

INTRODUCTION

Nataša Ďurovičová

After hovering for decades at the very margins of the film-historical field as a mildly bizarre curiosity – the two headed pig of the classical cinema – the phenomenon of language versions (LVs), i.e. the simultaneous remaking of the same title in a variety of language versions, has in recent years begun to draw the interest of film historians at exponential speed. As an antonym to the monolithic and monolingual “Hollywood,” versions have also provided a prime test case for the limits of the national cinema paradigm, which had, from the mid-1980s, begun to be put into question.¹ Even when not necessarily front and center of the argument, the LVs have repeatedly cropped up to figure as important evidence in the context of star studies, exile studies and sound studies.²

Repeatedly but always anecdotally. For all this attention, doing research on LVs has generally been a near-impossible task, since it depended first of all on a hands-on comparison. Beyond locating two versions of the same film (itself a challenge, given standard archiving as well as cataloging practices, as Davide Pozzi and Ivan Klimeš attest to in this volume), the effort of bringing together the two titles (which by the fiat of distribution were meant to be mutually exclusive – to see the German version of *Anna Christie* was usually meant to pre-empt seeing the American version), not to mention arranging for two flatbeds next to each other, begged to be taken on as a collective undertaking.

The MAGIS Gradisca International Film Studies Spring School is among the very few places where such an undertaking was conceivable. Wedged in a three-corner space between Italy (proper), Slovenia, and Austria, Friuli is palpably polylingual. Added to this is its unique regional investment in film-historical research and scholarship of the last decade, as embodied in the Pordenone/Sacile “research festival” *Giornate del cinema muto*, the Udine International Film Studies Conference, and now in the Gradisca Spring School: all these have made Friuli a prime location for European as well as trans-Atlantic film studies. It is more than a coincidence that one of the very first monographs on the subject of LVs, Mario Quargnolo’s *La parola ripudiata*, was published by the Cineteca del Friuli in 1989.

Adding a further essential dimension to the Spring School is the geographical and intellectual closeness of Bologna, where academic film studies coexist with the Cineteca del Comune di Bologna and its *L’immagine ritrovata* workshop. Their joint contribution to the versioning project has been not only through prints and technical support but also through a unique combination of restoration practice and the theoretical discourse informing it, in which the classical philological tradition of textual editing is combined with new media theories.

But neither research nor theoretical work on the LVs can be divorced from the hands-on moment of comparison which, after all, is what makes this topic so singular. And running two or three versions side-by-side is inherently (in a way almost perceptually) a collective, or at least a dialogical enterprise: at its core the Spring School was above all a workshop. It took a lot of organizational talent, energy and patience to assemble and run, in the ad-hoc space of a 17th century palazzo, a 35 mm projection booth, a multimedia lab with dozens of titles, a document and book library and, above all, a revelatory series of films screened in two to three versions. The team responsible for assembling them included Mariapia Comand, Veronica Innocenti, Francesco Pitassio, Valentina Re, Cosetta Saba and Laura Vichi, with the genial, generous and inspirational Leonardo Quaresima at its helm. To these must be added the name of Hans-Michael Bock, whose willingness to share films and documents, combined with superb organizational skills and deep knowledge of the period, honed through his long-standing involvement with the *CineGraph* project (in some respects the research precursor and natural future partner of the MAGIS project) influenced every aspect of the seminar.³

The core Italian group had already laid ground for the Spring School in organizing, during the preceding spring (2002) a conference in Udine entitled *Il film e suoi multipli/Film and its Multiples*, out of which the theme for the Gradisca project emerged.⁴ At the Udine International Film Studies Conference language versions had appeared in the framework of all kinds of other cinematic series, and all kinds of methodological approaches to seriality, ranging from semiotic through phenomenological to historical. While the scope of papers presented in Gradisca was somewhat broader (Martin Barnier on a French and an American adaptation of *Les Misérables*, Manlio Piva on the Italian and the French release copies of Bresson's *Pickpocket*, just to name a few), the focus of attention was on language versions proper. These were loosely approached as films which solve(d) the problem of dialogue translation not by adding a narrowly linguistic supplement (dubbing and subtitling), but rather by replicating all or some portion of the footage through reenactment, in a relatively close temporal arrangement, one that would allow positing the films as “versions” (in contrast, in particular, to “remakes” with their relatively longer temporal contract).

