CHAPTER I

A certain tendency in classical philology

This chapter provides a theoretical overview of the similarities between classical scholarship and scholarship on the cinema. It is not my goal, nor would it serve any practical purpose, to delineate either the one or the other in its entirety or to discuss their obvious differences. Rather, I intend to provide those engaged in classical scholarship with a justification to turn to the cinema as an important complement to their work and as a means to illuminate classical texts from a contemporary perspective. Various modern approaches to antiquity in such areas as comparative literature, art history, political theory, feminism, psychoanalysis, history, and anthropology have yielded significant insights into ancient works and their cultural, aesthetic, and social contexts. There is then no reason to assume that the cinema could not also increase our understanding of the past and of its continuing influence on the present. Film, together with related media like television and the production of digital images, is now our chief means of storytelling and the most important heir to textual narrative; it also has a greater reach than any other medium of high and popular culture. The reception of classical art and literature has by now become inseparable from the ancient works themselves. Translations and creative adaptations of ancient texts have given strong impulses to the entire history of Western culture. In striking ways, the cinema exemplifies the continuing importance of classical works. So professionals who interpret the past ought to be knowledgeable about the history of this past's influence at different times and in different media.

The cinema presents traditional literary scholars with what may at first seem a bewildering variety of quality and quantity, ranging from large numbers of crassly commercial products to rarefied art-house films, with great variability between these extremes. Films also have a complex production process that involves dozens and often hundreds or even thousands of people in the creation of one single work. In literature, more often than not the process of production is considerably simpler. We refer to a poem,

play, novel, or essay as the work of a creative individual whom we call an author. Classicists might therefore be tempted to argue that films cannot be compared to literature because they appear not to have authors. Two well-known classical scholars have recently advanced just such an argument. The cinema, they write, is

> so *different* from everything they [classicists] regularly have to do with . . . The product cannot be reduced to the intention of an individual "author" – simply too many people are decisively involved in the process of production – nor can we adduce the public's understanding as a standard . . . Film is the postmodern medium *par excellence*. The "death of the author," frequently adduced, does here not remain merely a decorative slogan but turns into visible and audible reality and forces on us different ways of approaching and working with film than we are accustomed to.[1]

This perspective is demonstrably wrong. The idea of authorship, as we will see, applies just as readily to the cinema as it does to literature. Not all films have authors in any serious sense of the term (nor does every written work), but most good films and all of the very best films do. So we need a greater measure of clarity about the concept of literary and cinematic authorship and a working definition of the term *author* as applicable to both literature and film. But we first need an understanding of film as a narrative medium that is analogous to that of textual narratives. We can then proceed to a consideration of cinema as a modern form of visual poetry. Lastly, we need a broader understanding of what constitutes legitimate areas of classical scholarship in an ever-changing world that has considerably expanded the ways and means of creative expression and that provides us with new ways to engage with ancient Greece and Rome. A wider comprehension of what classical scholarship entails fits the parameters of classicists' intellectual responsibilities that had been established in antiquity itself. With the framework provided in this chapter we can apply principles of classical philology to the cinema, as Chapters 2–6 will demonstrate.

[1] The quotations, in my translation, are taken from the editors' preface ("Vorwort") to Korenjak and Töchterle 2002: 7–11, at 7 and 8. The original text reads: "[. . . das Kino] so *anders* ist als alles, womit sie sonst zu tun haben . . . Weder lässt sich das Produkt auf die Absicht eines einzelnen 'Autors' zurückführen – dazu sind einfach zu viele Personen massgeblich in den Entstehungsprozess involviert – , noch können wir das Verständnis des Publikums als Massstab heranziehen . . . Film ist das postmoderne Medium *par excellence* . . . Der vielbeschworene 'Tod des Autors' bleibt hier kein dekoratives Schlagwort, sondern wird sicht- und hörbare Realität und zwingt uns andere Zugangs- und Arbeitsweisen auf, als wir es gewohnt sind." On the death of the author cf. especially Roland Barthes's essay "Death of the Author" from 1968, in Barthes 1977: 142–148 or Barthes 1986: 49–55. For a detailed study of the entire question with extensive bibliography see Benedetti 2005 (with a title changed rather infelicitously from the original, Benedetti 1999). Schmitz 2007: 50–55 and 124–127 provides an overview.

Chloe, which dates to the late second century AD, demonstrates that one and the same story can be told equally well in images as in words, The narrator explains how he came to write his novel:

I saw the most beautiful sight I have ever seen . . . : a painting that told a story of love . . . combining great artistic skill with an exciting, romantic subject . . . I gazed in admiration and was seized by a yearning to depict the picture in words.

I searched out an interpreter of the picture and produced the four volumes of this book.[4]

with extensive references, is Kristeller 1951–1952, rpt. in Kristeller 1990: 163–227. The comparison of poetry and painting is fundamental to literature and the arts. As Kristeller 1952: 36 (= Kristeller 1990: 217) observes in connection with Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's *Laocoon* (1766): "the parallel between painting and poetry was one of the most important elements that preceded the formation of the modern system of the arts." For theoretical affinities of Lessing's *Laocoon* to cinema see especially Sergei Eisenstein's monograph-length essay "Laocoön" in Eisenstein 1988: 109–202.

[4] Quoted from Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*, tr. Christopher Gill, in Reardon 1989: 285–348; quotation at 288–289. I have examined examples of the inherently filmic quality of ancient literature in Winkler 2000–2001 and 2006b. Malissard 1974 and 1982 examines parallels between historical narrative in ancient sculpture and epic and principles of narrative film. Cf. Ann Steiner 2007 on "reading" images on Greek vases. – The first technical handbook on cinematography by a film cameraman had an appropriate title: *Painting with Light* (Alton 1949). Cf. such technical terms as *prises de vue* ("captures of images") for cinematographic shots and *direttore delle luci* ("director of lights") for the cinematographer. The title of a recent monograph on Italian director Enrico Guazzoni rightly calls him a "director-painter" (Bernardini, Martinelli, and Tortora 2005). See also Bordwell 2005. An instance of non-narrative film in which a painter literally paints with light (and with brush and paints) is Henri-Georges Clouzot's *The Mystery of Picasso* (1956). Picasso drew and painted on a transparent surface that allowed Clouzot to film him from behind it in such a way as to make it appear to viewers that Picasso was painting directly onto the screen. (The film had to be reversed in the laboratory to present the correct left-right view when screened.) Non-narrative and experimental cinema has a long-standing tradition of filmmakers painting, drawing, or even scratching lines and shapes directly onto the filmstrip; Canadian filmmaker Norman McLaren was a pioneer of this. For a number of years, director Martin Scorsese has used the phrase "A Martin Scorsese Picture" (rather than "A Martin Scorsese Film") in his screen credits to emphasize the painterly aspects of his work. Cf. Ingmar Bergman on *The Seventh Seal* (1957): "The whole film is based on medieval pictures in a Swedish church. If you go there, you will see death playing chess, sawing a tree, making jokes with human souls . . . . I have the feeling simply of having painted a canvas . . . . I said, 'Here is a painting; take it, please.'" Quoted from Samuels 1972: 204. German Expressionism of the 1920s embraced three art forms simultaneously: literature, painting, and film. Cubist and surrealist art also found its way onto the screen; the classic instances are, for the former, Fernand Léger's *Le ballet mécanique* (1924) and, for the latter, *An Andalusian Dog* (1929) and *Age of Gold* (or *The Golden Age*, 1930), both directed by Luis Buñuel and written by him in collaboration with Salvador Dalí. Jean Renoir's *A Day in the Country* (1936) is one of the most painterly films ever made, reminiscent of the work of his father Pierre Auguste Renoir. Three later films consciously evoke the light and color of his father's paintings: *French Cancan* (1955), *Elena and Her Men* (or *Paris Does Strange Things*, 1956), and, primarily, *Picnic on the Grass* (1959). The cinematographer on *A Day in the Country* and *Elena and Her Men* was Jean Renoir's nephew Claude Renoir, one of the most distinguished French cameramen. In general cf. Andrew 1984. Director Robert Bresson once compared a particular aspect of filmmaking to a particular procedure of painters: "Several takes of the same thing, like a painter who does several pictures or drawings of the same subject and, each fresh time, *progresses towards rightness*." Quoted from Bresson 1977: 53. Director King Vidor reports that in preparation for his first color film (*Northwest Passage*, 1940) he studied painting and himself started painting. He learned

Compare the words of film director Jean Renoir:

> I'm a storyteller . . . I feel . . . an urge to tell the story, and I tell the story. Now I tell the story with the camera, or with a pen, or with a typewriter – well, to me it doesn't make very much difference. The main thing is to tell the story.[5]

Any modern reader of Longus can only agree with Renoir.[6] Equally, film viewers will immediately agree with Longus' perspective, even if they are aware that the situation described in his Prologue is fictional: an author's or narrator's set-up for the story that will follow.

The affinities common to reading and viewing were well established in antiquity. The Latin word *legere* ("to read") can mean "to see" because its original meaning is "to pick up" something piece by piece, first literally and then figuratively. (Its Greek cognate *legein* has the same original meaning but then comes to mean "to say, speak" rather than "to read.") So picking up the meanings of words and picking up those of images are related mental activities, both carried out initially with our eyes. An explanatory example in Roman literature occurs in Book Six of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Before Aeneas descends to the Underworld, he and his companions look at the images on the doors of Apollo's temple. Virgil uses the expression *perlegere oculis*: "to read through with their eyes." The ancient commentary by Servius gives *perspectare* as a synonym of *perlegere* and adds: "like a picture." Servius then observes: "Nor does he say inappropriately that a picture can be read since in Greek *grapsai* means 'to paint' [Latin *pingere*] and 'to write'."[7]

from Picasso about forced perspective for the most famous shot in *The Crowd* (1928); see Stevens 2006: 52 and 43–44.

[5] Quoted from Part Two ("Hollywood and Beyond") of *Jean Renoir* (1993), a BBC documentary directed by David Thompson. After retiring from filmmaking, Renoir wrote several novels and some non-fiction books.

[6] The parallel (if not identical) nature of literary and filmic storytelling appears to especially telling effect in the case of Eric Rohmer's *Six Moral Tales*. Rohmer had written them years before filming them. The series of six films, two short and four feature-length films, however, were to him the definitive versions: "It is only on the screen that the form of these tales is fully realized." Quoted from Rohmer's "Preface" to *Six Moral Tales* in Rohmer 1980: v–x; quotation at x. Its 2006 reprint is included in the DVD boxed set of the films released by the Criterion Collection (and carries the company's logo). In his "Preface" Rohmer discusses similarities, differences, and interactions between his written and filmed tales, but he begins with two questions that reinforce the affinity of both to each other: "Why film a story when one can write it? Why write it if one is going to film it?" (v). Rohmer also reveals that the written tales were somewhat changed for publication after they had been filmed (ix) – an additional layer of composition: writing, filming, rewriting. Rohmer, it should be added, is one of the most learned and literate of filmmakers. A look at some of his essays and reviews as collected in Rohmer 1989 is instructive. Cf. also the brief remarks on Japanese writer and director Yasujiro Ozu in Mast 1977: 57.

[7] Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.33–34: *quin protinus omnia / perlegerent oculis*; Servius on *Aeneid* 6.34. Servius then quotes Horace, *Art of Poetry* 52–53, as his authority for comparing Greek and Latin usages. Similar situations and expressions using *perlegere* occur at Ovid, *Fasti* 1.591, and Statius, *Thebaid* 3.500.

