> *Two brothers undertook directions*
> *that logically conformed to their aptitudes*
> *and, following opposite paths,*
> *grew completely apart from one another.*
> Thomas Bernhard

The III edition of the MAGIS – International Film Studies Spring School (Gradisca d'Isonzo, 10-19 March 2005) continued the research activities proposed in the previous occasions (2003 and 2004), dedicated to an apparently occasional and limited episode of film history: the production of multiple versions with the advent of sound and for the most part in Europe, and in a slightly different form in Hollywood.[1] A more than cursory glance immediately reveals not only the historical and geographical extension of the phenomenon – not solely limited to the brief stage following the advent of sound, nor to the more thriving cinema markets[2] – but also the theoretical productivity of its examination. The multiple versions phenomenon renders notions, often abused in the historiography of cinema – work, author, national cinema – less obvious and suggests to the scholar a more integrated approach to the practice of cinema. A *plural* practice, since its origins.[3] This is why the third edition of MAGIS has examined (highlighting it in the title even, *Moving Images – Moving People. Film and Other Media*), the dynamic dimension of numerous elements: production methods, filmmakers, national cultures, media devices and forms.

The work carried out during the workshops held over the last three years in Gradisca d'Isonzo has provided valid reasons to consider, in a processual perspective, a notion too often assessed in static terms: national identity. Over that last two decades the concept of national belonging based on stale and lasting components, independently of the cooperative and participative activity of the members of the community, has been repeatedly contested.[4] This is why, increasingly, the term identity has been supplanted by the term identification, a notion able to suggest an inherent processual nature to the sense of belonging to a community and more effectively and closely describing the plurality of variables at the base of modern identity.[5] Greater attention has, furthermore, been reserved for the ability of representative forms to be places of mediation and negotiation, instruments for the activation and instruction of identification processes. Amongst these forms cinema, during the first half of the 20th century, took on a cardinal role.[6] The multiple versions phenomenon is undoubtedly an emblematic example of the possible multiplication of identity in

order to stir a national sense of community through partly repeatable, but not in the least identical, representations.

The case examined by Horst Claus and Anne Jäckel is in these terms extremely informative.[7] The production of films able to raise recognition in the nation is not only subject, as might be expected, to market influence and, in the peculiar situation of Germany in 1933-34, to political pressures; it can in some ways be planned irrespective of the nation that it tries to identify with, as *Die Insel / Vers l'abîme*, examined here, or *Der Kongreß tanzt / Le Congrès s'amuse / Old Vienna* (Erik Charell, 1931) examined elsewhere,[8] perfectly demonstrate. Such planning is not necessarily based on the concurrence between natural language and national community, usually institutive of the modern nation concept. In spite of what seems more obvious, and all the more so when examining the practice of multiple versions – linguistic instances of a relatively fixed narrative root – other ends are in store. For example, the production of multiple versions is joined by an equally under-investigated, and yet no less stimulating, phenomenon: that of the international versions, that is films spoken in different languages, the best known case of which probably being *Kameradschaft / La Tragédie de la mine* (Georg Wilhelm Pabst, 1931). This plural dimension, apparently very distant from the determination of a single identity, can call to a national belonging varied, and usually little considered, communities. This is the case with Switzerland, described by Rié Kitada, which gives rise to a small production able to treasure the experience of sound and to identify a cinematic representation able to answer their ethnolinguistic characteristics with films spoken in the different cantonal languages, or even dialects.[9]

The phenomenon of multiple versions offers therefore significant moments of reflection on the forms of national identity in 20th century Europe: a process that in many occasions resulted in dramatic and brutal conflicts, but in many others structured so as to extol the plurality and difference.[10] The cinema industries of the single European nations, faced with the invasiveness of the production from Hollywood after the end of the first world war and with the increase in production costs due to sound restructuring, between the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the subsequent decade, find in the multiple version the possible key to setting up a continental market based on national differences.[11] A cultural, representative, productive and commodity model in part alternative to the usual practice of national production, well described by O' Regan:

The aim of a national cinema is one of producing a local presence alongside the dominant imported presence in both the local and international markets. The task of a national cinema is to graft itself as a minor component on to the existing communication circuits and networks [...]. The aim of a national cinema in this market and cultural environment is not to replace Hollywood films [...] so much as to provide a viable and healthy local supplement to Hollywood cinema.[12]

This is why Nataša Ďurovičová proposes a distinction between two possible basic methods of «language versions», «simultaneous remake of the same film in a variety of versions and languages»:[13] the «foreign language versions», that is the application of the Hollywood standardised production process to the linguistic and national multiplicity, and the «multiple language versions», European model, that for the expert, is limited in procedures and time:

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.*[14]

In the reconstruction of the various models according to which the practice of multiple versions was represented at the beginning of the 1930s (and therefore referring to the period sources), Leonardo Quaresima's contribution aims on the other hand to lay the foundations of a typology essentially based on the production methods. Thus highlighting the fact that dubbing, generally considered the opposite of multiple versions, must on the other hand be considered as an internal variant of the same procedure.[15]

