sofia, "Ein schwedisches Marseille: Die schwedische Mehrsprachenversionen aus Joinville im lokalen Rezeptionskontext", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik 2006), pp. 51-64.
- Sadoul, Georges, *Le cinéma: Son art, sa technique, son économie* (Paris: La Bibliothèque Française, 1948).
- Said, Edward, *Orientalism* [1978] (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).
- Sarris, Andrew, *The Films of Josef von Sternberg* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1966).
- Saunders, Thomas J., *Hollywood in Berlin: American Cinema and Weimar Germany* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1994).
- Saurel, Louis, "Ce que pense le public parisien des films parlants", *Cinéma*, no. 49 (26 September, 1929).
- Saurel, Louis, "La question du doublage", *La cinématographie française*, no. 712 (25 January, 1932).
- Saussure, Ferdinand de, *Course in General Linguistics*, eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaue, trans. Roy Harris (Chicago, IL: Open Court, 1986).
- Schenk, Irmbert, "'Titelloser Film' im deutschen Kino der Zwanziger Jahre", *Scrittura e immagine: La didascalia nel cinema muto, Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sul Cinema*, ed. Leonardo Quaresima (Udine: Forum, 1997), pp. 225-246.
- Schlamp, Hans Joachim, *Käthe von Nagy* (Berlin: Hans Joachim Schlamp, Verlag Robert Mölich).
- Schöning, Jörg (ed.), *London calling: Deutsche im britischen Film der dreißiger Jahre*, (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1993).
- Schüttpelz, Erhard, "Der Fetischismus der Nationen und die Durchlässigkeit der Zivilisationen: Globalisierung durch technische Medien bei Marcel Mauss", *1929 Beiträge zur Archäologie der Medien*, ed. Stefan Andriopoulos and Bernhard J. Dotzler (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2002), pp. 158-172.
- Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam, "The Cinema After Babel: Language, Difference, Power", *Screen*, vol. 26, no 3-4 (May-August, 1985), pp. 35-58.
- "Show Boat", *Bioscope* (10 April, 1929).
- Silverman, Kaja, *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press), 1988.
- Smile, J., *Pour Vous*, no. 32 (27 June, 1929).
- "Sony Boy", *Bioscope* (1 May, 1929).

- Sorlin, Pierre, "Multilingual Films, or What We Know about a Seemingly Bright Idea", *Cinema & Cie: International Film Studies Journal*, no. 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 17-21.
- Spielhofer, Hans, "Hoffnung auf Film als Gesamtkunstwerk", *Deutsche Filmzeitung* (17 May 1929).
- Spohr, Mathias, "Austauschbar oder unverwechselbar? Person und Funktion in der Filmoperette", *Zauber der Boheme: Martha Eggerth, Jan Kiepura und der deutschsprachige Musikfilm* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2002), pp. 415-434.
- Stahl, Hans, "Triumph der Photomontage/Melodie der Welt", *Der Montag Morgen*, no. 11 (18 March, 1929).
- Staiger, Janet, *Perverse Spectators: The Practices of Film Reception* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2000).
- Stam, Robert, *Subversive Pleasures: Bakhtin, Cultural Criticism, and Film* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).
- Stangl, Burkhard, *Ethnologie im Ohr: Die Wirkungsgeschichte des Phonographen* (Vienna: WKV Universitätsverlag, 2000).
- Steiner, George, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* [1974] (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).
- Steinthal, Walter, "Melodie der Welt" *Neue Berliner Zeitung, Das 12 Uhr Blatt*, no. 61 (13 March, 1929).
- Sterne, Jonathan, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2003).
- Sterne, Jonathan, "Preserving Sound in Modern America", *Hearing History: A Reader*, ed. Mark M. Smith (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), pp. 295-318.
- "Streit um Jan Kiepura: Er soll gleichzeitig in Europa und Amerika filmen", *Mein Film*, no. 395 (1932).
- Sturm, Sibylle M. and Arthur Wohlgemuth, (eds.), *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris!: Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939* (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1996).
- "Sunshine Susie", *Film Weekly* (15 April, 1932).
- Svenbro, Jesper, *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993).
- Svensk filmtidning* (1 April, 1930).
- "Svensk premiär på China", *Aftonbladet* (13 November 1931).
- Sydsvenska dagbladet* (3 November, 1930).
- Szczepanik, Petr, "Tief in einem deutschen Einflussbereich: Die Aufführung und Rezeption deutschsprachiger Filme in der Tschechoslowakei in den frühen 1930er Jahren", *Babylon in FilmEuropa: Mehrsprachigenversionen der 1930er Jahre*, ed. Jan Distelmeyer (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2006), pp. 89-101.
- '-t', "Marius på Bio Bio", *Hufvudstadsbladet* (20 January, 1932).
- Taussig, Michael, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
- Thomasson, R. de, "Quand Lilian Harvey séjourne à Paris: petites confidences d'une grande vedette", *Pour Vous*, no. 169 (11 February, 1932).
- Thompson, Emily, "Sound Effects: The Production and Meaning of Incidental Sound in American Film Industry, 1925-1930", unpublished paper at *Sonic Interventions: Pushing the Boundaries of Cultural Analysis*, ASCA Conference (Amsterdam, March 29-31, 2005).
- Toeplitz, Jerzy, *Geschichte des Films. Bd. 2, 1928-1933* (Berlin, 1976).