When we call verbal narratives "texts," we describe them with an imaginative metaphor, one that equally fits visual storytelling. A text is, etymologically, a product of weaving: the Latin *textum* or *textus* (from *texere*, *textum*: "to weave") indicates that literary authors put their words and lines together just as weavers do with their threads and so produce a "web" of words.[8] Quintilian, for instance, once uses the expression "fabric of speaking" (*dicendi textum*).[9] More important for our context, however, is the phrase with which Virgil characterizes the scenes on Aeneas' shield in Book Eight of the *Aeneid*. They make for an art work of such great beauty that the narrator has the difficult task to do the near-impossible in his attempt to describe the scenes in words: they represent a *non enarrabile textum*, a "fabric impossible to describe in words."[10] But since we *are* reading what he then does manage to describe in great detail in a passage that is one of Virgil's (and Roman literature's) most famous, we are in fact encountering an *enarrabile textum*, a fabric that *is* capable of verbal description. The juxtaposition of *textum* and an adjective derived from the verb *narrare* ("to tell") is one of the best instances in ancient literature to point us back to the affinities between the verbal and the visual. The prefix *e-* ("out") specifies and reinforces both sides: *enarrabile* is something that can be spoken out loud, as in a recital of poetry, and that can be told in sequence, as is appropriate for the individual scenes that are listed in the order of their appearance on the shield. The result is a kind of verbal sculpture. The narration in images and the narration about images works through text and context simultaneously.[11]

In Greek, the image of weaving also underlies the word *rhapsôdos* ("weaver of song") for the archaic poet-performer and regularly appears, for instance, in lyric poetry.[12] Simultaneously it refers us to Simonides: ancient weavers could, and did, put pictures and whole stories into their

[8] On this see the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s. vv. *texo* 1.e ("to represent in tapestry"), 3.a ("put together or construct") and b (regarding "writings and other mental constructs"), *textum* 1.b (on "rhetorical style"), and *textus* 3 ("fabric made by joining words together"), with the ancient sources cited there.

[9] Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 9.14.17, about the Greek orator Lysias.

[10] Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.625.

[11] The rendition of Virgil's *textum* as "texture and context" by Ahl 2007: 204 is therefore both apt and felicitous.

[12] The metaphor goes back to an Indo-European tradition; cf. Durante 1960. Jane McIntosh Snyder 1981 gives a concise introduction to this aspect of ancient literature, which is far too large a topic to be dealt with or summarized here. See especially Scheid and Svenbro 1996, with detailed discussions of primary sources and extensive references to scholarship. On *textus* see Scheid and Svenbro 1996: 111–155 and 204–214 (notes). Jane McIntosh Snyder 1981: 195 notes that "the image of the poet as weaver has clearly become an important means of self-description" by the time of Pindar. On Roman culture cf. now Bergmann 2006 and Corbier 2006.

tapestries, carpets, or cloaks. Several famous descriptions of woven images occur in classical literature.[13]

Films provide viewers with only a minimum of non-visual information about characters, about their thoughts, emotions, or motivations, and about the atmosphere prevailing in a given scene or sequence. So viewers must draw the appropriate conclusions chiefly from the images on the screen; that is to say, they must pay close attention to what they are watching and hearing and interpret a film with the help of the visual and verbal clues which director, writer, editor, and cast provide through action and dialogue. Music and sound effects give supporting aural clues.[14] An interpretive approach is also required for our understanding of literature. Anyone who has studied the classical languages knows that the closest attention to every detail, to each word and even to a word's ending or one single letter in it, is necessary. All classical literature and each meaningful film call on us to pay this kind of attention if we wish to appreciate its artistic quality. Rigorous training in philology of the kind classical scholars undergo, first in their undergraduate language courses and then in graduate school, is the best conditioning for any kind of analysis, "close reading," or *explication de texte*.[15] It works equally well for the analysis and interpretation

[13] Here are some of the best known: the images woven on Jason's cloak in Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 1.721–767; those woven by Minerva and Arachne in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.70–128 (with phrase *Pallas . . . pingit* at 70–71: "Athena paints"). Instances of images and stories told visually on artifacts and reported textually (in *ecphrases*, "descriptions") are numerous. The tradition goes back as far as the earliest work of ancient literature; most famously, Homer gives a detailed description of the scenic and narrative decorations on the shield of Achilles in Book 18 of the *Iliad*. I explain the cinematic nature of this *ecphrasis* and of Homeric similes in Winkler 2006b: 48–63. On Longus cf. Mittelstadt 1967. Brilliant 1984 is a useful introduction to the subject of visual narratives; cf., among much other work, Stansbury-O'Donnell 1999, Zanker 2004, and Ann Steiner 2007. Cf. the words of master cinematographer William Daniels: "You see, *we try to tell the story with light as the director tries to tell it with his action.*" Quoted from Higham 1970: 72. – The modern novel with its cinematic aspects of storytelling continues the tradition of mutual influence; see especially Magny 1972 and Spiegel 1976. On earlier novelists see especially Fell 1986: 1–86, with additional references.

[14] A more detailed description of this process is at Mast 1977: 18–19.

[15] For brief and non-technical definitions of "philology" see, e.g., Jan Ziolkowski 1990b: 5–7 and Thomas 1990: 69–70. A simple exercise may serve as a reminder to those who only dimly remember their Latin or as an elementary demonstration to those without any Latin (or Greek) how decisive even a single letter in a given text can be. Here is an elementary Latin example, with minimal changes from sentence to sentence: *Quid egit Marcus?* ("What did Marcus do?") – *Quid agit Marcus?* ("What is Marcus doing?") – *Quid aget Marcus?* ("What will Marcus do?") – *Quid agat Marcus?* ("What can Marcus do?"). Even on this level philologists need to *look* carefully; far more is required for works of great literature. Concerning literature in general and classical literature in particular, we have the following concise summary: "Good reading is a matter of paying attention, of observing the effects of adding one detail to another and of watching how the new details build on, qualify, refine, elaborate, or contradict what has gone before . . . The ancient critics insist on the importance of individual syllables, clusters of consonants, sequences of vowels . . . We tolerate this microscopic

of films. In analogy to the well-established philologies we might call such an approach to visual texts the philology of film.[16] Like the words on the page, the images on the screen are only the outer manifestation of a work's meaning, which lies below the surface. "The camera," director Elia Kazan has observed, "is more than a recorder, it's a microscope. It penetrates, it goes into people and you see their most private and concealed thoughts."[17] To this we could add: and their emotions, as director John Ford once said: "The camera photographs your innermost thoughts and picks them up. If you concentrate, the camera can look into your innermost feelings."[18] The camera becomes "an instrument for photographing the invisible."[19] Therefore viewers must carefully look at the visible to be able to reach and interpret the invisible, such as characters' thoughts, emotions, and

scrutiny of language for lyric poetry, rarely for other genres. But in prose too, of course, minor details of phrasing make a difference... Appreciation of the verbal texture of language is one of the most important objects of the teaching and study of literature" (Segal 1985; rpt. in revised form in Segal 1986: 359–375; here quoted from this reprint at 363–364). – The inflections in Greek and Latin morphology are analogous to the visual compositions in a film's individual shot; the morphological changes of nouns, adjectives, or words in a sentence or clause parallel the movements of camera, actors, or objects within a shot. A cut in a film may then be regarded as functioning like the punctuation marks (commas, periods, etc.) modern editors introduce into classical texts. The ancients did not generally use – and did not need to use – such conventions, just as editing in classical cinema was mostly meant to be unobtrusive or unnoticeable, even invisible, to viewers. In the words of writer-director Richard Brooks: "You shouldn't be aware of the director. If anybody at any time says, 'Wow, what a shot,' then you've lost the audience. They should never know there's a director in it. They should never know where the music starts or ends. They should never see the camera move... They should be lost in the story. That's all you're telling them. That's where the camera is." Quoted from Stevens 2006: 547.

[16] The term (as *Filmphilologie*) was previously applied to classical literature by Sütterlin 1996: 173.

[17] I quote Kazan from Scorsese and Wilson 1997: 148. Cf. Bresson 1977: 39: "Your camera passes through faces... Cinematographic films [are] made of inner movements *which are seen*." And: "Your camera catches... certain states of soul... which it alone can reveal" (53). The kind of films Bresson refers to are films of an artistic and creative nature, not commercial films. As actress Louise Brooks wrote: "The great art of films does not consist of descriptive movement of face and body, but in the movements of thought and soul, transmitted in a kind of intense isolation." Quoted from Kenneth Tynan, "Louise Brooks," in Tynan 1990: 483–525; quotation at 524.

[18] Quoted from McBride 2001: 158.

[19] Geoffrey O'Brien 1993: 87. He mentions (87–88) the work of Robert Bresson, Carl Theodor Dreyer, Kenji Mizoguchi, and Roberto Rossellini as examples. Other directors' names could be added. On the subject cf. the study by future screenwriter and director Paul Schrader (Schrader 1972). A comparable perspective informs Kawin 1978. Earlier, and on a significantly larger scale, Kracauer 1947 had made the case for German cinema between World War I and 1933. As he states: "Inner life manifests itself in various elements and conglomerations of external life, especially in those almost imperceptible surface data which form an essential part of screen treatment. In recording the visible world – whether current reality or an imaginary universe – films therefore provide clues to hidden processes" (7). Those he analyzes "expos[e] the German soul" (1). A more recent individual example is the description by Michael Chapman, director of cinematography on Martin Scorsese's *Taxi Driver* (1976), of this film being "a documentary of the mind"; quoted from *Making Taxi Driver*, written and directed by Laurent Bouzereau (1999), a documentary included on the "collector's edition" DVD of the film.

motivations or the structure and meaning of the story that is being watched. After all, as Christian Metz has pointed out: "A film is difficult to explain because it is easy to understand."[20]

The analogy between literary, especially classical, texts and films extends even further. Digital technology now makes it possible for philologists of the cinema to have easy access to a particular film and to work with it as traditional philologists have always worked with *their* materials. In ways comparable to how we can consult books, we can now view a film again and again at any time we wish, go from any scene or sequence to any other within seconds, concentrate on a scene or an individual moment for particular scrutiny by putting it into slow motion, or even pause a film to look at single frames. In other words, we are now in the position to "read" a filmic work in ways similar to those in which we read a literary one. The literary term *chapters* for a film's individual sequences or scenes in DVD editions is entirely appropriate.

Since the arrival of digital technology an increasing number of films have begun to receive critical attention that is no less philological than the kind accorded literary texts. Just as practically all works of ancient literature exist in scholarly editions, DVDs of films are now appearing in comparable form. Editors of classical texts consult the manuscript traditions of the works they are editing and weigh the importance of textual variants in the manuscripts and those proposed by earlier scholars; they emend and restore the text to come as closely as possible to the original work as its author intended it. Frequently an extensive commentary accompanies such a critical edition; a case in point is Eduard Fraenkel's monumental three-volume edition, translation, and commentary of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*.[21] All serious readers of classical Greek or Latin literature, including scholars, rely on such an expert's introduction, commentary, or both. Now films, too, exist in critical editions alongside earlier incomplete, re-edited, or variant prints. For example, several different versions of Fritz Lang's *Die Nibelungen* (1924) or Sergei Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* (1925) which had circulated for decades have now been superseded. A "director's cut" DVD of a film originally released in a different form or severely cut by a studio gives its maker a chance to restore deleted scenes or even to provide a different ("alternate") but more appropriate ending. In addition we are now frequently able to view different camera takes or outtakes of a scene. In some cases individual moments or whole scenes intended for television

[20] Quoted from Stephenson and Phelps 1989: 28.

