

INTRODUCTION

The debate around the plurality and multiplicity of cinema, repetitions and differences, accurate filmographic and document research, versions and variants, remake and ‘reprise’) has identified – rediscovered – in multiple versions a polyhedral object that is observed and can be observed from a heterogeneous number of points of views but equipped, on the whole, of a strong equilibrium between historiographic tendencies and theoretical and analytical reflections. In a sort of ‘hermeneutics rebound effect’ historiographic studies have in fact forced the theory to rethink and reassess the reference categories and taxonomies, thus rendering more problematic the research’s status quo. Vice versa theory, in an effort to define adequate analytical tools, has raised new considerations and reassessments in historical studies (Horst Claus and Anne Jäckel’s paper is an illuminating example).¹

The studies published here constitute an important part of the papers and research presented, discussed and developed during the 2004 II Gradisca Spring School.² The contents of this monographic number reveal the aim of introducing the discussion starting from two theoretical studies, with different directions and orientations, centred on well-defined case studies. The first by Marie-France Chambat-Houillon, starts from an in-depth and engrossing theoretical reflection on the remake of a classic – *Psycho* – in order to bring multiple versions back into direct contact with the theoretical debate on cinematic plurality. A fruitful and productive field for the definition of the identity of multiple versions, which finds coherent confirmation in the case studies discussed by Michèle Lagny and Michel Marie. The second – by Francesca Chelu Deiana and Davide Pozzi – continues, with constancy and rigour, the debate on multiplicity, between versions and editions, faced by the theory and practice of film restoration.³

Whilst investigating “la place de l’auteur” in the dynamics put into play by the practice of ‘remaking,’ Chambat-Houillon encounters the “fluctuating frontiers” of multiplicity. As well as confirming the tools and theoretical areas that match the allographic and autographic properties of the works,⁴ there are two elements that in particular concern the differentiation between multiple versions (territory of multiplicity) and remakes (territory of plurality).

The first characteristic peculiar to the remake is the lack of “equivalence” between the works, whilst the multiple versions are typified (in part: the autographic side) by the – functional – equivalence.⁵ The second element consists of one of the identifying traits of the “originality” of a work. Along with the innovation and the singularity “l’écart temporel” between original and remake, the diachronic and ‘re-recognition’ perspective of the ‘re-made’ work “fonctionne comme un différence ‘essentielle’” that heightens and highlights the authorial intentions in the textual process and result of

the remake. In multiple versions, on the contrary, the equivalence logic, even if not always and entirely present, joins the relative indifference of the “amplitude temporelle” in defining the theoretical identity of the multiple versions and in their distinction as single works.

Could one say then, provocatively taking the seductive intuitions present in the assessments of certain theoretical studies to their extreme, that the multiplicity in multiple versions can be considered as the synchronic “version” of plurality? As Chambat-Houillon points out in her study, it nevertheless remains difficult – in the oscillations between theory and concrete manifestation, often “hybrid” and “mixed,” of multiplicity/plurality – to offer exact definitions, hierarchies and delimitations.⁶ One could in fact object that the practice of the remake often annuls or limits “the essentiality of the temporal difference.” In Italy, for example, many cases that can be ascribed to the field and ‘strong’ period of multiple versions, the first half of the 1930s, are classified as remakes of ‘contemporary’ foreign films, a practice that in actual fact is not limited to that transitional moment, but can be found throughout the history of cinema.⁷

The notion of synchronicity, even if insufficient to define the identity of the multiple versions, nevertheless offers interesting ideas and certain implications, which appear even more important, of the theoretical practices defined by the concept of *présentisme*, not by chance also treated and used by Michèle Lagny in his highly original case study⁸. Seemingly removed from the *strictu sensu* study of multiple versions, the study reveals itself to be fascinating and rich. It is able, amongst other things, to spark further considerations on the dimension of multiplicity and plurality, when defining the intertextual relationships and the mnemonic processes between heterogeneous (in the temporal sense) textual forms. In the specific case analysed by the scholar – a 1968 ‘original’ and two 1996 ‘synchronic’ versions – the 1996 documentary originates from a “frame-icon,” a “fantasme,” that demands a “devoir de mémoire,” far from the forms prescribed by the authorities, through the re-use and the stimulus of original elements (the May 1968 documentary) to establish, starting from an “objet-témoin” (the still of the working woman followed ‘live’ in 1968), a series of “images-mémoire” of the present: a “nouvelle archive” of oblivion and of the socially removed. An archive of a living memory, that works not to preserve but to create “present” testimonies, “remémoration,” in order to (as is the case of the second version of the 1996 documentary) establish more linear and pedagogic interpretations. In this extremely complex case it is perhaps the re-use dimension, the oscillation between past and present, between mythical uniqueness and the kaleidoscope of mnemonic locations, that helps us to understand well Lagny’s hesitation between the entity of the multiple and the plural.