One theoretical framework offered here up-front was François Jost's semio-pragmatic account of pertinent categories of identity and difference between two “works.”⁵ The point of departure is the concept of replicability: what makes a second work, in an oxymoron, a “true copy” of the first, i.e. when is it similar enough to be a facsimile (like the prints of a photographic negative) of the first, and consequently also potentially a falsificate? And when is the second work different enough so as to no longer have a relationship of identity to its presumed precedent, i.e. when does it become a “version” of some preceding work? The terms “autographic” and “allographic” (borrowed from Nelson Goodman via Gérard Genette's body of work) chart two different principles of difference: an autographic work is unique and thus possible to falsify (= be copied perfectly, such as a painting), while an allographic work (e.g. a play) exist only in each of its many possible manifestations (e.g. a variety of performances). To extrapolate from Jost's presentation, the claim for a version being strictly a communicative act of linguistic translation into another language of a “*version originale*” (its “functional equivalent”) would thus emphasize its autographic characteristics, while a more expressive-

ly driven view of versions as “cultural translations” (as Joseph Garnarcz would have it) would search out and dwell more on their “variant” allographic properties. Both in Genette’s and Jost’s use much modification of Goodman’s binary set follows, but for our purposes it provided one conceptual handle on the spectrum of versioning processes.

Pierre Sorlin’s historicist stock-taking of the near-endless heterogeneity of the concept of a “version,” together with the critical survey of the historical writing on the versions and its methods provided by Rémy Pithon, blocked out many of the guideline questions of the coming days.⁶ Together the two overviews agreed, implicitly if not explicitly, on a preamble: our definitional problems are first and foremost a function of scarce data. Until we can accurately determine the degree of planning, that is, of *intentionality* involved in the decision to substitute elements x and y but not w and z, it will remain impossible to draw a distinction between a version and a remake, a version and an adaptation, and even a version and a generic cluster, which in turn will make periodization impossible.

The search for a definition can be sought in the direction of theory (“what is the particular nature of repetition in the LVs?”), or in history (“when were versions?”). The bulk of papers presented here, and the Spring School’s general tenor, were in the latter category – research papers with a historical-culturalist bent. Brought up to historiographical scrutiny, however, there are in them leads toward larger issues of history of representations from which it is but a close step to more general media-theoretical concerns.

As studied in Gradisca the LVs were assumed to be a finite series, limited to the 1929-1939 decade; though there are odd instances of LVs during and after WWII, these really are extremely rare. This periodization then begs the question of whether it is accurate, as systems-driven historiography would have it, to view the LVs as a “glitch,” a historically contained moment of experimentation during the unruly period of transition to sound. On this view translation through versions was a deviation from some sort of norm (whether that norm be understood in textual or production-related terms) which at some point became reinstated. Or, should the LVs, given their large numbers and considerable pervasiveness, be viewed as a distinct, even autonomous form/at/ion brought about by the confrontation of competing or complementary media regimes of sight and sound, such as on one hand the stage, on the other for instance the recording industry and radio? This latter point was advanced in discussion especially by Thomas Elsaesser, in whose perspective the chief interest of the LVs is as one symptom of what he called “a generalized crisis of indexicality.” On this view the versions’ approach to the body/voice split represents simply one strategy among many for the wholesale reconfiguration, in 20th century modernity, of perception and knowledge, a process in which the newest medium of sound cinema joined its technological predecessors and competitors – photography, silent film, radio, telephony – in molding new reality-effects and new forms of subjectivity.