[21] Fraenkel 1950. His commentary takes up two volumes.

broadcasts as alternatives to those shown theatrically, especially if sex and violence are an issue, are included alongside their original versions. Roughly, all these are the equivalents of the "variant readings" (*variae lectiones*) of ancient texts. Washed-out colors and faded black-and-white images are restored to their original appearance through recourse to the camera negative when it survives or to an exceptionally well-preserved print, often in combination with digital image enhancement. Widescreen films are restored to their original aspect ratio, which is sometimes accompanied by the older – and compositionally ruinous – "pan and scan" format. Unlike the preservation and editing of ancient texts, however, the process of film restoration today can involve the original creator, usually the director. Terry Gilliam's cooperation on the three-DVD set of his film *Brazil* (1985) is just one representative example of many. A number of DVD editions of modern films are therefore being presented as "director-approved" versions. An individual DVD or boxed set may even offer different versions of an entire film for scholarly study, as is the case with *Brazil*. Even greater complexity is evinced by the three-DVD set of Orson Welles's *Mr. Arkadin* (1955), which has three versions under two titles. A somewhat different case is Howard Hawks's *The Big Sleep*. For the first time in decades we can now compare the film's original pre-release version of 1944 with the general-release version of 1946. Some scenes were either shortened or expanded by reshooting, the placement of a few scenes was changed, and some footage was dropped altogether. Hawks was in charge of filming and incorporating all changes, which are substantive enough to affect the narrative itself. The film's second version has the reputation of presenting to viewers a plot of such labyrinthine complexity as to be nearly impenetrable; the earlier version is noticeably clearer. And Hawks's epic western *Red River* (1948) exists in two versions of which one uses a voice-over narration, the other a written on-screen text; the versions also differ in the way the film's climax is edited. Film scholars have been debating the merits of either version much in the same manner in which textual scholars compare and evaluate different manuscripts or editions of a play, poem, or novel.[22]

Other films may exist in versions that differ in their very format, as when director Raoul Walsh simultaneously made a widescreen and a standard version of his epic western *The Big Trail* (1930) and reshot dialogue

[22] For instructive examinations of the "book version" vs. the "voice version" of this film see especially Mast 1982: 337–346 ("A Note on the Text of *Red River*") and 381–382 (additional information and references in notes), and McCarthy 1997: 440–442. The conclusions they reach and the chain of reasoning they employ to reach them are instructive – and familiar to textual scholars. (Mast was a professor of English.)

scenes and close-ups with a different cast for the film's release in Germany, Italy, and Spain. Before dubbing films for foreign markets became the standard way, many films had different actors in other-language versions. An example is *The Testament of Dr. Mabuse* (1933), which director Fritz Lang shot in German and French, using different casts in the main parts and somewhat different camera set-ups. As late as 1953 Jean Renoir filmed *The Golden Coach* in no fewer than three different languages. In Renoir's case we know which of these versions he preferred, in Lang's case it is immediately obvious which version represents his true intentions, and in Walsh's case it is easy to decide which screen format is preferable. But in the case of Hawks and the two versions of *The Big Sleep* the question of authorship and of what constitutes the best "text" of this work becomes more difficult (and fascinating) to answer. Textual scholars and classical philologists have dealt with such problems for centuries. But *Brazil*, *The Big Sleep*, or even *Mr. Arkadin* are far from being the most complex cases. Mainly for financial reasons Francis Ford Coppola edited his two-part epic *The Godfather* (1972, 175 mins.) and *The Godfather: Part II* (1974, 200 mins.) into *The Godfather Saga* (1977, 434 mins.) for television: one continuous version with rearranged chronology, added footage, and cuts of the most violent moments. *The Godfather: Part III* (1990) had different running times for its theatrical release (162 mins.) and its "Final Director's Cut" video release (170 mins.). As if this were not enough, *The Godfather DVD Collection* (2001) expands the entire trilogy to a running time of 545 minutes and contains yet additional footage. In a kind of reverse process, in 1991 director Jacques Rivette edited outtakes and other unused footage from his four-hour film *La belle noiseuse* into a version (*La belle noiseuse: Divertimento*) of just over half the original's length, thereby achieving not just a shorter but, according to some critics, quite a different work. For Rivette, however, this is nothing extreme. In 1972 he had released *Out 1: Spectre* with a running time of four and a quarter hours. This film was edited down from *Out One* (or *Out One: Noli me tangere*), his film of the year before. The earlier version had run to no fewer than twelve hours and forty minutes and was once characterized by Rivette in analogy to the modern *roman fleuve* as a *film fleuve*.[23] (*Out One* was based on Honoré de Balzac's novel *Histoire des treize* and deals with two theater companies that are in rehearsals for Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes* and *Prometheus Bound*.)

More recently, and perhaps closer to classicists' hearts, writer-director Oliver Stone agreed to a truncated version of *Alexander* (175 mins.) for

[23] Rosenbaum 1977: 39, in an interview first published in *La nouvelle critique* 63 (April, 1973).

its theatrical release in 2004 and re-edited it in 2005 for a "director's cut" on DVD that was marketed alongside the DVD edition of the theatrical version. The new version is seven or eight minutes shorter than the earlier one because Stone removed and added footage and tampered with existing scenes. Is this then the real *Alexander*? Not at all. Stone prepared a third version, called *Alexander Revisited: The Final Cut*, for release in 2007 on DVD only. It is a little over three and a half hours long. Stone has said about it:

> Over the last two years I have been able to sort out some of the unanswered questions about this highly complicated and passionate monarch – questions I failed to answer dramatically enough. This film represents my complete and last version, as it will contain all the essential footage we shot. I don't know how many filmmakers have managed to make three versions of the same film, but I have been fortunate to have the opportunity because of the success of video and DVD sales in the world, and I felt if I didn't do it now, with the energy and memory I still have for the subject, it would never quite be the same again. For me, this is the complete *Alexander*, the clearest interpretation I can offer.[24]

Stone elaborated on this in a video introduction to this last version, in which he said in part:

> This third version . . . was undertaken in an entirely different way. It was done only for DVD home use . . . The structure has been changed, in some cases radically. We start the movie on a wholly different note . . . Part of this process of going through three cuts is of course wrestling with the idea of making it clearer to the public. It was always a difficult film to understand and difficult to do. This is a breakthrough for me, to give me complete freedom to break the constraints of theatrical, commercial filmmaking, to go and make a film at any length that was required by the material itself, without studio interference, without critics, without even having to satisfy an audience except ourselves. In so doing we would create a film that was undiluted, untampered with, uncensored. This would be a freedom for me that I've never had, and I took it.

Whether Stone succeeded in making a difficult film and its complex protagonist clearer to the public in this third cut, which relentlessly switches back and forth in time throughout its entire length, is debatable. But Stone's various comments and the availability of three editions of one and the same film afford us an opportunity to become aware of some of the quandaries and vagaries inherent in commercial epic filmmaking today.

[24] Quoted from the descriptive announcement of this release at http://www.thedigitalbits.com/mytwocentsa132.html#alex.

could have had, and express their views in articles, book chapters, and, in the case of films, audio commentaries and documentaries. But sometimes even the most dedicated scholarship can take us only so far.

Analogous to the scholarly editions of ancient texts, DVDs of significant films now regularly include continuous audio commentaries by film historians and, for more recent films, by directors, screenwriters, or others involved in their making. Documentaries, behind-the-scenes footage, production stills, and other materials round off these editions – just as classical editors include all available historical and textual information or at least references to it in theirs. *Blade Runner* may be an extreme case, but then the entire *Godfather DVD Collection* runs to 725 minutes for the films and their supplements. The DVD edition of *The Testament of Dr. Mabuse* includes a specialist's commentary on the visual comparison not only of the differences and discrepancies between the German and French versions but also of a later version, altered and dubbed in English for the American market. Images from two of these versions often appear on the screen side by side and make exact comparison and analysis possible.[27] Beyond such work on their texts, literature and films have come to share a tradition of extensive interpretation in books and scholarly journals. And just as scholarly editions and commentaries of texts are subject to revision, expansion, correction, or entirely new editions, so apparently definitive editions of films are subject to later improvement. For example, after appearing in what was considered a definitive edition on DVD some years ago, Akira Kurosawa's *Seven Samurai* (1954) was re-issued in an elaborate three-DVD set in 2005. One disc contains the film itself ("All-new, restored high-definition digital transfer"), the other two contain supplemental material: not, as before, one but two complete audio commentaries on a film 206 minutes long; two documentaries on its making and on its cinematic and cultural background; a two-hour video conversation with its director; behind-the-scenes photographs and production stills; a booklet with various kinds of testimony to the film and an interview with its star; and several other pieces. The three-DVD set of *Mr. Arkadin* includes audio commentary, alternate scenes, outtakes, rushes, stills, and various other pieces of information, a booklet, and even the original novel on which Welles had loosely based his film. The director's commentary on the standard DVD of *Alexander Revisited* is different from the one Stone recorded for the same cut of the film's DVD in HD (High Definition), which furthermore contains a commentary by Oxford scholar Robin Lane Fox, Stone's historical advisor

[27] The same scholar provides a full audio commentary to the film itself. He is the author of a study of Mabuse films and novels (Kalat 2001).

(and one of Alexander's generals in the film). These and comparable editions of other films should silence any doubts about the nature of films as texts or the necessity of film philology.[28]

AUTHORSHIP: ANCIENT *AUCTOR* AND CINEMATIC *AUTEUR*

If it is sensible to regard films as visual narratives, the question immediately arises: Do films then have authors? By *author* we usually mean the individual who is the sole and original creator of a literary work. But this narrow understanding of what constitutes an author did not arise until the eighteenth century and did not exist in antiquity.[29] The Latin word *auctor* (pl. *auctores*) carries the basic meaning of "furtherer, promoter" (from the verb *augêre*, "to increase") or "guarantor" (e.g. in historical contexts as "predecessor," "informant," or "source").[30] This is true throughout the history of Greek and Roman literature, although ancient writers never developed a precise terminology. Classical literature – that is, written works – derived from an oral tradition which had been largely anonymous.[31] Names of individual authors from the age of oral performance

[28] Sometimes such accumulation of details may become excessive; cf. Rafferty 2003, rpt. in Noël Carroll and Choi 2006: 44–48. Rafferty's main point of criticism is the "interactive" nature of DVDs, which does not affect our subject. If film scholars can be excessive in their hunt after each and every surviving scrap of film, they only follow the example of traditional scholars, who have long been a target of ridicule for their dry-as-dust bookishness and obsession with trivialities. Robert Browning's poem "A Grammarian's Funeral Shortly After the Revival of Learning in Europe" (1855) is a, well, classic example: "This man decided not to Live but Know" (line 139). The grammarian, of course, was a scholar of Greek. For the Latin side we have the school teacher in Anton Chekhov's *Three Sisters*.

[29] On this see, e.g., Abrams 1953: 272–285 and Lieberg 1982: 159–173. Cf. Kristeller 1983, rpt. in Kristeller 1990: 247–258.

[30] Cf. the definition in Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, s. v. *auctor*: "he that brings about the existence of any object, or promotes the increase or prosperity of it, whether he first originates it, or by his efforts gives greater permanence or continuance to it." Cf. the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s. v. *auctor*, especially 2.a and c, 4.d, 7–9, 13.b–c and g, with the ancient sources cited there. Cf. also Pollitt 1974: 311–318 (on *auctoritas*). Wetzel 2000 surveys the subject from a modern perspective, with extensive additional references. Cf. Wetzel 480–481 (on the etymology of *auctor*), 481 (on the death of the author), and 502–509 (on the concept of authorship from antiquity [502–503] to the early modern age).