In Deiana and Pozzi’s study the ‘silent multiple versions,’ in an analogous way and in an extremely different historical and methodological context, nevertheless reveal – as well as the confirmation of different editions, produced deliberately and with identical legitimacy and reciprocal autonomy from an ‘archetype’ – how the very practice and methodology of film restoration becomes a continuous decanting operation between past and present. The *enquiry* (the *inspection* table, the restoration *process*) questions the documentation, the texts, the historical and material heritage, archived and rediscovered to bring the film back *to the* present as a new version, restored to ‘regulate’ the distance between contemporaneity and original context. The progressive restorations of *Kif Tebbi* (1928, Mario Camerini), conditioned by the subsequent discovery of new witnesses, leads to the production of ‘new’ and further editions that feed, on the plural-

ity front, the pragmatic, original and constituent multiplicity of the text. In this sense also the duplication process, as the final element of the restoration process and as an element of a theoretical whole, must be set in correlation with the concept of the remake.¹⁰ Finally the analysis and method of the variants proves to be a common tool, when examining the texts, to restoration methodology and the study of differences/repetitions in multiple versions.¹¹

The considerations tied to the processes and temporal dispositions (in the remake, in the ‘reprises’, in the restoration) lead one to believe that if the plurality of the remake acts and “neutralises the time of the story – time as tension between the production context and the reception context” – then the synchronic multiplicity of multiple versions, works on the implementations of texts having equivalent differences and repetitions, whose aim is not to neutralise the time of the story but to establish a communication between the production context and the reception – linguistic and cultural – contexts. The production and semiotic machine of the multiple versions works (regulates the tension between production and reception contexts) in a, prevalently synchronic, adaptation and translation regime, not only strictly linguistic, but also, and especially, cultural and symbolic.¹²

If in the plurality of the remake one aims for “un accord entre le présent de l’expérience du spectateur [...] et celle de la fabrication du film,” the multiple versions operate through the multiplication to fill, translate and connect the distances between the different ‘cultural locations’ of reception.¹³

Therefore in Europe there is the notion of the multilingual version system as a form of synchronic adaptation to the international, national and trans-national cultural and linguistic identities and contexts. Much like a linguistic and cultural translation system that nevertheless, and perhaps because of it, acts on a level that intersects the remake.¹⁴

The investigations into the adaptations to the multilingual contexts, on the constructions and representations of national and trans-national identities, on “national styles,” carried out also through multiple versions, follow this direction and are part of this theoretical and historiographical field. The essays by Paul Lesch, Charles O’Brien and Ivan Klimeš and Pavel Zeman, in their evident differences, contain a common root in the research current that, starting from different analysis levels and contexts – the reception and diffusion of multiple versions and of talking films in the transition from silent cinema to talkies in Luxembourg in Lesch’s case; the statistical approach, between production modes and national styles in O’Brien’s case; the study of different diffusion forms and modes of newsreels in the Czechoslovak territory in Klimeš and Zeman’s case – investigate the modes of construction and representation of identity and national and trans-national aesthetic forms as well as the diffusion of multiplicity in, and for, multilingual contexts.

The case study treated by Lesch, in which the essential and characterising features of the specific historical picture provided by the cinema in Luxembourg – small multilingual and multicultural context – during the transition from silent to sound films, is of extreme interest. There are three preliminary factors that Lesch highlights: a multilingual and multicultural context; a cinematic institution that acts on the level of film distribution, exhibition and critical reception, that is, it does not produce a national cinema; a transitional moment – from silent to talkies – perceived in the initial stages as a fear of loosing, along with the aesthetic dimension, the communicative and ideological qualities of silent cinema: internationality, popularity and democratic nature. The mul-