Some of the debates issuing from here then circled around to the question of whether dubbing (the historically privileged translation substitute for version-making) was in some sense ontologically inevitable, the “natural” functional equivalent of the LVs which was bound to put an end to this practice, or whether it needed to be checked against, and found in some respect constitutionally different from, the LVs’ extreme form of duplicating in which the process of translation included cultural as well as linguistic elements.⁷ If we take the LVs as more than just a transitional form, we are bound to return to the surplus of “body” – as (gendered) actor, as performance, as agency.⁸

The contributions that follow in this issue can be divided into two broad groups. One takes as its implicit assignment Sorlin's set of questions: what can be identified, historically, as the common element(s) for a cluster of films so that they can qualify as "versions" of each other? In other words, *exactly* what were the procedures and/or textual elements that could be duplicated economically and practically (and thus copied "autographically"), and which were instead the elements in need of local modification, that is, elements seen as the required signals of national difference (i.e. "allographic" elements of non-identity)?

The other set of papers extrapolates from this research to ask: what can we learn from the interaction between LVs and the historiographic category they most apparently challenge, that of the national cinema(s)? And in extension of this, is there (not) a line to be drawn between the type of seriality deployed in the Hollywood-made "foreign" versions (FLVs) and the "multilingual" versions made in Europe (MLVs)?

The answer to the former question is to be found, and was sought, in the format of close reading. The assumption underlying this approach is then that a critical mass of precise details will give us a "bottom-up" account, mapping "exactly" what could or had to be varied in order to create difference significant enough to qualify as a version.

Beyond the chronological primacy of his material, Davide Pozzi's gloss on the restorations of *Nana* and *Prix de beauté* also perfectly illustrates Sorlin's call for research on production procedures. Aiming to ascertain the exact relation between "one title... two editions [silent and sound]... and four [dubbed] versions" the restoration story as told here demonstrates that the two editions did not as stand in a hierarchical – let's say autographic – relationship, in other words that the sound version was not simply a silent version with inserted sound shots. Rather, the silent and the sound "editions" (to use the philological term favored by the Bologna scholars) are allographic, two separate "performances" of the title *Prix de beauté*. This non-identity is beautifully confirmed in the reconstruction which revealed that while the film-within-film ending of the silent version fills the frame completely, in the sound version the corresponding film-within-film shot consists of a film strip that includes an optical sound track. The two mutually exclusive variants thus carry with them a substantial allegorical baggage, as Malte Hagener's very different essay on the same film suggests later in this issue.

The four subsequent essays share the procedure of close and comparative reading. What they differ in is the choice of the materials of expression through which the national "reassignment" is accomplished: music, narrative, language/cultural idiom and spatial markers respectively.

Like Pozzi, the musicologist Roberto Calabretto tracks a two-step inter-media version switch – from Weill/Brecht's stage opera to Pabst/Weill/Mackebien's film with songs (German/original) to Pabst/Weill/Mackebien's (French/secondary) version. Generally siding with the view critical of the film's revision of the stage version, Calabretto in turn sides with the German version over the French, which he finds better corresponding to both the original stage score and to Brecht's theories in general. He notes changes in performance (Oswald's aggressive contra Florelle's lyrical tone), as well as in scoring (the German version's more complex use of recitative in the wedding sequence than that of the French version, yet its failure to deliver on Brecht's preference for "speaking against music"). Ultimately an instance of philologically-informed textual comparison, Calabretto's analysis concludes without extrapolating to a general "nationalizing" interpretation of the differences he identifies.⁹

If it was the musical structure that was the chief evidence of a two-step “degradation” for Calabretto, Francesco Bono’s discussion of the opera-film *Casta Diva* and its English version *The Divine Spark* (C. Gallone, 1935) locates difference squarely in the realm of narrative. Chiefly by tracking divergences in editing and framing Bono shows the difference between the longer Italian version which centers on the protagonist Bellini’s Faustian deal with his musical career and is complemented by a distinctly divine vision of his muse Maddalena, and the shorter English version in which the muse’s “spark” invokes a less ephemeral and more human female character counterbalancing a less “predestined” composer. This drift away from the operatic and more toward the romantic modality is then also present in Gallone’s 1954 Italian “auto-remake” of *Casta Diva*.