[31] Nilsson 1932, a classic study, demonstrates that Greek myths, the fundamental subject matter of classical literature, were already fully formed before the advent of writing and depended on oral retellings. Artifacts from before the introduction of the alphabet do not reveal names of storytellers or authors. On oral composition and performances see, e.g., Nagy 1989: 38: "the pan-Hellenic tradition of oral poetry appropriates the poet, potentially transforming even historical figures into generic ones who merely represent the traditional functions of their poetry. The wider the diffusion and the longer the chain of recomposition, the more remote the identity of the composer will become. Extreme cases are Homer and Hesiod." Nagy has published numerous other studies of this and related subjects.

of narratives did not survive into the age of writing except for Homer's. Homer and after him Hesiod, the earliest Greek authors who survive in name and work, are near or on the border of oral and written composition. While Hesiod speaks about himself in his *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, specific knowledge about Homer the man was as good as nonexistent.[32] With the introduction of writing, authors could ensure their remembrance by mentioning their names in their works as a kind of signature or seal (*sphragis*).[33]

Medieval and early modern authors followed the ancient *auctores* and regarded themselves primarily as mediators. A poet was still the same kind of author as his ancient predecessor. To use Latin terms, he was an *inventor* (i.e. "finder"; from *invenire*, "to come upon, find"): someone who finds an existing theme or topic for his composition, who takes up and reshapes old material according to his own ingenuity (in Latin, *ingenium*: "set of innate qualities"), and who gives it new life in his retelling.[34] A film scholar once said almost the same thing about plot content and visual appearance in the cinema: "the normal function of a director," wrote V. F. Perkins, is "not to devise stories and not to construct painterly patterns but to realize given material and organize it into significant form."[35] This organization, of course, represents a new synthesis based on pre-existing kinds of content and form and ideally achieves a work that transcends but does not wholly disregard generic, formulaic, or stylistic principles.

Complete originality and creative autonomy, the very qualities we expect from and attribute to our authors today, were impossible throughout antiquity, as such central terms of ancient literary theory and history as *exemplum* ("model, exemplar"), *imitatio* ("artistic imitation" of a model; *mimêsis* in Greek), and *aemulatio* ("artistic competitiveness") attest. For the ancients, knowledge of a text always included an awareness of its contexts, usually other texts by earlier *auctores* who in turn depended on *their* predecessors.[36] As mentioned, Homer, the first *auctor* in the history of Western literature whose works survive because they came to be written down, had his roots in the anonymous oral tradition. He did not invent or create the subject matter of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.[37] As has been said appropriately about later

[32] Cf. in this context Danek 1998. [33] On this see Kranz 1961, rpt. in Kranz 1967: 27–78.

[34] On *ingenium* cf. Pollitt 1974: 382–389. [35] Perkins 1972: 79.

[36] This also applies to authors who consciously turned away from their precursors. Examples are discussed in Chapter 5. For detailed studies of the subject in Greek and Roman literature, with additional references, see Rosenmeyer 1992 and Conte 1986.

[37] The subject of Homer's authorship, generally called the "Homeric question," was first broached in Friedrich August Wolf's *Prolegomena in Homerum* of 1795, a study that revolutionized Homer scholarship. For a modern annotated translation see Wolf 1985.

ages of antiquity: "One of the most striking features of Latin and later Greek literature is the pervasive imitation (*mimêsis*) of previous authors. Originality is found within an awareness of a past tradition, authors name and adapt their predecessors, and audiences are expected to recognise these allusions."[38]

The basis of cinema is a technology far more complex in its processes of production, distribution, and consumption than the technology required for printed literature. Even so, the most conspicuous and artistically decisive contributor to a film is generally its director, as the very term and its equivalents in other languages (*Regisseur*, *regista*, *metteur en scène*, etc.) indicate. In the words of American critic William Pechter, ideally a film is "demonstrably stamped with an identifiable directorial style" and with "the imprint of an authorial imagination" on the part of a director "whose work, in its totality, seems both to be encompassed by a controlling vision and to encompass the kind of imaginative world one finds in the work of the first-rank creators of literary or dramatic fiction."[39] As early as 1913, American director D. W. Griffith, one of the greatest pioneers of the new medium, took out a full-page advertisement in *The New York Dramatic Mirror* to claim personal authorship for the films he had been making since 1908 and to take credit for "revolutionizing motion picture drama and founding the modern technique of the art."[40] Griffith was justified to do so. As Jean Renoir remarked, individual creativity applies to all forms of art:

[38] Quoted from Innes 1989: 246. The phenomenon of *mimêsis* or homage to great and revered predecessors is standard in the cinema. It is helpful here to keep in mind the points raised by Bloom 1997, even if "anxiety of influence" is probably too strong or neurotic-sounding a term to characterize the majority of ancient authors and modern filmmakers. An illustrative example of non-anxious influence are these words by Federico Fellini about Ingmar Bergman: "he confesses candidly that he has seen all my films and cites them in his own. Being a rich, an authentic artist, he can borrow from others without being guilty of plagiarism." Cf. Bergman about himself: "I have never been scared of being influenced. I like to use others' styles. I don't want to be unique. I am a cinemagoer. I have no complexes on this subject." The quotations are from Samuels 1972: 135 and 196.

[39] Pechter 1982: 59. Cf. Pechter 152 on Michelangelo Antonioni's film *L'Avventura* (1960): "a work whose importance lies . . . in its giant appropriation for the film medium of a territory of psychological subtlety and emotional nuance previously thought exclusively to belong to the novel." On the immediacy of film style cf. the following words by director King Vidor: "I'm a firm believer in the fact that you put your individual stamp on your work . . . I went into a projection room at MGM at one time and sat down waiting for some dailies to end, and said, 'Oh, that's George Stevens.' I spotted his style in that footage. Another time I went in and – with no name on it or anything – knew it was [Josef] von Sternberg. I spotted that because of the photography." Quoted from Stevens 2006: 52.

[40] Quoted from Henderson 1970: 158, where the full text of the ad may be found. Cf. Gunning 1991.

All works of art bear the artist's signature. If there is no signature, there is no work of art. And by "art," I don't mean only paintings, sculpture, films, plays; I mean anything in life that is done well and carefully. In my opinion, our age commits its greatest crime when it kills the author or makes him disappear.[41]

In the first century AD Pliny the Elder used the term *auctor* equally for the painter and the sculptor.[42] The work of either bears the artist's signature. The true signature is not the name written on a work but its artistic quality, its style, as we will see soon.

Filmmaking involves any number of participants in artistic, technical, administrative, and many other functions. But this is no reason to deny films their authorship. Ancient terms can again help us understand the situation better. Romans used *auctor* or *artifex* for the man who functions as a sovereign creative artist. By contrast, a *faber* or *opifex* was the technician, the mere workman. In the *Art of Poetry* Horace clearly distinguishes between these two kinds of people involved in the collaborative production of works of art. The *faber*, Horace emphasizes, is subordinate because he does not know how to design or compose (*componere*: "to put together") an artistic whole.[43] If we apply Horace's perspective to the cinema, such craftsmen are, primarily, the entire technical staff engaged in the process of making a film. All filmmaking depends on the creative and technical expertise of many people and is often so highly collaborative as to make it impossible or at least difficult for us to identify individual contributions to the finished work that appears on our screens, let alone to find proof of one particular person's creative intelligence that gives it its final shape. This circumstance applies to the largest quantity of films made: commercial works meant purely for spectacle, thrills, superficial entertainment, and the highest profits possible. It applies far less frequently to art cinema. But on either level the artist and the technician depend on each other. Art historian Erwin Panofsky once expressed the complexity of the creative process in a memorable comparison. The conclusions he drew are worth remembering:

[41] Quoted from Samuels 1972: 210.

[42] Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, preface 23 and 34.19.93. It is worth remembering that Plutarch, *Moralia* 747–748 ("Table Talk: Question 15"), especially at 748a, widens Simonides' saying about poetry and painting to apply it to poetry and dancing. Evidently some of the ancients were readier to take broad and comparative views than some of the moderns.

[43] Horace, *Art of Poetry* 32–35; cf. 45–46. Robert Bresson accordingly did not consider himself a *metteur en scène* (the common French term for a film director) but as someone who arranges the order of his work: *metteur en ordre*. On originality in ancient literature in connection with cinema cf. Dehon 1994.

It might be said that a film, called into being by a cooperative effort in which all contributions have the same degree of permanence, is the nearest modern equivalent of a medieval cathedral; the role of the producer corresponding, more or less, to that of the bishop or archbishop; that of the director to that of the architect in chief; that of the scenario writers to that of the scholastic advisers establishing the iconographical program; and that of the actors, cameramen, cutters, sound men, makeup men, and the divers technicians to that of those whose work provided the physical entity of the finished product, from the sculptors, glass painters, bronze casters, carpenters, and skilled masons down to the quarry men and woodsmen . . .

This comparison may seem sacrilegious, not only because there are, proportionally, fewer good films than there are good cathedrals, but also because the movies are commercial. However, if commercial art be defined as all art not primarily produced in order to gratify the creative urge of its maker but primarily intended to meet the requirements of a patron or a buying public, it must be said that noncommercial art is the exception rather than the rule, and a fairly recent and not always felicitous exception at that. While it is true that commercial art is always in danger of ending up as a prostitute, it is equally true that noncommercial art is always in danger of ending up as an old maid . . .

It is [the] requirement of communicability that makes commercial art more vital than noncommercial, and therefore potentially much more effective for better or worse . . . in modern life the movies are what most other forms of art have ceased to be, not an adornment but a necessity.[44]

A more modern analogy, frequently employed by film directors themselves, is that of the orchestra conductor. It is equally enlightening and worth juxtaposing with Panofsky's. In the words of director Fred Zinnemann:

there is a good deal of similarity between a conductor and a director, in the sense that you work with a large number of people. What you have to do is persuade them of your own vision so that they form one body working together for one purpose – to the ideal result.[45]

Only in their anonymity do the medieval artists and craftsmen differ from those of the cinema. But it is often just as difficult sharply to distinguish between the artists and *fabri* of cathedrals as between those of the cinema. Screenwriters, cinematographers, actors, producers, and editors, for example, can participate in creative decisions and in some cases decisively shape the completed work. They can even become *auctores* in their own

[44] Erwin Panofsky, "Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures" (1947); rpt. in Panofsky 1995: 91–125 and 210 (notes); quotation at 119–120. Panofsky adduces Georges Seurat's "Grande Jatte" and Shakespeare's sonnets as examples of noncommercial, Albrecht Dürer's prints and Shakespeare's plays as examples of commercial art. A shorter version of Panofsky's essay had appeared in 1936 under the title "On Movies."

[45] Quoted from Stevens 2006: 412.

right.[46] Some time ago British film scholar Roger Manvell summarized the situation with memorable concision:

> unlike the novel which is written by one man or the picture which is painted in seclusion, the film is the result of conferences and staff work in which it might be thought that the sensitive artist would become lost among a welter of executives. But this is not so. The twentieth-century artist of the film – the director – is a man who combines sensitiveness with leadership, who can convey to his cameramen, his electricians, his scenic designers and builders, his costumiers and his property-men, the spirit of the film as a whole and of the sequence on which they are working in particular. The film is a co-operative art, but, as in all creative work, a single mind with a single purpose must dominate the whole. The names on the credit titles are the names of those who have served under the leadership of the director to create the unified though composite achievement of the film.
>
> Behind every large-scale film there lies, therefore, the financial conference, the staff work for camera, lighting, sets, costumes, make-up and finally cutting, together with the discussions of producer, director, scenarist, cameraman, editor and actors. Collectively they stand or fall.[47]

When a film's production proceeds in the harmonious collaboration of an artistic designer or *auctor* with his staff of *fabri*, both sides stand to gain. As Jean Renoir observed: "The more you help your partners to express themselves, the more you express yourself . . . I believe that we should feel the presence of the author in a film."[48] American director Frank Capra was especially outspoken on this matter, summarizing his view in the

[46] Well-known if random examples: it is a cliché about film history that screenwriters have complained about being neglected as the true creators of the films they write; cf. McMurtry 1987: 13: "If one were to make a misery graph of Hollywood, screenwriters would mark high on the curve . . . in terms of steady, workaday, year-in-year-out dolorousness, the writers have no near rivals." See also Goldman 1983 and 2000 and Dunne 1997. Orson Welles repeatedly drew attention to the importance of cinematographer Gregg Toland for *Citizen Kane* (1941) and to the fact that he learned everything about the camera from Toland on this film, which is frequently cited as the best ever made. Actors with star power and producers with strong personalities decisively shaped the films even of well-known writers and directors, usually without screen credit. For an illuminating account of the importance of film editing on the part of an editor who is not otherwise creatively involved in a film's production see the cases described by Rosenblum and Karen 1979. Cf. Welles's 1964 comment on American technical crews: "You are side by side with men who don't feel themselves to be workers but who think of themselves as very capable and very well paid artisans. That makes an enormous difference [to a director] . . . And it is not only a question of technique, it essentially concerns the human competence of the men with whom I worked . . . they do not think of themselves as belonging to another class." Quoted from the reprint of Cobos, Rubio, and Pruneda 1966 in Estrin 2002: 96–125, at 120.