-
- Toulout, Jean, Philippe and Hériat (Délégués de l'Union des Artistes), "L'Union des artistes contre le doublage", *La cinématographie française*, no. 696 (5 March, 1932).
- Trinh T., Minh-Ha, *Framer Framed* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992).
- Uhlenbrok, Katja, "Verdoppelte Stars: Pendants in den deutschen und französischen Versionen", *Hallo? Berlin?, Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939* (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 1996), pp. 155-168.
- Uppsala Nya Tidning* (6 November, 1930).
- Veckojournalen* (9 November, 1930).
- Vertov, Dziga, Lecture April 5, 1935, Manuscript held in the Österreichischen Filmmuseum, Vienna.
- Vincendeau, Ginette, "Les films en version multiples un échec édifiant", *Le passage du muet au parlant: Panorama mondial de la production cinématographique, 1925-1935*, ed. Christian Belaygue (Toulouse: Editions Milan, 1988), pp. 29-35.
- Vincendeau, Ginette, "Hollywood Babel", *Screen*, vol. 29, no. 2 (1988), pp. 24-39.
- Vincendeau, Ginette, "Films en versions multiples", *L'histoire du cinéma: Nouvelles approches*, eds. Jacques Aumont, André Gaudreault, Michel Marie (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1989), pp. 111-117.
- Vincendeau, Ginette, "In the Name of the Father: Marcel Pagnol's 'trilogy': *Marius* (1931), *Fanny* (1932), *César* (1936)", *French Film: Texts and Contexts*, eds. Susan Hayward and Ginette Vincendeau, (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 67-82.
- Vincent-Bréchnignac, J., "Die Drei von der Tankstelle", *Pour Vous*, no. 142 (6 August, 1931).
- Vorse, Mary Heaton, "Some Picture Show Audiencies", *The Outlook*, no. 97 (24 June, 1911).
- W., "Quand le 'Chanteur de jazz' était muet", *Pour Vous* (24 January, 1929).
- Wahl, Chris, *Das Sprechen der Filme: Über verbale Sprache im Spielfilm*, Ph.D. diss., Ruhr Universität-Bochum (2003), pp. 179-182.
- Wahl, Chris, *Das Sprechen des Spielfilms: Über die Auswirkungen von hörbaren Dialogen auf Produktion und Rezeption, Ästhetik und Internationalität der siebten Kunst* (Luxemburg: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2005).
- Weis, Elisabeth and John Belton (eds.), *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).
- Whitman-Linsen, Candace, *Through the Dubbing Glass: The Synchronization of American Motion Pictures into German, French and Spanish* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992).
- Williams, Alan, "Is Sound Recording Like a Language?", *Yale French Studies*, no. 60 (1980), pp. 51-66.
- Witte, Karsten, *Lachende Erben, Toller Tag: Filmkomödie im Dritten Reich* (Berlin: Verlag Vorwerk, 1995).
- X, "La Pente (Dance, Fools, Dance)", *La cinématographie française*, no. 685 (19 December, 1931).