The pair of papers by Peter Szczepanik and Petr Mareš, deliberately triangulated with Ivan Klimeš’s overview of the Czechoslovak 1930s situation elsewhere in the issue, put into focus a major national cinematography otherwise largely ghettoized in its post-WWII “East” incarnation. Jointly they highlight its complex participation in the transnational film space via its special relationship to the German and the Austrian state, as well as to the larger Germanophone “imagined community.” Attending to the full range of permutations in the clefts between the social space and the linguistic space of both the diegesis and the spectator, and to the versions’ attempts to overcome these gaps by various ways of “stitching” spaces together, Szczepanik proposes, on the Czech example, a conceptual framework for the work of cultural translation (Garncarz’ term again) amongst several variations of such an “imagined community.” Mareš’s essay, with its linguistic focus, proceeds in the complementary direction. Attending closely to what we might call “the shifter function” of linguistic and cultural idiom, he tracks the versioning procedures of the bilingual Czech star Vlasta Burian as a loop from his “mitteleuropean” Habsburg Empire themes in their distinctly local Czech formulation (both in terms of the characters’ punning and ornate language and in terms of the films’ mildly Schweikian anti-Habsburg ironies), which he then re-packaged in version format for the sensibilities of the “mitteleuropean” German-speaking audiences. As laid out by Mareš, the Burian example also demonstrated the non-linear ricochet effect of “cultural translation”: a version’s failure may be an index signaling that a non-negotiable and thus non-translatable border exists between national(ist) spaces.

In counterdistinction to these “bottom-up” close readings, several contributions offered a reverse top-down perspective, placing the LVs within the paradigm of national cinemas. In Joseph Garncarz’ analysis of the German situation that paradigm not only remained intact right until the mid-1960s, but was in fact buttressed by the LVs in their collective effort to mobilize, satisfy and thus mirror a given set of national norms (whether linguistic, stylistic or typological). In a comparable scenario, Charles O’Brien identifies the signature effect of the French (national) cinematography of the 1930s as a direct legacy of Paramount’s Joinville studio, whose “canned theatre” (i.e. direct-recording) sound model, elsewhere limited to the transition era, came to correspond particularly well to the performance-driven French mode and became adopted as its dominant stylistic norm.¹⁰ In these two essays the LVs thus became a kind of *primus inter pares* of their “host” national cinematographies.

In contrast to the model in which a national cinema is equated with and measured through the box office records in that country, the model implied in Ivan Klimeš’ study of the Czechoslovak interwar situation drives a wedge between the concept of national cinema as a market and as a discursive entity. Aiming for a basic factographic invento-

ry of versions produced in the country, and therefore concentrating on production more than on reception, Klimeš's account nonetheless offers the picture of a complex national non-identity within the state's boundaries. The Czech-language films were thus versioned (largely into German) as a strategy to help finance them, the target audiences being not just the German speakers abroad but also the country's own substantial German minority. But access to both these markets was regulated by the multi-national Czechoslovak state through a range of legal and economic tools, such as import quotas and quality subsidies. In the border areas the Czechoslovak German versions would thus compete with the imported German-language originals, the two sets thus no longer functioning as mutually exclusive "functional equivalents." Almost simultaneously this minoritarian versioning nexus also became a transitional landing point in the lines of flight along which some Jewish émigrés were moving out of the widening realm of the Nuremberg laws.

Klimeš's account lends empirical as well as conceptual resonance to Malte Hagener's schema. It is no accident that Hagener too takes up *Prix de beauté*, sometimes known as *Miss Europe*. At once famously lost, fragmented, mythical (thanks to Louise Brook's cinephiliac standing on the right side of the Atlantic), multi-national and multi-medial, caught between the allographic (via its two media versions, silent and sound) and the autographic (via dubbing) poles of duplication, the film served Pozzi as an exemplum of the restoratorial challenge to notions of single origins. It serves Hagener as a case study for, as well as allegory of what he calls the "over-in-determination," (i.e. multiple causality in uncertain hierarchy) of the transitional early sound period in a Europe at once heterogeneous and crisscrossed by an array of inter-national production networks. It is then his claim that the European MLVs, the *multi-language* versions produced in the nexii of such production networks (held together by powerful producer figures, from Joe May and Erich Pommer down through today's Claude Berri and David Puttnam) signal a different (more allographic, let's say) kind of cinematic seriality than the vulgarly mechanical the FLVs, the (let's say quasi-autographic) "*foreign language versions*" made in Hollywood.