In this phase, mobility and cosmopolitanism are part of European culture and of the ordinary functioning of the cinema market.[16] The multiple versions are at a crossroads between national and international production, as Pierre Sorlin suggests.[17] For a relatively short period and much before the phenomenon of the co-productions that came after the end of the second world war, they presented a prototype of textual, economic and medial organisation that responded to the European cultural and market requirements. Extremely lively producers, ready to exploit the opening of markets and access to previously denied resources, emerge in this phase: as is the case with Seymour Nebenzahl for example; or the much less known Stefano Pittaluga, researched by Luca Mazzei.[18] A textual model characterised by a crisis of indexicality and by the ability of persistently reflecting – and often ironically, as is shown by the combination with comedy – on itself and the manipulation of the relationship between sign and referent. Perhaps it is the result of the lesson of Dr. Mabuse, updated with the arrival of sound in *Das Testament des Doktor Mabuse / Le Testament du Docteur Mabuse* (Fritz Lang, 1932-33), but already subject of additional manipulative practices found in dubbing; at least, in a much less modernist Italy than the regime wanted to make believe, as Massimiliano Gaudiosi's contribution shows.[19] In this stage the aesthetic practices start to consider, and consequently apply, the technically reproducible nature of its elements, whilst the same organisation of the cultural industry favours the inter-medial circulation and the multiplication of aesthetic objects. Charles O'Brien explains this well, by assessing the close knit relationship between the recording distribution of music prepared by Kurt Weill for Bertolt Brecht's *Die Dreigroschenoper*, the French and German medial scenarios and the variants of the two cinema versions of the Brechtian text directed by Pabst.[20]

The multiplication of the versions can also be assessed from another point of view: the significant relationships between one text and another, the type of relationships that allow the identification of the specificity (difference, multiplicity) and recognition of identity (equivalence).[21] This is why, the availability of adequate theoretical tools to assess the cinematic text, plural from the material conditions of its existence, allows for a greater propriety in the work, also in historiographic terms and to define on the basis of an agreed working protocol the objects being examined – whether they be multiple versions, remake or both things at the same time... Augusto Sainati's work, dedicated to Jacques Tati's debut in features, presents the reader with a definition of remake structured on the textual structures and the pragmatic conditions of the use of the text.[22] Starting from the notion of *type/token*, used «in linguistics to define a concrete linguistic element that can be observed (*token*) and the abstract class that it can traced back to (*type*),»[23] Sainati questions the relationship between an ideal and abstract text

and the material conditions of existence and consumption; a question that is the heart of the significant device of the multiple versions. Multiple yes, but of what original type? We'll leave the pleasure of finding an answer to the reader, through the following multiplicity of contributions.[24]

[f.p., l.q.]

1   Outcome of the research presented and undertaken during the first two editions of the Spring School (2003 and 2004): *CINÉMA & Cie.*, no. 4, Nataša Ďurovičová, in collaboration with Hans-Michael Bock (eds.), *Multiple and Multiple-language Versions / Versions multiples* (Spring 2004); *CINÉMA & Cie.*, no. 6, Hans-Michael Bock, Simone Venturini (eds.), *Multiple and Multiple-language Versions II / Versions multiples II* (Spring 2005)

2   For example, the production of multiple versions in Eastern Europe, between the two wars and subsequently, or within the Scandinavian cinema industry have been poorly explored.

3   This is another reason why, MAGIS has always allowed scholars, participants and young researchers the possibility of working with concrete objects, through the availability of documentary material, offered by the generosity of the single researchers, and with the possibility of viewing previously unseen films in multiple versions, from the collections of European film archives. During the last three editions of the school it has been possible to compare the version of well known films such as: *Atlantic* (Ewald André Dupont, 1929), *Die Dreigroschenoper / L'Opéra de quat'sous* (Georg Wilhelm Pabst, 1931), *Voruntersuchung / Autour d'une enquête* (Robert Siodmak, 1931), *Murder! / Mary, oder, Sir John greift ein* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1930), but of which one of the terms was almost unknown. But also to discover the richness of the phenomenon in less well known films such as: *T'amerò sempre* (Mario Camerini, 1933) / *Je vous aimerai toujours* (Mario Camerini/Henri Decoin, 1933), *Casta diva / The Divine Spark* (Carmine Gallone, 1935), *Let's Love and Laugh / Die Braeutigamswitwe* (Richard Eichberg, 1931), *Ne sois pas jalouse* (Augusto Genina, 1932) / *Non son gelosa* (Carlo Ludovico Bragaglia, 1933), *Viktor und Viktoria* (Reinhold Schünzel, 1933) / *Georges et Georgette* (Reinhold Schünzel-Roger Le Bon, 1933).
    A broad assessment of the plural dimension of the cinematic practice is provided by the records of the X edition of the Udine's International Film Studies Conference: Anna Antonini (ed.), *Il film e i suoi multipli / Film and Its Multiples* (Udine: Forum, 2003).