[47] Quoted from Manvell 1950: 26.

[48] Quoted from Samuels 1972: 210 and 214. The working method of Alfred Hitchcock is the best-known example of such an approach; Hitchcock gives a concise and illuminating description at Samuels 1972: 234.

concise phrase "one man, one film."[49] As Italian filmmaker Michelangelo Antonioni described it:

> Only one person has the film clearly in mind, insofar as that is possible: the director. Only one person fuses in his mind the various elements involved in a film, only one person is in a position to predict the result of this fusion: the director.[50]

The collective nature of filmmaking has a parallel in literature. While a lone individual may autonomously create a novel, poem, or play, the process of printing, publishing, marketing, and selling it involves many others. So direct correspondences between literature and film exist in this regard, too. Nevertheless nobody is likely to deny that the collaborative or collective nature of the publishing industry has caused the death of the author. The argument about the absence or death of an author cannot hold true for cinema or any other creative medium. In antiquity, too, authors depended on collaborators, for how else could a written work that started as one single manuscript have found its readers or have survived? An even better illustration is Greek drama. In ancient Athens the performances of tragedies and comedies depended on the city's involvement in the festivals during which the plays were produced and in their financing, on skilled craftsmen for building the stage, on actors and singers for performing, and on judges to award prizes. These are only the most obvious kinds of involvement by people other than the author. But no one will deny Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, or any of the other Greek playwrights their authorial status. Since the ancient playwright also functioned as producer and director of his own works, he is comparable to a modern filmmaker – a "hyphenate" like a producer-director, writer-director, or, ideally, writer-producer-director-actor. The best-known example of this is Charles Chaplin, who sometimes composed the music for his films as well. Or we may think of Orson Welles, who in 1941 and 1942 directed, acted in, co-wrote, and co-produced *Citizen Kane* and directed, wrote, and co-produced *The Magnificent Ambersons*. Or we might consider Jean Cocteau alongside Sophocles. Both were poets, playwrights, and stage directors. Sophocles introduced set painting (*skênographia*) to the classical theater, Cocteau was a painter and draughtsman. Unlike Cocteau, Sophocles also

[49] See on this Stevens 2006: 77–79 and 87–89; cf. the words of King Vidor at Stevens, 50 and 52.

[50] Quoted from Billard 1996: 144 in an interview conducted and first published in French in *Cinéma 1965*, 100 (November, 1965). See further Antonioni's more detailed comments in Labarthe 1996: 136–137 (originally in Labarthe 1960).

composed the music for his plays.[51] Unlike Sophocles, Cocteau also acted.[52] Small wonder that on numerous occasions he called the cinema a modern Muse or "the tenth Muse."[53]

Filmmakers have known all along that the cinema is by no means a radically new medium of artistic creativity – not even in its dependence on modern technology – but that it is firmly anchored in the entire tradition of literature and the visual arts. Sergei Eisenstein, a screenwriter, director, editor, theoretician of cinema, and cultural critic, long ago pointed to the ancient Greeks as the earliest models and precursors of the art of cinema:

> our cinema is not altogether without parents and without pedigree, without a past, without the traditions and rich cultural heritage of the past epochs. It is only very thoughtless and presumptuous people who can erect laws and an esthetic for cinema, proceeding from premises of some incredible virgin-birth of this art! . . . Let Dickens and the whole ancestral array, going back as far as the Greeks and Shakespeare, be superfluous reminders that both Griffith and our cinema prove our origins to be not solely as of Edison and his fellow inventors, but as based on an enormous cultured past; each part of this past in its own moment of world history has moved forward the great art of cinematography.[54]

[51] Cocteau did, however, compose the music for Harry Kümel's *Anna la bonne* (1958), an experimental short film based on Cocteau's poem.

[52] And he adapted Sophocles for the modern stage. *Oedipe Roi*, a short play based on Cocteau's work for Igor Stravinsky's oratorio *Oedipus Rex*, and *The Infernal Machine* are adaptations of the most famous and influential of Sophocles' plays and indeed of all Greek tragedies. Oedipus, Antigone, and the Sphinx briefly appear in Cocteau's film *The Testament of Orpheus* (1959). Cocteau also wrote an *Antigone*.

[53] For examples see Cocteau 1992: 23, 123, and 56 (with slight corrections); cf. also 176–177 and 192–193. Three of Cocteau's best-known films are on or related to classical subjects: *The Blood of a Poet* (1930), *Orphée* (1949), and *The Testament of Orpheus*. I discuss *Orphée* in Chapter 6 below. – The metaphor used to appear regularly, often in more or less loose usage; cf., e.g., director Anthony Asquith's now little-known article "The Tenth Muse Climbs Parnassus" (Asquith 1946; rpt. in *The Penguin Film Review* 1977–1978, here vol. 1, 10–26, a brief survey of film history), and this advice to aspiring filmmakers by Orson Welles from 1982: "give your attention to the charms of the most perverse of muses." Quoted from Boujut 2002: 175. Cf. also the quotation from Abel Gance in the Introduction to this book.

[54] Eisenstein, "Dickens, Griffith, and the Film Today" (1944) in Eisenstein 1949: 195–255, at 232–233. The literal translation of the title of Eisenstein's essay is "Dickens, Griffith, and Us"; cf. Eisenstein 1949: 267. Aristotle's influence on Eisenstein in regard to the concept of *mimêsis* appears, e.g., in Eisenstein's 1929 essay "Imitation as Mystery," tr. Richard Taylor, now in Eisenstein 2006: 11–19. Literature on the artistic prehistory of cinema is extensive; the *locus classicus* is the 1933 essay by Rudolf Arnheim, "The Thoughts That Made the Pictures Move," now in Arnheim 1957: 161–180. For additional discussion and references cf. Winkler 2001b: 14–17. Cf., on a smaller scale, early French film director, screenwriter, and critic Louis Delluc, "From Orestes to Rio Jim" (Delluc 1921; now in Abel 1988, vol. 1: 255–258). Despite its amusing title, this brief article makes a number of serious points about the continuity of Greek tragedy and its connections to film. Delluc's title refers to *Two-Gun Hicks* (1914), an American western directed by and starring William S. Hart and released in France as *Le serment de Rio Jim* ("Rio Jim's Oath").

Eisenstein referred to the ancients on numerous occasions in his writings. In his essay "Laocoön," for example, he prominently discusses Homer and Virgil; in another he turns to the Parthenon and its environs.[55] The Greeks in particular are a living presence in Eisenstein's thinking about cinema. So is the entire tradition of Western art and literature, which derives from antiquity. As early as 1915, about twenty years after the birth of cinema, American poet Vachel Lindsay, who had been trained as a painter, had examined the various ways in which the cinema and the traditional arts are connected.[56]

As already indicated, there are also films whose creative authorship is unknowable or unclear, films that are unworthy of serious concern or too shallow to make any interpretation possible. But in this, cinema is again comparable to literature. In the history of narrative prose, which is the kind of writing most closely analogous to the cinema, there exists a plethora of mediocre products for every immortal masterpiece. The genre of the novel

[55] Eisenstein, "Laocoön" in Eisenstein 1988: 157–163, and "Montage and Architecture" in Eisenstein 1988: 59–81 at 60–67, with the following conclusion: "In the 'montage plan' of the Athenian Acropolis we find, of course, the same unsurpassed artistry as in other monuments of antiquity" (67).

[56] Lindsay 1915. For examples of German-speaking writers dealing with early cinema cf. Kaes 1978; authors include Alfred Döblin, Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Bertolt Brecht (who worked on screenplays during his exile in Hollywood), Gerhart Hauptmann, and Heinrich and Thomas Mann. Cf. playwright and soon-to-be screenwriter and director Marcel Pagnol, "The Talkie Offers the Writer New Resources," in Abel 1988, vol. 2: 55–57; originally Pagnol 1930. Elie Faure, "The Art of Cineplastics," tr. Walter Pach, in Abel 1988, vol. 1, 258–268 (originally published as "De la cinéplastique" in Faure 1922: 277–304); and Panofsky, "Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures," are examples of how prominent art historians have judged the cinema. His correspondence shows that Panofsky took cinema seriously. In a letter of September 11, 1944, to American film historian Parker Tyler he speaks of the "literary factor in cinematic art" and remarks on French cinema: "the French actors, directors and possibly even producers are... imbued with a humanistic tradition." In a letter of February 13, 1948, to James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, Panofsky looks into the academic future: "I do not see any reason why a university should not deal with the motion pictures on the same critical and historical level as it does with the productions of painting, sculpture or literature and thereby try to raise critical standards." Both letters, here quoted in my translation, are now in Wuttke 2003: 484–485 (no. 953; quotation at 485), and 904 (no. 1194). For another famous art historian's take on the cinema see Arnheim 1957. Perkins 1972 is a kind of riposte to early critics like Lindsay and Arnheim; cf. especially Perkins 9–27 (chapter entitled "The Sins of the Pioneers"). But it is well to remember as telling an example of mainstream cinema as American director Henry Hathaway, who observed in connection with his film *Peter Ibbetson* (1935), in which he took his lighting cues from works by Rembrandt: "I was influenced more by paintings than anything... You learn about photography from these people" (i.e. Hogarth, Brueghel, Dufy, and Vermeer, whom he had just named). Quotation from Behlmer 2001: 116–117. Cf. master cinematographer Lee Garmes on Rembrandt as quoted in Higham 1970: 35–36. Rembrandt's "north light" technique is clearly evident in Garmes's body of work. The influence of Rembrandt on cinema is greater than art historians tend to realize. Still valuable on this topic is Manvell 1950, especially its first part ("The Film as a New Art Form"): "Introduction: The Peculiarities of the Fine Arts Generally" (22–23) and "The Peculiarities of the Film in Particular" (24–26). On style and content in film cf., e.g., Perkins 1972: 116–133 (chapter entitled "'How' Is 'What'").

is the best illustration: it encompasses the greatest works of psychological realism and the modern *nouveau roman* all the way down to predictable romances and pornography, with formulaic or stereotypical fiction coming somewhere in between. Still, even if the amount of trash far exceeds that of genuine achievement, no one denies the novel its status as a literary art form. It is only fair to apply the same perspective to film. Jean Cocteau put it succinctly:

> Cinematography is an art. It will free itself from the industrial bondage whose platitudes no more condemn it than bad pictures and bad books discredit painting and literature.[57]

That even the traditional Hollywood studio system worked for commerce and profit but at the same time also fostered individual talents is obvious to anyone familiar with film history. Andrew Sarris's book *The American Cinema* provides ample if by no means exhaustive evidence.[58] We should keep in mind that the arts have always depended on commerce. Distinguished writer and filmmaker Marcel Pagnol rather vividly observed on behalf of cinema in 1933:

> a work of art must not only be conceived; its creator must realize it. A ton of marble is needed to sculpt the Venus de Milo; ten pounds of gold for a cup by Cellini . . . That's why, in order for its works first of all to be realized and then to be distributed, an art needs to be nurtured by a world of commerce: it needs people to buy the books, paintings, statues, theater or cinema seats. So as to make the idealists happy, let's say that this commerce is the manure which nurtures the flower. But the prosperity of this commerce is indispensable to the brilliance, vigor, and diffusion of any art whatsoever.[59]

Serious studies of cinematic authorship began in the silent era and have proliferated enormously in the last few decades since the advent of academic

[57] Cocteau 1967: 49 (in an essay entitled "On the Marvels of Cinematography").