Filmography

Die 3-Groschenoper (G.W. Pabst, 1931)
Allo Berlin? Ici Paris /Hallo hallo! Hier spricht Berlin! (Julien Duviver, 1931)
Andalusische Nächte (Herbert Maisch, 1938)
Anna Christie (Clarence Brown, 1930)
Anna Christie (Jacques Feyder, 1931)
Atlantic (E.A. Dupont, 1929)
Atlantik (E.A. Dupont, 1929)
Atlantis (E.A. Dupont, 1930)
L'auberge espagnole (Cédric Klapisch, 2002)
Autour d'une enquête (Henri Chomette and Robert Siodmak, 1931)
Berlin Alexanderplatz (Phil Jutzi, 1931)
Berlin: Die Sinfonie der Großstadt (Walter Ruttmann, 1927)
The Big House (George W. Hill, 1930)
Blackmail (Alfred Hitchcock, 1929)
Der blaue Engel (Josef von Sternberg, 1929)
Das blaue Licht (Leni Riefenstahl, 1932)
The Blue Angel (Josef von Sternberg, 1929)
Bride of Frankenstein (James Whale, 1935)
Broadway (Paul Fejos, 1929)
Broadway Melody (Harry Beaumont, 1929)
Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari (Robert Wiene, 1920)
Camp volant (Max Reichman, 1932)
Cape Forlorn (E.A. Dupont, 1929)
Le cap perdu (E.A. Dupont, 1929)
Carmen, la de Triana (Florián Rey 1938)
César (Marcel Pagnol, 1936)
Chelovek s kino-apparatom (Dziga Vertov, 1929)
Le chemin du Paradis (Wilhelm Thiele and Max de Vaucorbeil, 1930)
Le congrès s'amuse (Erik Charell and Jean Boyer, 1931)
City Lights (Charles Chaplin, 1931)
La dactylo (Wilhelm Thiele, 1931)
Dance, Fools, Dance (Harry Beaumont, 1931)
Deutscher Rundfunk/Tönende Welle (Walter Ruttmann, 1928)
Dr. Mabuse der Spieler: Ein Bild der Zeit (Fritz Lang, 1922)
Die Drei von der Tankstelle (Wilhelm Thiele, 1930)
Ein blonder Traum (Paul Martin, 1932)
Eskimo (W.S. Van Dyke, 1933)
Fanny (Marc Allégret and Marcel Pagnol, 1932)