tilinguism of the Luxembourg territory allowed, since the early 1930s, for an extended distribution of films in double-version: subtitled and dubbed. Until the second half of the 1930s the Luxembourg territory offered a broad range of possibilities: American films dubbed in German, multiple versions of American films, German films, Franco-German multiple versions, French films subtitled in German, etc. American cinema regained its dominant position only in the second half of the 1930s, to the advantage of German cinema whilst French cinema dropped in preference and screening frequency. Lesch identifies, in the consistent drop in popularity of French films during the first half of the 1930s not only the linguistic barrier, that is a minor familiarity with the French as opposed to German language, but also a lack of promotion of the films compared to the advertising campaigns and materials of Ufa films. The prevalence of the German language, especially in rural areas, in connection with the advertising campaigns does not prevent French and American films from finding their place. In conclusion there are two significant features that render the Luxembourg context unique and interesting. The contemporary presence in the territory, between 1930 and 1933, side by side or in the same cinema of French and German versions of the same film. The multiple versions tend to, in this hybrid and complex cultural and linguistic context and with different technological and linguistic solutions, to escape a strict regime of functional equivalence. They are screened in the same cinema and one is encouraged to see both of them, as is the case with *Atlantic* (1930, Ewald André Dupont, Jean Kemm), in order to appreciate the difference in treatment of the same scenario and they are also dealt with parallel in the newspapers. The particularity of the context is further confirmed by the fact that dubbing and subtitling (in French and German) were introduced and accepted relatively early and without an evident refusal, resulting in the winning model (especially for American cinema) throughout the 1930s.¹⁵

Ivan Klimeš and Pavel Zeman analyse, with different results and scope, the variants and strategies of propaganda and adaptation to the different Czechoslovak linguistic and cultural contexts present in two years of the weekly newsreel *Aktualita* (in Czech, German and to a lesser extent Slovak versions). Despite the multilingual context, the historical and political period leads Klimeš and Zeman to highlight, through a rigorous analysis and documentation, how at times, under certain circumstances – in this case the specific situation of conflict and precariousness in Czechoslovakia in the second half of the 1930s –, communicating in a particular language, with particular symbolic, cultural as well as political values, becomes more important than the content. The analysis of the variants between the Czech and the German language versions, made possible on the whole thanks to the use of a relevant quantity of non-filmic sources, identifies, with philological rigour, five types of basic variants: order, removal, substitution (to match certain current affairs pieces with the reference territories and populations or to avoid undesirable political connotations), variants in the audio commentary (for political reasons or to avoid possible misunderstandings), and finally variants that summarise and combine the above. The Czechoslovak propaganda therefore finds, through the cultural focus and linguistic commutation, a flexible strategy such as to maintain an equilibrium between the different intra-national and trans-national inhabitants. The multiplicity of the versions of *Aktualita* allows the state to represent itself as a body close and directly interested in the cultural, social and daily activities of the German minority. The media attention expressed in the Slovak version is very similar.

O'Brien's statistical analysis, in the wake of Barry Salt's studies, starts from a macro-

analytical level, fruitfully bringing together national styles and aesthetics, production and editing methods and techniques of sound cinema, in order to find, on a micro-analytical level, ways of understanding the historical weight and influence of the multiple version system. The research on the statistical data from the Average Shot Length (ASL) calculation is placed next to the assessment of the different market targets of the national cinema industries. The analysis of this data demonstrates a considerable difference between national cinemas: in particular France, throughout the 1930s, maintains a longer average shot length than the United States and English language films. This is attributable to the greater presence of live shots and contemporaneously demonstrates a much broader oscillation (a *range*) than the German or American range and therefore a greater variety of editing techniques. O'Brien puts down this last aspect to the genres employed and to the relevance of the role of the *auteur* in French cinema. In the period between 1930 and 1932 sound recording and editing techniques and the market trends devised and employed by three different film industries (United States, France, Germany) offer a diverse statistical and analytical picture. If one considers the different market targets – on one hand, USA and Germany as “export-oriented film industries,” and on the other France, more intent on maintaining the local market – the industrial and consistent impact on the production methods and editing techniques of the solutions employed through multiple versions by the United States and Germany lead to, as O'Brien suggests, a “pre-designed modular film-sound technique.” On the contrary, the French cinema industry, anchored to the local market, evolves, through differentiated solutions and a marked use of live shots, towards a national style different “from that of the export-oriented German and American film industries.” The comparison between the different ASL of English and German versions of the same film therefore have a clear convergence with the more general data, highlighting a planned modulation and adaptation process of the multiple versions to the “national styles” and not exclusively for strictly cultural and linguistic translation.