[58] For a recent introduction to current Hollywood filmmaking see, e.g., Maltby 2003. For a first orientation in regard to the question "studio or individual filmmaker?" see, e.g., Durgnat 1967: 61–86 (chapter entitled "Auteurs and Dream Factories"); Bordwell, Thompson, and Staiger 1985; and Schatz 1988. Among innumerable other works see Luhr and Lehman 1977, with case studies mainly of films by John Ford, who was and is famous for his genre films, especially westerns, and who nevertheless (or for that very reason) has the reputation of being one of the most important cinematic *auteurs*. That as ritualistic and formulaic a genre as the western indeed admits of, even encourages, serious films by *auteurs* is demonstrated in the classic study of Kitses 1969, especially 7–27 (chapter entitled "Authorship and Genre"). The recent new edition of this book (Kitses 2004) exemplifies the difference between the qualities of traditional scholarship and current academic trends. The old version was written with clarity and evident love for its subject and was pleasurable to read; the new edition's added material, illuminating to the patient readers, is marred by jargon.

[59] Marcel Pagnol, "Cinematurgy of Paris," in Abel 1988, vol. 2: 129–136; quotation at 130. The article first appeared in Pagnol 1933.

film studies. But the most influential answer to the question of who is a film's true creator, its *author*, as it were, came with an essay written by young French critic and soon-to-be director François Truffaut, published in 1954 in the journal *Cahiers du cinéma*: "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema."[60] Truffaut's essay was rather polemical, but theorists, historians, critics, and many filmmakers adopted, if not without lively debates about its pros and cons, what Truffaut called *la politique des auteurs*, an expression generally rendered in English as "the *auteur* theory."[61]

According to this view, the *auteur* or author of a film is in most cases its director, the one who puts a personal stamp on the finished work. Anticipating much of what later came to be called reader-response criticism and the idea of the reader's presence in the text, the *auteur* theory introduced, indeed demanded, an equivalent viewer response. From this derives the claim, often made explicitly, that *auteur* cinema is as important for the life of a culture and for the culture of life as literature and all the other arts. The rejection of the counter-claim that cinema is a mere commodity is implied in this. As has been well said, the *auteur* theory

> insists on a *personal* relationship between filmmaker and film viewer. Movies must no longer be alienated products which are consumed by mass audiences; they are now intimate conversations between the people behind the camera and the people in front of the screen.[62]

[60] Truffaut 1954. An English version is readily available in Nichols 1976: 224–237. Cf. Tredell 2002: 101–130 and 243–244 (notes; chapter entitled "The Birth of the *Auteur*: *Cahiers du cinéma*"). For different approaches to the question of authorship in film see, e.g., Stillinger 1991: 174–181 (in chapter entitled "Plays and Films: Authors, Auteurs, Autres"; close to the position of Korenjak and Töchterle) and Benedetti 2005: 78–82. Marie 2003 provides a first orientation about the state of French cinema and culture at the time of Truffaut's writing. For additional information see Monaco 1977 and Neupert 2002.

[61] Cf., e.g., Caughie 1981, reprinting Barthes, "The Death of the Author" (208–213); Naremore 1999, and Casetti 1999: 76–82. Cf. further Sarris 1968 and Sarris 1977; rpt. in Wexman 2002: 21–29; further Wollen 1998. Gerstner and Staiger 2003 presents valuable introductions to the topic by the editors and examines a number of case studies. A modern assessment of the *auteur* theory, with brief discussion of the death of the author, is to be found in Perez 1998: 3–9. Truffaut was by no means the first to use the term "author" for the filmmaker; a much earlier example is film director (and *auteur*) René Clair, "Film Authors Don't Need You," tr. Stanley Appelbaum, in Abel 1988, vol. 2: 57–60; Clair speaks of "the true film author, who has been able to dominate the author of [a literary] original . . . and . . . has been able to recreate, for a new form of expression, a subject that was not intended for it" (58). The original, a short salvo aimed at Pagnol's article on the talking film, is Clair 1930. On the necessity of the ideal director as *auteur* to be a veritable polyhistor see Kazan 2006. Kagan 2006 has insights into filmmaking from script to postproduction, but not all of the directors interviewed can be regarded as major *auteurs*. Earlier, if more briefly, director King Vidor had made similar observations, including points about the director as writer and painter; see Vidor 1972: 35–37. On the related question of a film canon, which runs parallel to critical disputes about literary canons, cf. Schrader 2006.

[62] Monaco 1977: 8.

Crystallizing earlier views about filmic authorship, resurrecting and emphasizing the traditional Romantic view of the individual creator, and proposing what at the time appeared to be an almost radically new view of authorship in the cinema, Truffaut provided a strong impulse for, among other countries, France, Britain, and West Germany in the 1950s and 1960s: the *nouvelle vague* (New Wave), the British New Wave, and the "young German film." The last of these was often referred to as *Autorenkino*: "cinema of authors."[63] Even before Truffaut film scholars had applied principles of literary scholarship to the cinema. Research into what is usually called "the language of film" – its grammar, semiotics, or semantics – illustrates the affinities between literary and filmic storytelling. Once again we find corroboration that films, as coherent narratives, are visual texts.[64] One of the most influential statements of this perspective is an article by French critic and filmmaker Alexandre Astruc, who asserted the importance of language over the image and coined the arresting term *caméra-stylo* ("camera pen"):

[63] Not to be confused with the earlier German term *Autorenfilme* ("authors' films") which goes back to 1913 and denotes films based on literature or involving literary authors or stage actors.

[64] Spottiswoode 1935 is the pioneering study. Clifton 1983 examines filmic analogies to literary tropes; his chapter headings consist of or contain such basic rhetorical terms as symbol, simile, metaphor, anadiplosis, antithesis, hyperbole, ellipsis, metonymy, synecdoche, and allegory. Harrington 1973: 144–158 gives a brief introductory survey. For exemplary demonstrations of how greatly principles of literary scholarship can deepen our understanding of films and their *auteurs* see Mast 1982 and Wood 2002 on Howard Hawks and Alfred Hitchcock, two directors who were fully integrated into the studio system but created highly personal bodies of work. Mast was Professor of English before turning to film studies, Wood studied under F. R. Leavis. On the death of the author see further Wood 1998a, especially 27–28 (section entitled "L'Auteur est Mort – Vive l'Auteur!"). Wood's essay deals with *auteur* Anthony Mann. In general cf. also the following: Richardson 1969, Chatman 1978, Beja 1979, Browne 1982, Branigan 1984, and Bordwell 1985. David Bordwell in particular has examined filmic narration and narrative in several studies. The title of Phillips 2000 and the main title of Monaco 2000 are telling. (That of Ann Steiner 2007 is analogous to the latter.) Cf. also Thompson 1999, Bordwell 2006, and Cahir 2006: 44–71 (chapter entitled "The Language of Film and Its Relation to the Language of Literature"). Robert Bresson once gave an elegant definition of the fundamental nature of cinema: "CINEMATOGRAPHY IS A WRITING WITH IMAGES IN MOVEMENT AND WITH SOUNDS." Quoted from Bresson 1977: 2. Cf. the main titles of George M. Wilson 1986 and Bernardi 2001. On differences and analogies of literary and filmic points of view and for an overview of various analytical positions see Branigan 2006: 39–54 and 235–241 (notes). On film semiotics see especially Metz 1994 and 1986 and Metz 1982b. Only earlier versions of Metz's books exist in English (Metz 1974a, 1974b, and 1982a). Metz concluded that the language of cinema is significantly different from all other languages. Cf. Mast 1977: 16: "the cinema has no language. It has, rather, many languages." See also Wollen 1998 and John M. Carroll 1980 on film language, linguistics, and grammar. There is extensive further literature. Soviet film theoretician Dziga Vertov anticipated this with great concision when he noted in 1928 about his approach to film (which he named *kino glas*: "cinema eye"): "Kino-eye's new experimental work aims to create a truly international film-language, *absolute writing in film*, and the complete separation of cinema from theater and literature." Quoted from Vertov 1984: 283. Vertov made this observation in connection with his next film, *The Man with a Movie Camera* (1929), which he called "A Visual Symphony."

the cinema is quite simply becoming a means of expression, just as all the other arts have been before it, and in particular painting and the novel . . . it is gradually becoming a language. By language, I mean a form in which and by which an artist can express his thoughts, however abstract they may be, or translate his obsessions exactly as he does in the contemporary essay or novel. That is why I would like to call this new age of cinema the age of *caméra-stylo* (camera-pen). This metaphor has a very precise sense. By it I mean that the cinema will gradually break free from the tyranny of what is visual, from the image for its own sake, from the immediate and concrete demands of the narrative, to become a means of writing just as flexible and subtle as written language.[65]

Alongside this consider the following statement by French *auteur* Robert Bresson, one of the greatest cinema artists, about his own approach to filmmaking:

each shot is like a word, which means nothing by itself, or rather means so many things that in effect it is meaningless. But a word in a poem is transformed, its meaning made precise and unique, by its placing in relation to the words around it: in the same way a shot in a film is given its meaning by its context, and each shot modifies the meaning of the previous one until with the last shot a total, unparaphrasable meaning has been arrived at.[66]

Bresson's words are a clear, elegant, and immediately understandable description of how a film artist proceeds. His reference to poetry is illuminating and appropriate. For Truffaut (under Astruc's influence) and contemporary theorists and critics writing in *Cahiers du cinéma*, several of whom later became influential directors, the analogy of film to literature and of the literary author to the film director was a matter of course. Terms like Astruc's *caméra-stylo* and, more generally, *écriture* ("writing") emphasize the quasi-literary nature of filmmaking and filmic storytelling. French writer-director Agnès Varda, who coined the word *cinécriture* ("filmwriting"), has described her conception of it in the following terms:

I invented the word and now I use it to mean the filmmaker's work. It puts the work of the scriptwriter who writes but does not film, and of the director who does the mise-en-scène, back in their respective boxes. The two may be the same person, but there's often lasting confusion . . .

A well-written film is also well filmed, the actors are well chosen, so are the locations. The cutting, the movement, the points-of-view, the rhythm of filming

[65] Quoted from Astruc 1968: 17–18. The original (Astruc 1948) is now also in Astruc 1992: 324–328; original of text quoted at 325. On Astruc see Neupert 2002: 45–49 and especially Monaco 1977: 3–12 ("Introduction: The Camera Writes"). In 1948 Astruc directed *Ulysse ou les mauvaises rencontres* ("Ulysses, or Bad Encounters"), a short film now lost.

[66] Cf. the following brief statement in Bresson 1977: 15: "Cinematography: new way of writing, therefore of feeling."

and editing have been felt and considered in the way a writer chooses the depths of meaning of sentences, the type of words, number of adverbs, paragraphs, asides, chapters which advance the story or break its flow, etc.