There is room for a polemic with this account. Hollywood's several versioning strategies (generally not at the center of discussions in Gradisca) were more diversified than the contemporaries (especially the irate European guest talent, confronted with the strict routines of the American studio system) were able to judge and describe.¹¹ Thus MGM's mid-1930s Chevalier films such as *Folies Bergères/Man from Monte Carlo* were cut and tailored with utmost care around the French star's persona, much like the UFA versions of Lilian Harvey's films, and were very successful both at home and in France. This is then to be contrasted with the same studio's completely mechanical Laurel and Hardy films in which the duo speaks a phonetically acquired Spanish, though with tongues firmly in cheeks. Here the role of parody as a kind of "preemptive anti-nationalist strategy" remains to be examined. And in extension of O'Brien's argument much can be said about Paramount-Joinville's effort to acquire a full gamut of French features, from stylistic to legal, to the point of producing some of France's best-loved national classics, such as Pagnol's *Marius* (1930).

But arguments about the various "continental" types of seriality don't subtract from (in fact probably add to) Hagener's broader methodological proposition, namely that overdetermination is the versions' *sine qua non*. For the multitude of representational transfers – linguistic, stylistic and legal – which is so thoroughly laid out in Sorlin's arti-

cle *cannot* ultimately be sorted out by “getting it right,” by cumulatively adding production datum to production datum. The definitional boundaries of the version *corpus* will remain unstable, dovetailing not only with versions achieved via partial reshooting and reediting but also, for instance, with the phenomenon of remakes ongoing until today, and encountering further difficulties when new storage media such as DVDs make their own use of versions. Best understood via a multiplicity of causes arranged in uncertain hierarchies, and often formally or thematically preoccupied with their own “conditions of representability,” versions in the term’s broadest sense make a case for “crisis historiography” which aims precisely to acknowledge shifts in definitions, and the ongoing jurisdictional battles in the process of trying to stabilize them.¹²

A few summarizing thoughts. There is no data available that can sustain the widely accepted claim that it was some generalized “change in public taste” that led to the abandonment of versioning and to its replacement by dubbing and/or subtitling. Had that been the case, we would be able to explain how “public taste” could differ so instantly and radically between countries like (1) Sweden and the US where dubbing never became prevalent, (2) France which operated with a dual system of dubbing for provinces and *versions originales* for select urban audiences, (3) Italy and Germany which lined up thoroughly behind dubbing, etc. The format in which linguistic transfers were happening was instead determined in Europe by a wide-ranging series of top-down decisions, legally secured by the state, while in the US it was quasi-sanctioned through the state’s intermittent tolerance of monopoly manifested in the film industry’s vertical integration. And because of the additional factor of a massive and vast economic depression that was unfolding simultaneously with the technological transition, scarcity of films was the case more than an array of choices. Put otherwise, the linguistic air space of a given country was regulated not by what the public preferred but by a mix of national cultural policies, the strength of the exhibitors vs. the producers’ organizations, the impact of patents, the standing of intellectual property rights etc. It was in this “over-in-determinate” mix (to use Hagener’s term) rather than in some aesthetic free market that the versions’ viability was decided.

As a phenomenon versioning participates in the generalized world-wide mobilization of cultural boundaries in the post-Crash, an era forming a dialectical hinge between the *Amerikanismus* of the 1920s and the reactive nationalisms of the 1930s. But the desire for acoustic self-recognition also on the level of speech, akin to what Benjamin calls “modern man’s legitimate claim to being reproduced,” of which the LVs were such a radical manifestation, doesn’t disappear with this format’s disappearance.¹³ It finds its more permanent expression instead in the 1930s (state-supported) boom in national cinemas and their specific genres. Even while the exports of Hollywood films grew again in mid-1930s, to higher levels than they have been around the crisis of the transition period, their market share (as Garncarz and O’Brien have pointed out here) remained relatively lower, certainly much lower than their near-complete penetration so common world-wide a decade earlier, as well as today.