Hartvigson, differently from Lesch, O'Brien and Klimeš-Zeman states right from the outset, in his examination of *Frk. Møllers Jubilæum* (1937, *Miss Møller's Jubilee*, Denmark) and *Julia Jubilerar*, (1938, *Julia Jubilates*, Sweden), his intention of not analysing the differences in terms of nationality, but rather in the methods of actuating comic strategies. In this sense, multiple versions offer a unique opportunity to highlight the methods and processes for constructing characters in comedy. The Danish and Swedish versions, starting from the same scenario and the same set, offer two considerably different approaches to the definition of the main characters. The Swedish version, monotonous in its classical running, maintains a strong adherence to the canons of realism, in terms of a suppression of fiction codes. The Danish version, on the other hand, constructs and develops the characters by placing in the middle of the comedy their stereotypical and caricatural nature with connotations pursued by moving from one genre, and functional world, to another (the musical, the melodrama). The opportunity to investigate the traits of the comical and comedy through different acting and recitative approaches and through the construction methods of the comic substance finds, in this multiple version, a perfect case study that pitches a discussion on the clarification of the boundaries and transitions of fiction (the baroque, in the Danish version) against a discussion on the suppression of comic codes (the discreet, in the Swedish version). Such an approach sheds light both on the implementation strategies of multiple versions and on their validity, on an operative and phenomenological level,

in order to study the acting techniques, film star systems and the “substances” in the genre’s requirements.

The aims, approach and conclusions of the case treated by Horst Claus and Anne Jäckel who have re-examined (“reassessed”) nearly ten years later, the celebrated *Der Kongreß tanzt* (1931, Erik Charell) and compared it with the French and English versions are different still. There are numerous reasons: a notion of historiography as a process of reassessment, “re-examinations” and revision of the texts and contexts with new available sources.

Furthermore Claus and Jäckel highlight, in the production and screening process of the different versions, the special attention paid by Ufa to financial, commercial and production policies between 1930 and 1932, with the progressive slide towards a greater attention to European markets (German and French) at the expense of English language markets (United States and Great Britain) as well as the particular and detailed attention to the production practices of the first film by the theatre director Charell and to the conflictual and non linear genesis of the film which also contained different contributions. Versions that starting from the initial multiplicity, ontological/constitutive, filmographic and productive, proliferate through the historiographic and philological enquiry towards a more extended multiplicity: the Viennese premiere, the Berlin premiere and the subsequent censorship variants, the French version, the English version and its 1932 *Old Vienna* re-edition, etc. The comparative analysis of the surviving prints and the considerations that emerge seem more significant. If the three versions, at a first cursory glance, seemed basically similar and the genre (the operetta-film in an intermedial perspective) became the main “internationalisation” vehicle of the film, allowing for the coexistence of national and contradictory elements, now a textual analysis, – still to be completed, warn the authors – the consideration of the details (at a recitative, linguistic, musical, choreographical and editing level, as well as for example the special intervention of the supervisor, Carl Winston, on the English script) leads one to reflect on the generalisations often acquired by historical research on multiple versions. That is that the production and commercial practices influenced by the historical, cultural and economic context and by the particular and individual interventions occurred at different stages of the production and distribution process of *Der Kongreß tanzt* make one in part, and positively, doubt, opening the historiographic re-examination, generalisations tied to linear views of the standardisation processes, techniques and solutions in act during the transition from silent to talking pictures or to the schematics tied to the conception and constitution ‘by nation/language/culture’ of multiple versions. Furthermore, such re-openings include in the field of multiple versions, not only of the remake, a strong rate of intentionality (authorial, textual, pragmatic, productive) that is considerably different in the different original texts.

Also Michel Marie, in the study dedicated to *Le Mépris*, stresses how the expression “multiple versions” denotes “very varied technical practices.” Therefore “dubbed” versions must then be considered as “another variant of multiple versions.” If for Marie the analytical approach goes through the textual and historiographical analysis, for the procedures that make a film multiple, this doesn’t prevent it finding in the temporality, in the contemporariness of the circumstances or in their subsequent manifestation, a fundamental difference between multiple versions and remake. It is in this sense that *Le Mépris* becomes multiple and not plural. From a different point of view, one must

also consider how the structure of the European cinema system of the sixties - with one of the dominant factors consisting of co-productions and joint ventures, on the most part at a financial level – meets, in its involution, certain ‘strong’ cases of ‘real’ co-production. Films conceived from the outset with a mixture of international and multi-layered elements (international crew, intervention of a French author on an Italian literary text, multilingualism, etc.).¹⁶