Den farliga leken (Gustaf Bergman, 1930)
La féerie du jazz (John Murray Anderson, 1930)
The First Auto (Roy del Ruth, 1927)
F.P.I antwortet nicht (Karl Hartl, 1932)
Frau im Mond (Fritz Lang, 1929)
Gabbo le ventriloque (James Cruze and Erich von Stroheim, 1929)
Gardez le sourire (Paul Fejos, 1933)
Girl Overboard (Wesley Ruggles, 1929)
The Godless Girl (Cecil B. DeMille, 1929)
Gone with the Wind (Victor Fleming, 1939)
Grand Hotel (Edmund Goulding, 1932)
The Great Gabbo (James Cruze and Erich von Stroheim, 1929)
Hallelujah (King Vidor, 1929)
Happy Ever After (Paul Martin, 1932)
Hinter Schloss und Riegel (James Parrott, 1931)
Hintertreppe (Paul Leni and Leopold Jessner, 1921)
Une histoire d'amour (Max Ophüls, 1933)
Hokuspokus (Gustav Ucicky, 1930)
Hors du gouffre (Raoul Walsh, 1931)
I am Suzanne (Rowland V. Lee, 1933)
IF1 ne répond plus (Carl Hartl, 1932)
Ihr dunkler Punkt (Johannes Guter, 1929)
Innocents of Paris (Richard Wallace, 1929)
The Interpreter (Sydney Pollack, 2005)
The Jazz Singer (Alan Crosland, 1927)
Kameradschaft/La tragédie de la mine (G.W. Pabst, 1931)
Kebab Connection (Annu Saol, 2005)
King Kong (Merian C. Cooper and Ernest B. Schoedsack, 1933)
The King of Jazz (John Murray Anderson, 1930)
The King of Kings (Cecil B. DeMille, 1927)
Der Kongreß tanzt (Erik Charell, 1931)
A Lady Lies (Hobart Henley, 1929)
Längtan till havet (John W. Brunius, 1931)
The Last Warning (Paul Leni, 1929)
Der letzte Mann (F.W. Murnau, 1924)
Liebelei (Max Ophüls, 1933)
Der Liebeswalzer (Wilhelm Thiele, 1930)
Lola Montès (Max Ophüls, 1955)
The Love Waltz (Carl Winston, 1930)
M (Fritz Lang, 1931)
M-le maudit (Fritz Lang and Roger Goupillière, 1931)
Mädchen in Uniform (Leontine Sagan, 1931)
The Man Who Came Back (Raoul Walsh, 1931)
Marius (Alexander Korda and Marcel Pagnol, 1931)
The Marriage Circle (Ernst Lubitsch, 1924)
Melodie der Welt (Walter Ruttmann, 1929)
Melodie des Herzens (Hanns Schwarz, 1929)
Menschen im Käfig (E.A. Dupont, 1929)

Le mépris (Jean-Luc Godard, 1963)
Metropolis (Fritz Lang, 1927)
Murgalie (James Parrott, 1931).
Die Nacht gehört uns (Carl Froelich and Henry Roussel, 1929)
Nanook of the North (Robert J. Flaherty, 1922)
Napoléon (Abel Gance, 1927)
När rosorna slå ut (Edvin Adolphson, 1930)
Niemandsland (Victor Trivas, 1931)
Noah's Ark (Michael Curtiz, 1928)
La nuit du carrefour (Jean Renoir, 1932)
La nuit est à nous (Roger Lion, 1929)
Les nuits de Port Said (Léo Mittler, 1931)
Odna (Grigori Kozintsev, 1931)
L'opéra de quat'sous (G. W. Pabst, 1931)
Orlacs Hände (Robert Wiene, 1924)
Ourang (1931)
Pardon Us (James Parrott, 1931)
La passion de Jeanne d'Arc (C. T. Dreyer, 1928)
La pente (Claude Autant Lara, 1931)
The Perfect Crime (Bert Glennon, 1928)
The Phantom of the Opera (Rupert Julian, 1929)
The Physical History of M (Issa Clubb, 2004)
Die Privatsekretärin (William Thiele, 1931)
Prix de beauté (Augusto Genina, 1929)
Los Presidarios (James Parrott, 1931).
Rapt/ La séparation des races (Dimitri Kirsanoff, 1934)
Reaching for the Moon (Edmund Goulding, 1930)
La résurrection (1931)
Un rêve blond (Paul Martin, 1932)
Säg det i toner (Edvin Adolphson and Julius Jaenzon , 1929)
Saturday's Children (Gregory La Cava, 1929)
Scherben (Lupu Pick, 1921)
Der schwarze Walfisch (Fritz Wendhausen, 1934)
La segretaria private (Goffredo Alessandrini, 1931)
Show Boat (Harry A. Pollard, 1929)
Die singende Stadt (Carmine Gallone 1930)
Sonnenstrahl (Paul Fejos, 1933)
SOS Eisberg (Arnold Fanck, 1933)
Sunshine Susie (Victor Saville, 1931)
Sous les toits de Paris (René Clair, 1929)
Sous les verrous (James Parrott, 1931)
Stachka (Sergei M. Eisenstein, 1925)
Die Straße (Karl Grune, 1923)
Stürme über dem Mont blanc (Arnold Fanck, 1930)
Sunshine Susie (Victor Saville, 1931)
Sylvester (Lupu Pick, 1924)
The Taming of the Shrew (Sam Taylor, 1929)
The Temporary Widow (Gustav Ucicky, 1930)