It is this internal faultline, the built-in duck-rabbit effect of identity politics running through the versions that makes them so worthy of study. In their initial emergence, whether in the US or in Europe, the LVs represented the recognition, the acknowledgement of and the capitalizing on the continued existence of the local (or what has sometimes been referred to as “vernacular modernism”) by the behemoth of global media

modernity. But from the hindsight of the developments in the 1930s the persistence of versioning may also need to be paired with its replacement technique, dubbing. For both are manifestations of a kind of visceral reaction against the threat of modernity's polylingual babble, of an acoustic battening down of hatches and closing of ranks, a wish to block out all Others' voices, that the audio-visual spheres of the various countries could accomplish. Technology invited overhearing across various boundaries; politics aimed to regulate, even block that flow. Paris, the exile capital of the *entre-deux-guerres*, the mythical home of every true western cosmopolitan, was possibly the only place where one could experience and thus compare the spectrum of sound cinema's representational possibilities on an urban *dérive*, to hear the polyphony of voices, languages and translation modalities in their widest spectrum.

Finally, the present volume – as well as the ongoing Spring School project on language versions – testifies not only to the wealth of historical and archival research yet to be done of this complex topic. It testifies as well, I think, to a fascination with the LVs for a different, a more strictly aesthetic reason. As we approach and take in the corpus of all the versions in the attentive posture of comparison, the films' palimpsest offers us the flickering specter of endless alternatives. “What if” one thinks, the colonization of the American West had indeed been achieved by Italians (*Men of the North/Luigi la volpe*, Fox 1930)? What if that embodiment of German *Bürgerbildtum* Dr. Rath were the humiliated victim of a chanteuse from New York rather than of a local girl (*Der blaue Engel/Blue Angel*, UFA 1930)? What if American jails were filled with French inmates, staff and mores (*Big House/Big House*, MGM 1930)? What if Swedish sailors felt most at home in Marseilles (*Marius/Långtan till havet*, Paramount 1930)? What if the Habsburg empire were still standing, and everyone in it still, or again, spoke only the language of their emperor (*C. a k. polní maršálek/K. und K. Feldmarschall*, Elekta-Film, 1930)? And conversely, what of a world in which the same prying eye of a television set could penetrate simultaneously households in thirteen different countries (*Television*, Paramount 1930, in 13 language versions)?

While each of these differentials taken alone can be dismissed as nothing else but a symptom of a flat word of ethnic stereotypes, the composite effect that arises out of collating them is that of cinema as harboring, or rather figuring, a series of parallel and alternative worlds – not exactly utopian, simply different. It is this effect that Pierre Huygue taps in his museal installation of the 3 versions of *Atlantic*.¹⁴ Projected in loops on three large canvases hung next to one another, as if three of Monet's haystacks or cathedral facades, or like the Arles innkeeper Mme Ginoux, painted first by Van Gogh, then by Gauguin, then by van Gogh again, the three versions hum there with the ephemeral pleasure of contingency and difference, shimmering against the running strips of a world seized technologically.

1 A seminal article was Ella Shohat, Robert Stam, “The Cinema After Babel: Language, Difference, Power,” *Screen*, Vol. 26, no. 3-4 (1985). Early among revisionist approaches were for instance Dudley Andrew, “Sound in France: the Origins of a Native School,” in M.L. Bandy (ed.), *Rediscovering French Film* (New York: MOMA, 1983); Ginette Vincendeau, “Les Versions multiples,” in Jacques Aumont, Michel Marie, André Gaudreault (eds.), *Histoire du cinéma: nouvelles approches* (Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne, 1989).