In writing it's called style. In the cinema, style is *cinécriture.*[67]

So screenplay credits of Varda's films say *cinécrit* ("filmwritten") instead of the common credit *écrit par*... ("written by . . ").[68] In 1971 a number of German directors had organized their own distribution under the name *Filmverlag der Autoren.* A *Verlag* is primarily a publishing house, so the choice of the term for films came with the immediately evident claim that films are comparable to literature and that their directors are their authors. Long before this, Russian pioneer Vsevolod Pudovkin had spoken of the *kinopisatel* ("cinemawriter"), who is not identical with the screenwriter, and Dziga Vertov, another influential Russian filmmaker and theoretician, had written about what he called *kino glas* ("cinema eye"):

Kino-eye = kino-seeing (I see through the camera) + kino-writing (I write on film with the camera) + kino-organization (I edit).[69]

Varda's concept of *cinécriture* reminds us of Roland Barthes's parallel term concerning literature: *écriture.* It is worth recalling that Barthes and the *auteur* theorists and New Wave filmmakers have more in common than those who attribute Barthes's idea of the death of the author to cinema seem to be aware of. The matter has been summarized with admirable concision:

At about the same time that Alexandre Astruc wrote his essay on the Caméra-Stylo, Roland Barthes . . . was beginning to work out a theory of literature which is not dissimilar to the New Wave vision of film. Barthes suggests a subtle and variegated critical theory that places emphasis not on the historical dimension of literature (what he calls its "language"), nor on the personal dimension (the "style") but on a third thing, the product of the two – what Barthes calls *écriture* ("a mode of writing") . . . this is a useful way to approach the cinema of the New Wave: as a tertium quid – a cinematic *écriture* that combines "language" and "style" and is "written" with a Caméra-Stylo.[70]

[67] Quoted from Alison Smith 1998: 14 note 3. The original French appears on the same page. On style in film cf. below.

[68] Vsevolod Pudovkin, "On the Language of the Script: A Conversation," in Pudovkin 2006: 179–184. The conversation dates to 1928.

[69] Quoted from Vertov 1984: 87.

[70] Monaco 1977: 8–9. Monaco quotes a passage from Barthes 1968: 14 here omitted, as are further similarities between Barthes's *écriture* and the *cinécriture* of the New Wave, important as these are.

So filmmakers are best regarded as authors of their works, and many great directors understand themselves as such.[71] The common and familiar international custom of identifying a film by its director's name indicates such authorship. Credits and advertisements indicate the same: "Alfred Hitchcock's *Psycho*," for instance, or *Un film de . . .*, *Ein Film von . . .*, *Un film di . . .*, etc., with the director's name appearing in place of my ellipses.[72] Jean-Luc Godard – like Truffaut first a film critic and then a screenwriter and director and like Truffaut one of the most important *auteurs* in the history of cinema – once expressed this perspective in an essay about a film by Swedish *auteur* Ingmar Bergman:

> The cinema is not a craft. It is an art. It does not mean teamwork. One is always alone; on the set as before a blank page. And . . . to be alone means to ask questions. Nothing could be more classically romantic.[73]

With this we may compare Bergman's own assessment of writing and editing his films. He identifies

> a fundamental truth – that editing occurs during filming itself, the rhythm created in the script . . .
>
> The rhythm in my films is conceived in the script, at the desk, and is then given birth in front of the camera. All forms of improvisation are alien to me . . . Filming for me is an illusion planned in detail, the reflection of a reality.[74]

Orson Welles, another acknowledged *auteur*, seems to concur. Three years after Godard's mention of the blank page, Welles said: "Film is a very personal thing, much more than theatre, because the film is a dead thing – a ribbon of celluloid – like the paper on which one writes a poem. Theatre is a collective experience; cinema is the work of one single person – the director."[75] Repeatedly Welles stressed the importance of writing. About his own approach he has said, for example:

[71] Cf. King Vidor on the term *auteur*: "Of course, the meaning of the word in French is 'author' but with a broader meaning than its English equivalent. Its connotations include much more than simply the authorship of original, written material. It means the control of screenplay, casting, decor, editing, acting, with a dynamic emphasis on the supervision of photography." Quoted from Vidor 1972: 109.

[72] Contrast, however, the words of writer-director Carol Reed: "it's stupid to write, as they do in Europe, a film by so-and-so. The English or American terminology is much better: written by – –, from a play by – –, adapted by – –, produced by – –, directed by – –. Then you know – approximately – who did what." But note his immediately following statement about his own films: "In my case, the film is really mine." Quotations from Samuels 1972: 79. Reed's distinction between (continental) European and English-language practice is too rigid.

[73] Godard 1958, quoted from Narboni and Milne 1972: 76. [74] Quoted from Bergman 1988: 73.

[75] Quoted from Cowie 1973: 108, originally in Bogdanovich 1961.

I always begin with the dialogue. And I do not understand how one dares to write action before dialogue. It's a very strange conception. I know that in theory the word is secondary in cinema but the secret of my work is that everything is based on the word. I do not make silent films. I must begin with what the characters say. I must know what they say before seeing them do what they do.[76]

And:

the various technical jobs [of filmmaking] can be taught, just as you can teach the principles of grammar and rhetoric. But you can't teach writing, and directing a picture is very much like writing, except that it involves 300 people and a great many more skills . . . So it's partly a question of personality, which isn't so easy to acquire as a skill.[77]

The words of a filmmaker who was also a literary author and painter may carry special weight in this context. Jean Cocteau once said about film language and his own work in cinema:

The cinematograph requires a syntax. This syntax is obtained through connection and the clash between images. No wonder that the peculiarity of such a syntax (our style) expressed in visual terms seems disconcerting to spectators accustomed to slapdash translations and to the articles in their morning paper . . . Before film art can be worthy of a writer, the writer must become worthy of film art. I mean, he should . . . work hard at building an object in a style equivalent to his written style . . . I am a draughtsman. It is quite natural for me to see and hear what I write, to endow it with a plastic form. When I am shooting a film, every scene I direct is for me a moving drawing, a painter's grouping of material . . . I work in close collaboration with my assistants. Consequently, as my unit itself admits, the film becomes a thing of my very own to which they have contributed by their advice and skill.[78]

The "classic" that Godard had in mind is, of course, not a reference to classical antiquity but to the tradition and influence of Romanticism and

[76] Quoted from Cobos, Rubio, and Pruneda 1966 in Estrin 2002: 102. Welles often stressed the importance of the writer over the director; cf., e.g., this comment: "I'm sure I can't make good films unless I also write the screenplay." Quoted from Bazin and Bitsch 2002: 46 (originally Bazin and Bitsch 1958). Cf. Cocteau's words: "It is probably true that an author's text is the very foundation of a spoken film, but no more than the foundation. The real syntax of a film remains silent, wordless. Its style is visual. It is that 'writing' – the mechanism of the photographing of the scenes and the rhythm with which they are put together – that is the hallmark of the film-maker's language." Quoted from Steegmuller 1986: 483; source reference at 558.

[77] Quoted from Kenneth Tynan: "*Playboy* Interview: Orson Welles," in Estrin 2002: 126–145; quotation at 136. The interview first appeared in *Playboy* (March, 1967). Cf. writer-director Abraham Polonsky on directing: "It's almost as good as writing because it is a form of writing. . . . The set is a live thing – a more complex writing experience." Quoted from Pechter 1971: 153. Pechter 274 observes: "just as a film's editing corresponds to the writer's final act of revision, the analogue to the original act of literary creation is filming."

[78] Quoted from Cocteau 1954/1972: 16 and 21–22.

its conception of the artistic individual who independently creates a work of art through his own ingenuity.[79] The reference to writing seems to have occurred to Godard as the obvious point of departure for the creative artist in the medium of film. The elective affinity, as it were, between filmmakers and literary authors could scarcely have been expressed more elegantly. The same affinity, if to a lower degree, applies to less accomplished and even to crassly commercial films. The author, often prematurely pronounced dead, has been and continues to be alive and well in the cinema and is likely to enjoy good health in the future.[80] So the only way in which the claim that films do not have authors makes any sense is to restrict the term "author" to literature and to deny its applicability to all other forms of art. We have already seen that the ancients were far from taking this narrow view, and no one today is likely to feel comfortable with such a rigidly limited understanding of authorship. Films, we conclude, are created, either exclusively or chiefly, by their directors, who function as their *auctores* or *auteurs*, if with varying degrees of artistry. On the highest level of film as a modern art form we find directors whose status as cinematic *auteurs* it is pointless to question or deny.[81]

THE CINEMA OF POETRY

Style is one of the most important aspects of literature, particularly significant in poetry. If films are texts whose narratives can be presented in specific styles, can there then also exist a kind of poetry in the cinema? Can visual images be said to be analogous to literary poetry or actually to *be* poetic? We are likely to answer this question negatively if we apply the word "poetry" in the strictest sense, i.e. exclusively to literature. But as we have seen in the case of the term "author," such limitation is not helpful. Style is fundamental to all visual arts, and poetic qualities may be inherent in nonliterary forms of art as well, for instance in music. Etymology points

[79] McGann 1991 and Stillinger 1991, however, adduce ample evidence of the collaborate nature even of Romantic poetry production. McGann, editor of Lord Byron's poetry, speaks of "the hidden features of textual media" (10) and observes: "texts are produced and reproduced under specific social and institutional conditions . . . every text, including those that may appear to be purely private, is a social text" (21). And: "authorship is a social and not a solitary act or set of acts" (64).

[80] On Barthes and the death of the author in cinema see especially Colin MacCabe, "The Revenge of the Author," in MacCabe 1999: 33–41; rpt. in Wexman 2002: 30–41. Cf. the perspectives of various directors in Littger 2006.

[81] Sarris 1968: 39 famously grouped the greatest artists together as "Pantheon Directors" who "have transcended their technical problems with a personal vision of the world" and created "a self-contained world with its own laws and landscapes. They were also fortunate enough to find the proper conditions and collaborators [we might say, their *fabri*] for the full expression of their talent."

us in the right direction: "poetry" derives, via Latin *poesis*, from Greek *poiêsis*, a word whose literal meaning (from the verb *poieîn*, "to make") fits all acts of creation: those of craftsmen who create something tangible with their hands – cf. above on *fabri* – and those who create through ingenuity: poets, painters, sculptors, composers, and others.

Consideration of style is a useful way for literary scholars to approach the question of textual authorship and to deepen their appreciation of an author's work.[82] The same is true for visual storytelling, and film scholars regularly examine the question of cinematic style and poetry in their studies of a director's body of work, even if the term "poetry" is often applied as loosely to a film as it is to other works of art. The subject is too large to be dealt with systematically here, but some observations are appropriate.[83] In 1948 Roger Manvell made the following fundamental points:

> The use of the word "poetry" is always ambiguous, even when applied solely to the literary medium. To use it of the film is to imply that the motion picture is capable of intense emotional concentration as well as prolonged periods of narrative and character presentation which are rich in human understanding and illuminate the experience of life. It implies that the medium is flexible and eloquent under the control of the artist, and that it offers him resources of expression which will win his devotion and excite his genius. It implies also that these resources are not available in the same form in the other narrative arts, and that the film becomes a speciality and the film artist a specialist. It implies that the film is not a mere substitute for the drama or the novel, but an art with its own peculiar properties to arouse the aesthetic susceptibilities of artist and audience.[84]

[82] Cf. the comments by two directors, the former an *auteur* (Fritz Lang), the latter (Edward Dmytryk) not: "Every picture has a certain rhythm which only one man can give it. That man is the director. He has to be like the captain of a ship." Quoted from Rosenberg and Silverstein 1970: 347. And: "He must know how to use the various members of the production company to play them as a composer plays the keys of a piano." Quoted from Dmytryk 1984: viii.

[83] Specific instances of philological approaches to film and classical literature are Newman 2001 and Mench 2001.