The versions indicated by Marie and analysed according to their differences (linguistic, musical, editing variants, removed and added variants, consisting of Bardot’s nudes) offer a view of multiplicity in which the proliferations, the version of *Le Mépris*, appear like the effect of an exemplary conflict (between multilingualism and cosmopolitanism and commercial and institutional requirements) and of a rejection of a unique, and in certain ways ‘old style,’ co-production model.¹⁷

In conclusion, the ‘Multiple Versions Project,’ thanks to the results produced by the Spring School in terms of research, collaboration between university, research and archive institutions has achieved a first important operational objective, that is the presentation to the European Community of an ambitious and shared international long-term project: *Multilingual Version Films and European Cultural Identity. MLV – Multilingual Versions Project*. The project partners and the associated members are: Národní Filmový Archiv (Praha), *CineGraph* (Hamburg), Università degli Studi di Udine, Filmarchiv Austria (Wien), Bundesarchiv-Filmarchiv (Berlin), Archives Françaises du Film du Centre National de la Cinématographie (CNC, Bois d’Arcy), in cooperation with Universität Hamburg, Ruhr Universität (Bochum), Friedrich-Wilhelm-Murnau-Stiftung (Wiesbaden), Cineteca del Comune di Bologna, Cineteca del Friuli, Università degli Studi di Bologna, CSC-Cineteca Nazionale (Rome) and the PresTech Film Restoration Laboratory.

The project will work on three levels. A basic filmography, containing the essential information of the MLV films, will be used to create an advanced filmography containing detailed information as well as related documents. Census of the existing copies of MLV films in European and world film archives and their physical state. Filmography and important documents will be made available through a website and database (English, French, German).

As a first opportunity to relate the MLV project to a wider and popular audience *CineGraph* and Bundesarchiv-Filmarchiv will dedicate “CineFest - II International Festival of German Film-Heritage” as well as the 18th *CineGraph* Conference in November 2005 in Hamburg to the topic. The programme of CineFest will then be screened in Berlin, Vienna and Zurich.

The partners co-organizing the project will identify a series of MLV films, that will undergo reprinting and/or restoration of the various versions; a series of international events will present the results of the restoration projects and the progress of the researches. They will host exhibitions and screenings of MLV films; the research and restoration activity will result in publications (books as well as – hopefully – DVDs) in connection with European publishing houses.

Finally the organisation and distribution of an extensive retrospective dedicated to MLVs in the context of European production, presented in major cities of the continent. The publication of a book containing a popular summary of the MLV project.

[s.m., in collaboration with h.m.b.]