4   The most famous research about this is: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (New York: Verso, 1991).

5   On modernity, identity and nation see: Stuart Hall, "The Question of Cultural Identity," in Stuart Hall, David Held, Tony McGrew (eds.), *Modernity and Its Futures* (Cambridge: Polity/Open University, 1992), pp. 273-325.

6   Different interpretative paradigms of the relationship between cinema and nation are presented in Mette Hjort, Scott MacKenzie (eds.), *Cinema & Nation* (London-New York: Routledge, 2000).

7   Horst Claus, Anne Jäckel, "MLVS in a Changing Political Climate. Ufa's 'National Film' *Die Insel* (1934). A Case Study," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie.*

8   On this, see: Horst Claus, Anne Jäckel, "Ufa, Frankreich und Versionen," in Sybille M. Sturm, Arthur Wohlgemut (eds.), *Hallo Berlin? Ici Paris! Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen 1918-1939* (München: text+kritik/CineGraph, 1996), pp. 141-154; Id., "*Der Kongreß tantzt*. Revisited," *CINÉMA & Cie.*, no. 6, quot., pp. 76-95.

9 Rié Kitada, "Chacun parle sa langue: de la naissance du parlant international à l'essor du ciné-ma suisse multilingue," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.
   For an analysis focused on the receptive dimension, but equally capable of suggesting multi-linguism as the basic dimension in European cinema circulation, see: Paul Lesch, "The Transition from Silent to Sound Film in a Small, Multi-lingual Country. Luxembourg as a Case Study," *CINÉMA & Cie.*, no. 6, quot., pp. 42-54.

10 It is the perspective suggested in part by Luisa Passerini (ed.), *Identità culturale europea. Idee, sentimenti, relazioni* (Scandicci: La Nuova Italia, 1998).

11 See Andrew Higson, Richard Maltby (eds.), *«Film Europe» and «Film America». Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939* (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1999).
   On cinema production in Europe see: Anne Jäckel, *European Film Industries* (London: British Film Institute, 2003).

12 Tom O'Regan, *Australian National Cinema* (London: Routledge, 1996); partial reproduction as "A National Cinema," in Graeme Turner (ed.), *The Film Cultures Reader* (London-New York: Routledge, 2002), p. 141.

13 Nataša Ďurovičová, "Introduction," *CINÉMA & Cie*, no. 4, quot., p. 7.

14 *Ibidem*, p. 13.

15 Leonardo Quaresima, "Version multiple/Doublage," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.

16 Alberto Farassino, "Cosmopolitismo ed esotismo nel cinema europeo tra 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. See also: Id., *Fuori di set. Viaggi, esplorazioni, emi-grazioni, nomadismi* (Roma: Bulzoni, 2000).

17 Pierre Sorlin, "Multiple Versions: A Threat to National Cinemas?," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.

18 On Nebenzahl, see: Erika Wottrich (ed.), *M wie Nebenzahl. Nero – Filmproduktion zwischen Europa und Hollywood* (München: text+kritik/CineGraph, 2002). On Pittaluga and multiple versions: Luca Mazzei, "Un et Trin: les versions multiples à la Cines selon Pittaluga," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.

19 Massimiliano Gaudiosi, "Which Mabuse? Multiple Bodies, Multiple Voices," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.

20 Charles O'Brien, "Film, Gramopohone, and National Cinema: *Die Dreigroschenoper* and *L'Opéra de quat'sous*," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.
   More generally, on the reflexivity of European (German) cinema with the arrival of sound, see: Thomas Elsaesser, "Transparent Duplicities: Comedy, Opera, Operetta," in *Weimar Cinema and After. Germany's Historical Imaginary* (London-New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 293-358.

21 The following explore the significant relationships that characterise the versions and the variant: Simone Venturini, in collaboration with Hans-Michael Bock, "Introduction," *CINÉMA & Cie.*, no. 6, cit., pp.7-16; Marie-France Chambat Houillon, "Entre le même et l'autre: La Place de l'auteur," *Ibidem*, pp. 17-32.

22 Augusto Sainati, "Jour de fête, la couleur progressive," in this issue of *CINÉMA & Cie*.
   For a theoretical definition of the forms of cinematic seriality, with particular attention to the remake, see: Francesco Casetti (ed.), *L'immagine al plurale* (Venezia: Marsilio, 1984); Leonardo Quaresima, "Loving Texts Two at a Time: The Film Remake," *CINéMAS*, Vol. 12, no. 3, *Cinélekta 4* (Spring 2002), pp. 73-84.

23 Amedeo De Dominicis, "Type/Token," in Gian Luigi Beccaria (ed.), *Dizionario di linguistica* (Torino: Einaudi, 1996), p. 743.