The Terminal (Steven Spielberg, 2004)
Das Testament des Dr. Mabuse (Fritz Lang, 1932)
Die tolle Lola (Richard Eichberg, 1927)
Tönende Handschrift (Rudolf Pfenninger)
Un trou dans le mur (René Barberis, 1930)
Vi två (John Brunius, 1930)
Voruntersuchung (Robert Siodmak, 1931)
Weekend (Walter Ruttmann, 1929)
Wings (William A. Wellman, 1927)
The World (Zhang Ke Jia, 2004)
Zum goldenen Anker (Alexander Korda, 1931)

Stockholm Cinema Studies

Published by Stockholm University

Editor: Astrid Söderbergh Widding

1. *Karl Hansson*. Det figurala och den rörliga bilden – Om estetik, materialitet och medieteknologi hos Jean Epstein, Bill Viola och *Artintact* (The Figural and the Moving Image – On Aesthetics, Materiality and Media Technology in the Work of Jean Epstein, Bill Viola and *Artintact*). Stockholm 2006. 214 pp.
2. *Eirik Frisvold Hanssen*. Early Discourses on Colour and Cinema: Origins, Functions, Meanings. Stockholm 2006. 208 pp.
3. *Therése Andersson*. Beauty Box – Filmstjärnor och skönhetskultur i det tidiga 1900-talets Sverige (Beauty Box – Film Stars and Beauty Culture in Early 20th Century Sweden). Stockholm 2006. 200 pp.
4. *Anna Sofia Rossholm*. Reproducing Languages, Translating Bodies: Approaches to Speech, Translation and Cultural Identity in Early European Sound Film. Stockholm 2006. 214 pp.

Subscriptions to the series and orders for single volumes should be addressed to any international bookseller or directly to the distributor: Almqvist & Wiksell International, P.O. Box 7634, SE-103 94 Stockholm, Sweden.

Phone: +46 8 613 61 00

Fax: +46 8 24 25 43

E-mail: order@akademibokhandeln.se

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS STOCKHOLMIENSIS

Corpus Troporum
Romanica Stockholmiensia
Stockholm Cinema Studies
Stockholm Economic Studies. Pamphlet Series
Stockholm Oriental Studies
Stockholm Slavic Studies
Stockholm Studies in Baltic Languages
Stockholm Studies in Classical Archaeology
Stockholm Studies in Comparative Religion
Stockholm Studies in Economic History
Stockholm Studies in Educational Psychology
Stockholm Studies in English
Stockholm Studies in Ethnology
Stockholm Studies in History
Stockholm Studies in History of Art
Stockholm Studies in History of Literature
Stockholm Studies in Human Geography
Stockholm Studies in Linguistics
Stockholm Studies in Modern Philology. N.S.
Stockholm Studies in Musicology
Stockholm Studies in Philosophy
Stockholm Studies in Psychology
Stockholm Studies in Russian Literature
Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology. N.S.
Stockholm Studies in Sociology. N.S.
Stockholm Studies in Statistics
Stockholm Studies in the History of Ideas
Stockholm Theatre Studies
Stockholmer Germanistische Forschungen
Studia Baltica Stockholmiensia
Studia Fennica Stockholmiensia
Studia Graeca Stockholmiensia. Series Graeca
Studia Graeca Stockholmiensia. Series Neohellenica
Studia Juridica Stockholmiensia
Studia Latina Stockholmiensia
Studies in North-European Archaeology