- 1 In the name of continuity, as Nataša Đurovičová recalled in the *Introduction* of the first issue of *CINÉMA & Cie* dedicated to multiple versions, the IX Udine International Conference on Film Studies, held in 2002 – *Il film e i suoi multipli / Film and its Multiples* – had called the attention of scientific research to the different dimensions, figures and fields of cinematic plurality and multiplicity. This attention, over the last two years has found in the “Scuola di Gradisca” - MAGIS – International Film Studies Spring School – a special location and an international research and comparison project on multiple versions. This second editorial appointment with the research on multiple versions, made possible thanks to the activities promoted by the Spring School and the important and constant attentions, contributions and stimuli provided by all the young researchers and scholars that have taken part (many of the latter are by now no strangers to Gradisca d’Isonzo), confirms first of all the validity of the choices undertaken and of the research contributions, themes and perspectives opened and developed. Cf. *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, Nataša Đurovičová, in collaboration with Hans-Michael Bock (eds.), *Multiple and Multiple-language Versions/Version multiples* (Spring 2004); Anna Antonini (ed.), *Il film e i suoi multipli/Film and its multiples* (Udine: Forum, 2003).
- 2 Amongst the talks presented it is worth recalling André Gaudreault’s contributions, on multiple versions in the early cinema, Charles Musser’s on the variants and on the versions of *Ame d’artiste/Heart of an Actress* (1924, Germaine Dulac), Hans-Michael Bock and Nataša Đurovičová’s on the research issues and perspectives in the field of multiple versions. Furthermore the talks by Natalia Noussinova, Casper Tybjerg, Leonardo Gandini – on two versions, in English and Spanish, of *Dracula* (1931, Tod Browning/George Melford), Lenny Borger – a talk dedicated to the *The Robber Symphony* (1935-36, Friedrich Fehér) -, Rié Kitada (on the multiple versions of the *benshi*).
- 3 Cf. Davide Pozzi, “Quelle version restaurer? Deux cas concrets: *Nana* et *Prix de Beauté*”, *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, cit., pp. 22-29; Davide Pozzi, “La passione di *Nana*. Vita morte e trasfigurazione di un film di Jean Renoir,” *Cinegrafie*, no. 15 (2002), pp. 79-115.
- 4 For a treatment of the allographic and autographic qualities see Gérard Genette, *L’Œuvre de l’art. Immanence et transcendance* (Paris: Seuil, 1994); Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968).
- 5 Cf. François Jost, *Territoires de l’œuvre cinématographique*, unpublished paper, MAGIS - Gradisca International Film Studies Spring School, March 2003.
- 6 Cf. F. Jost, *op.cit.*; see also Rémy Pithon, *Les Versions multiples: composantes, limites et problèmes d’une définition*, unpublished paper, MAGIS – Gradisca International Film Studies Spring School, March 2003. See also Rémy Pithon, “Les Version multiples: ont-elles existé?”, in A. Antonini (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 123-129.
- 7 For the quoted theme and historical context cf. Orsola Silvestrini, “L’autoremake e il cinema di genere: il caso Mario Camerini,” in A. Antonini (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 180-181: “Nel periodo compreso tra l’avvento del sonoro e la seconda guerra mondiale, coesistono in Italia due principali forme di rifacimento cinematografico: le versioni multiple (o versioni in lingua straniera) e i remake [...] I remake sono per lo più tratti da film stranieri, in larga misura europei, realizzati qualche anno prima, o addirittura l’anno stesso.”
In a different perspective, but still relative to the constituent properties of multiple versions, Pierre Sorlin, taking as an example *Die Privatsekretärin* (1931, Wilhelm Thiele), asked himself what could be the link between the German and French versions and the English and Italian remakes: Pierre Sorlin, “Multilingual Films, or What We Know About a Seemingly Bright Idea,” *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, cit., p. 18. Cf. also with R. Pithon, *op.cit.*, p. 124. Pithon, referring to

- the same, and other analogous, cases asked himself: “Où est, dans ce cas, le limite entre la ‘version multiple’ et le remake?”
- 8 The concept of *présentisme* we believe can also be useful in the identification of the, not obvious, theoretical and cultural statute of the “restored” versions and in shedding light in part on the relationship between remake and restored editions within the field of filmic plurality. Cf. François Hartog, *Régimes d'historicité, présentisme et expériences du temps* (Paris: Seuil, 2003).
 - 9 The same Lagny, senses in the remakes and the adaptations, simple forms of multiplicity, of the “formes particulières de ‘version multiples’”. Cf. Michèle Lagny, “Le Téléfilm comme remake culturelle,” in A. Antonini (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 192.
 - 10 Cf. Cosetta G. Saba, “Cinema, differenza, ripetizione, remake” in A. Antonini (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 45-52; Michele Canosa, “Per una teoria del restauro cinematografico,” in Gian Piero Brunetta (ed.), *Storia del cinema mondiale*, Vol. V, *Teorie, strumenti, memorie* (Torino: Einaudi, 2001), pp. 1069-1118.
 - 11 Cf. with the essays by Ivan Klimeš, Pavel Zeman and Horst Claus, Anne Jäckel contained here.
 - 12 Cf. Joseph Garncarz, “Making Films Comprehensible and Popular Abroad: The Innovative Strategy of Multiple-Language Versions,” *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, cit., pp. 72-79; Nataša Ďurovičová, “Tradurre l'America. Il plurilinguismo hollywoodiano 1929-33,” *Cinegrafie*, no. 6 (1993); Nataša Ďurovičová, “Introduction,” *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, cit., pp. 8-9.
 In the 1930s Ufa produced and distributed in France, through ACE set up in Paris in 1926, French versions of German films. In certain cases as R. Pithon, *op.cit.*, p.129, suggests, only the “French” version, whose ‘original matrix’ was not realised. A sign of continuity and further concentration on the theme of cultural translation is represented in France, during the Vichy regime, by Alfred Greven already engaged by Ufa during the first half of the 1930s to manage French technicians and artists in Berlin in order to realise French versions of German films. Greven and Continental continued with this policy of realising films by French crews for French audiences. On this subject see also the proto-co-production relationships of Scalera Film with the French companies of the period.
 Cf. also Sibylle M. Sturm, Arthur Wohlgemuth (eds.), *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris!: Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939* (München: text+kritik/CineGraph, 1996). In a symbolic sense we are referring, amongst other things, to the fact that the dubbing practices, as noted by Nataša Ďurovičová, represent in part a ‘naturalized’ exception to the fact that “usually you can’t stand in two places at once.” The learning and acceptance of dubbing and subtitling practices must, in their different levels and evolutions (see for example the Luxembourgish context described by Paul Lesch in the essay presented here), be placed in correlation to the practices and processes of literacy and affirmation of representation modes. Cf. Nataša Ďurovičová, “Local Ghosts: Dubbing Bodies in Early Sound Cinema,” in A. Antonini (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 83; Noël Burch, *La Lucarne de l’infini. Naissance du langage cinématographique* (Paris: Nathan, 1991).
 - 13 Once again P. Sorlin, *op.cit.*, p. 18, found in “a film whose different versions were shot in the same studio” perhaps the most illuminating, but at the same time unsatisfactory, definition of multiple version. The idea of a ‘studio’ as the epicentre, production and semantic-cultural network, however unstable, of focalisation and implementation of the ‘meeting’ process between production and reception context is of considerable interest, especially if compared with the methods and forms of individual and cultural ‘migration’. Cf. with the essay by Horst Claus and Anne Jäckel contained here and with Harry Waldman, *Paramount-Paris: 300 Films Produced at the Joinville Studios, 1930-1933* (Lanham-London: Scarecrow, 1998);