- 2 For instance Dominique Lebrun, *Paris Hollywood: les Français dans le cinéma américain* (Paris: Fernand Hazan, 1987); Heike Hurst, Heiner Gassen (eds.), *Tendres Ennemis: Cent ans de cinéma entre la France et l'Allemagne* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1991); Jürgen Bretschneider (ed.), *Ewald André Dupont: Autor und Regisseur* (München : text+kritik/CineGraph, 1992); Sibylle M. Sturm, Arthur Wohlgemuth (eds.), *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939* (München: text+kritik/CineGraph, 1996); Martin Barnier, *En route vers le parlant: Histoire d'une évolution technologique, économique et esthétique du cinéma (1926-1934)* (Liège: Editions du Céfal, 2002).
- 3 While the plan to have the present issue of this journal be accompanied by a DVD-Rom (to have been edited by Hans-Michael Bock) didn't materialize for practical reasons, it remains the plan of the MAGIS project on versions to eventually generate a comprehensive electronic bibliography and filmography, accompanied when possible by clips and documentation.
- 4 Proceedings published as Anna Antonini (ed.), *Il film e i suoi multipli/Film and Its Multiples* (Udine: Forum, 2003).
- 5 François Jost, "Territoires de l'oeuvre cinématographique," unpublished paper, MAGIS Gradisca International Film Studies Spring School, March 2003.
- 6 Rémy Pithon, "Les versions multiples: composantes, limites et problèmes d'une définition," unpublished paper, MAGIS Gradisca International Film Studies Spring School, March 2003, and "Les 'Versions multiples': ont-elles existé?" in A. Antonini (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 123-129.
- 7 On the parallel development of versions and dubbing see Nataša Đurovičová, "Local Ghosts: Dubbing Bodies in Early Sound Cinema," in A. Antonini (a cura di), *op. cit.*, pp. 83-98.
- 8 A discussion of norms determining which bodies and which languages can be made "functionally equivalent" under what circumstances would benefit from a comparison with the other great systemic filmmaking paradigm, that of cinema in India. There version-making in an array of languages continues to be a common practice, even while it coexists alongside the open and artful post-synchronization of songs. For more on the general topic see Shoma A. Chatterji, "The Culture Specific Use of Sound in India Cinema," at <http://www.filmsound.org/india/>.
- 9 For a complex discussion of the film's relationship to various modes of duplication, and the attendant issues of intellectual property rights see Thomas Elsaesser, "Transparent Duplicities: *The Threepenny Opera* (1931)" in Eric Rentschler (ed.), *The Films of G.W. Pabst* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990), pp. 103-115. The essay doesn't, however, take up the French version, nor the film's deployment of the musical score.
- 10 For a wide variety of models of influence between the American and the French cinema see Martin Barnier, Raphaëlle Moine (eds.), *France/Hollywood. Echanges cinématographiques et identités nationales* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002).
- 11 For a particularly emotional reaction see for instance Claude Autant-Lara, *Hollywood Cake-Walk (1930-1932)* (Paris: Veyrier, 1990) which touches on Buster Keaton's versioning work for MGM. For an exemplary documentation and assessment of seriality involved in a Hollywood FLV production see Giuliana Muscio, "Come *The Big Trail* divenne *Il grande sentiero* e *Men of the North* divenne *Luigi la volpe*" in A. Antonini (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 105-114.
- 12 For an outline see for instance Rick Altman, "Introduction: Sound/History," in Rick Altman (ed.), *Sound Theory /Sound Practice* (New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 122-125.
- 13 Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Illuminations*, edited by Harry Zorn (New York: Schocken, 1969), p. 232 and note no. 7.
- 14 The English and German versions of *Atlantic* were directed by E.A. Dupont in 1929 for BPI, the French, directed by Jean Kemm, was made in London and Paris in 1930. On the installation see Anne-Françoise Lesuisse, "Le *Cinéma d'exposition*: mémoire et remake du specta-

teur” in A. Antonini (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 197-203. On Huyghe’s other work with cinema, including the installation entitled “Dubbing,” see for instance Christine van Asst, “Framing the Spatial,” in *Premises: Invested Spaces in Visual Arts, Architecture and Design from France, 1958-1998* (New York: Guggenheim/DIA, 1999).