- Riccardo Redi, "La Fabbrica dei multipli: Joinville," in A. Antonini (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 115-122; Andrew Higson, Richard Maltby (eds.), *"Film Europe" and "Film America": Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999); Martin Barnier, Raphaëlle Moine (eds.), *France/Hollywood. Echanges cinématographiques et identités nationales* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002); Alberto Farassino, "Cosmopolitismo ed esotismo nel cinema europeo fra le due guerre," in Gian Piero Brunetta (ed.), *Storia del cinema mondiale*, Vol. I, *L'Europa. Miti, luoghi, divi* (Torino: Einaudi, 1999), pp. 485-508.
- 14 The practice of the remake is adopted, for example, by the American cinema system as a form of replacement of multiplicity originating, amongst other things, from a refusal or at least a lasting difficulty in accepting such a translation technique on the part of American cinema audiences. Cf. N. Ďurovičová, "Local Ghosts: Dubbing Bodies in Early Sound Cinema," *op. cit.*, especially pp. 93-95.
- 15 The renewal of a dominant position by American cinema can also be associated, as well as to other factors, to the collusion between dubbing practices and the different technical, productive-commercial and stylistic approaches to talking pictures assumed by the American film industry, that quickly adopted the separate tracks and mixing technique. Cf. Charles O'Brien, "Multiple Versions in France: Paramount and National Film Style," *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, cit., pp. 80-88 and the essay by the same author contained therein; N. Ďurovičová, "Local Ghosts: Dubbing Bodies in Early Sound Cinema," *op. cit.*, pp. 83-98.
- 16 Cf. Aldo Bernardini, "Le collaborazioni internazionali nel cinema europeo," in G. P. Brunetta (ed.), *op.cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 1013-1048.
- 17 The reference is to the initial viewpoint of the first European co-productions, that is a reciprocal productivity, the autographical components present in the practices of re-use implemented in twin co-productions, the constitution of mixed production groups as well as famous cases of multilanguage versions such as *Hallo Hallo! Hier spricht Berlin/Allo? Berlin? Ici Paris* (1931, Julien Duvivier). Furthermore it is not by chance that, as of the beginning of the 1950s, many Italian companies, Gualino's Lux being the initial and ideal reference point, feel, as well as for purely speculative and financial motives, the need to look towards exporting and look out for genres and stylistic models that are trans-national and 'popular'. They undertake the challenge of elaborating new strategies of international understanding and translation of their products. Cf. J. Garncarz, "Making Films Comprehensible and Popular Abroad: The Innovative Strategy of Multiple-Language Versions," *op. cit.*; Simone Venturini, *Galatea s.p.a. (1952-1965). Storia di una casa di produzione cinematografica* (Roma: AIRSC, 2002).