[84] Manvell 1948, quoted from *The Penguin Film Review* 1977–1978, vol. 2: 111–124, at 112–113. Cf. there Manvell 121 on films that "rise . . . from the higher levels of emotional narrative to the degree of poetry itself" and 112: "Many men and women who would otherwise have been the poets of the twentieth century have found their medium of expression in the motion picture. To them is due our right to speak of the poetry of the cinema." About two decades earlier, André Maurois, well-known author and future member of the Académie française, had made the same case in Maurois 1927; cf. also Levinson 1927. Russian Formalists had expressed the analogy of poetry and film at the same time; I cite, as an example representative of numerous other works, Viktor Shklovsky, "Poetry and Prose in Cinematography," tr. T. L. Aman, in Bann and Bowlt 1973: 128–130 (originally published in a book on the poetics of cinema in 1927). Cf. Galan 1984: 95–104. For a more recent theoretical view cf. Bordwell 1989. A specific test case of how far one may wish to go applying the idea of poetry to cinema may be one's response to Kael 1976; rpt. in Kael 1980: 112–119 and Kael 1994: 668–674. Kael's subject is Sam Peckinpah's film *The Killer Elite* (1975).

do so: "The linguistic or grammatical world of the filmmaker is composed of images, and images are always concrete, never abstract." Since narrative films are concerned with plots, the language of cinema has predominantly resembled that of literary prose. But as a "new 'technique' or 'genre' of expression," the cinema is characterized by "irrational, oneiric, elementary, and barbaric elements" that "were forced below the level of consciousness." (We may be reminded of the common description of Hollywood as a dream factory.) The cinema's "narrative convention belongs without question, by analogy, to the language of prose communication, but it has in common with such a language only the external manifestation – the logical and illustrative processes – while it lacks one fundamental element of the 'language of prose': rationality. Its foundation is that mythical and infantile subtext which, because of the very nature of cinema, runs underneath every commercial film which is . . . fairly adult aesthetically and socially." From this Pasolini deduces that cinema, with its "language of [image]-signs, has a double nature: it is both extremely subjective and extremely objective" to an extent that the two sides become inseparable.[89] By contrast, literature also has a dual language (prose and poetry), but both sides are separable and often separate. Due to its lack of "a conceptual, abstract vocabulary," cinema is "powerfully metaphoric."[90]

For Pasolini this aspect of film leads to the heart of the matter. He poses the following question: "how is the 'language of poetry' theoretically explicable and practically possible in cinema?" He approaches the answer by first turning to a related question: "is the technique of free indirect discourse possible in cinema?" With this procedure Pasolini implicitly asks if film can adopt and express one of the most sophisticated techniques of literature.[91] As expected, he answers in the affirmative: "free indirect cinematographic discourse" is "the immersion of the filmmaker in the mind of his character [most commonly, a film's protagonist] and then the adoption on the part of the filmmaker not only of the psychology of his character but also of his language." While a filmic narrative that appears objective or neutral is analogous to prose narrative, direct discourse in literature corresponds to the point-of-view shot in film. The filmic equivalent of free

[89] We may compare Pasolini's term "image-sign" to Abel Gance's earlier "image-text"; in 1921 Gance had addressed the "literature" and "philosophy" of moving images. Cf. the quotations and discussion in King, 1984: 56, with source references at 222.

[90] Cf., in the context of more traditional filmmaking, the exhortation to future filmmakers by screenwriter and author Ray Bradbury on the importance of metaphor for both poetry and film at Stevens 2006: 382.

[91] Cf. on this the 1977 essay by Eric Rohmer, "Film and the Three Levels of Discourse: Indirect, Direct, and Hyperdirect," in Rohmer 1989: 84–92.

indirect discourse in literature is the "free indirect point-of-view shot," but whereas literature is capable of interior monologues, cinema is not, "since cinema does not have the possibilities of interiorization and abstraction that the word has. It is an 'interior monologue' of images." So complete correspondence between literature and film is not possible. A writer who recreates a character's speech "immerses himself in his psychology" (as does the filmmaker) and "in his *language*. Free indirect discourse is therefore always linguistically differentiated when compared to the language of the writer." In this, filmmakers, restricted as they are to image-signs for their language of communication, cannot follow or imitate writers: "They cannot take into consideration, because they don't exist [in image-signs], special languages, sublanguages, slang – in short, social differences."

From this, Pasolini reaches his conclusion about the importance of cinematic style as the decisive factor to create visual poetry:

> In practice, therefore, on a possible common linguistic level predicated on "gazes" at things, the difference that a director can perceive between himself and a character is only psychological and social. *But not linguistic.* He therefore finds himself in the complete impossibility of effecting any naturalistic *mimesis* of this language, of this hypothetical "gaze" at reality by others.
>
> Thus, if he immerses himself in his character and tells the story or depicts the world through him, he cannot make use of that formidable natural instrument of differentiation that is language. *His activity cannot be linguistic; it must, instead, be stylistic.*
>
> Moreover, a writer, too . . . can differentiate his psychology from that of his character . . . by means of a style – that is . . . through certain characteristic traits of the "language of poetry." Thus the fundamental characteristic of the "free indirect point-of-view shot" is not linguistic but stylistic. And it can therefore be defined as an interior monologue lacking both the explicit conceptual element and the explicit abstract philosophical element. This . . . causes the "free indirect point-of-view shot" in cinema to imply the possibility of an extreme stylistic articulation . . . In short, it is the "free indirect point-of-view shot" which establishes a possible tradition of the "technical language of poetry" in cinema.

For illustrations of such stylistic articulation Pasolini turns to two specific films – Michelangelo Antonioni's *The Red Desert* (1964) and Bernardo Bertolucci's *Before the Revolution* (1964) – and, more generally, to the cinema of Jean-Luc Godard. These films reveal that the cinema of poetry is "profoundly based, for the most part, on the practice of style as sincerely poetic inspiration." This in turn means that "a common technical/stylistic tradition is taking form [in early 1960s cinema]; a language, that is, of the cinema of poetry." This new kind of cinema makes viewers fully aware of camera techniques, whereas classic cinematic narratives had adhered

to the principle of keeping camera movements largely out of viewers' consciousness – in Pasolini's phrase: "the camera was not felt." Traditional films were not made "according to the canons of the 'language of poetry.'" Even so Pasolini calls the works of earlier directors like Charles Chaplin, Kenji Mizoguchi, and Ingmar Bergman "great film poems" and refers to "the classical 'cinema of poetry.'"[92] Overall, he characterizes this poetic tradition as being analogous to great prose literature:

> The poetic nature of classical films was . . . not obtained using a specifically poetic language. This means that they were not poems but stories. Classical cinema was and is narrative. Its language is that of prose. Poetry is internal to it, as, for example, in the tales of Chekhov or Melville.

Just as prose writers can be highly poetic, creating an "art prose . . . whose real protagonist is style," so classical filmmakers imbue their prosaic narratives with cinematic style, if not to the extent Pasolini postulates for the cinema of poetry.[93]

Pasolini's theory, here presented only in outline, is sophisticated and attractive. Still, not all scholars of literature or the cinema and not all filmmakers are likely to follow Pasolini in each and every point of his argument.[94] Traditional filmmaking can be far more poetic than Pasolini might have allowed for. In fairness to him we should remember that his theory is meant specifically to account for the new and liberating advances in technology and for filmmakers' approaches to their medium that originated in European cinema in the wake of Italian Neorealism and

[92] That the cinema of Bergman is related to the cinema of poetry, especially in regard to style and subjectivity, becomes evident, for instance, in Kawin 1978. Cf. Sontag 1967a; rpt. in Michaels 2000: 62–85. The collaboration of Jacques Prévert as author of film scripts, original or adapted, or as author of film dialogue with directors Jean Renoir and especially Marcel Carné is a particularly telling example of how decisively a literary poet can influence the work of earlier cinematic poets. On the "poetic realism" associated with Prévert, Carné, Renoir, and other French directors, especially Jean Vigo, René Clair, Julien Duvivier, and Jacques Feyder, see Andrew 1995. On the films of Andrei Tarkovsky, who is regularly called a film poet, cf., e.g., Turovskaya 1989 and, if with a different artistic metaphor, Tarkovsky's own book (Tarkovsky 1986). Cf. further Ruiz 1995. Instructive in this context are the contributions to "Poetry and the Film: A Symposium" of 1953, in which authors Arthur Miller and Dylan Thomas discussed cinema with filmmaker Maya Deren and film scholar Parker Tyler; most remarkable is the literary authors' lack of comprehension and their condescension. The symposium was published in *Film Culture*, 29 (Summer, 1963), and is now easily accessible in Sitney 1970: 171–186.

[93] Cocteau's film *Orphée*, dealt with in Chapter 6, is an especially striking instance of cinema of poetry from an earlier time.

[94] A noteworthy exception is British poet, dramatist, and filmmaker Tony Harrison, who refers to his work in cinema as "film/poems." He describes his views on poetry and cinema at Tony Harrison 1998: xxiii–xxvii, with several references to Pasolini. Harrison begins the introduction to the text edition of his film/poem *Prometheus* (1998) with a quotation from Pasolini: "To make films is to be a poet" (Tony Harrison 1998: vii). Cf. also Tony Harrison 2007.

the French New Wave. But it is entirely appropriate to the entire history of film that scholars and critics should fall back on analogies to literature – as Pasolini himself does in the last few passages quoted above – and, beyond this, should describe or analyze the works of any great filmmaker in terms derived from the interpretation of poetry. I adduce just one example of how a sensitive critic, here William Pechter, may assess the work of an important director. John Ford was for decades a popular traditional filmmaker, an acknowledged *auteur*, and, to critics and historians alike, a visual poet. Pasolini would regard him as an artist in the classical mold to whose filmic narratives poetry is internal. But even so the visual poetry of Ford and its style are clearly visible on screen. The influence on Ford of German Expressionist cinema as exemplified by one of its masters, Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau, has long been familiar to film scholars. Together with the cinema of montage of great Russian directors like Sergei Eisenstein, Dziga Vertov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, and others, Expressionism was one of the most influential ways that brought the cinema into the realm of modern art in the 1920s. As Ford biographer and scholar Tag Gallagher put it, under Murnau's influence "Ford's cinema became totally stylized . . . Ford found cinema could be completely poeticized."[95]

Looking back on Ford's career after Ford retired from filmmaking, Pechter expressed his summation of Ford in literary terms:

> John Ford has been making films since 1917, and his work has come, in its entirety, to resemble one vast fiction of such breadth and limpidity as virtually to make it seem a creation of the art of another age . . . but for Chaplin and Keaton, Ford is the only American director of films whose body of work has the formal beauty, richness of imagination, thematic unity, and wholeness of vision which we associate with artistic greatness as it is commonly understood with respect to the traditional arts. In order to see this, I believe one has to accept and reject several things; to accept, for instance, the Hollywood system in which Ford has had to function and which required his continually having to buy again the freedom to make a film of his own choosing with others that were commercial successes (a system, however, in which Ford . . . could thrive because of having by nature the gifts of a truly popular artist); and accept also Ford's imperfections of nature – his penchant for low comedy and his occasional inclinations toward sentimentality (good Shakespearean and Dickensian faults, respectively). I believe one has to reject, or at least have serious reservations about, such a textbook classic as *The Informer* . . . And one must reject as well the cult of Ford . . . or of thirty years of "Fordolatry" restricted to gauzily impressionistic tributes to his masterly visual style; both, in their insularity, confining to the dimensions of a ghetto an art whose

[95] Quoted from Gallagher 1984: 54. On Murnau and Ford cf. Gallagher 1984: 49–54 and McBride 2001: 158–163.

reach encompasses a world . . . The finest of Ford's films remain among the few great Apollonian in the art of this century.[96]

Further comments on the literary and cinematic concepts examined here are not required for our purposes.[97] We have seen that the cinema, a narrative medium, is closely related to literature, that films are or can be visual texts created by individual authors, and that scholarly interpreters of narratives and poetry ought to approach films philologically and often do. We now turn to a demonstration of how and why classical philology may be conceived to encompass film philology as an aspect integral to its nature. This implies the justification for those who practice the former also to engage in the latter.

PHILOLOGIA CLASSICA ET CINEMATOGRAPHICA: FROM CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY TO FILM PHILOLOGY

Academic departments of film studies train future scholars to deal with filmic texts, to teach courses on them, and to research specific aspects of cinema. Alongside such film scholars those trained in any of the modern

[96] Pechter 1971: 234–235 and 240 (in a piece entitled "A Persistence of Vision"). Sarris 1975 examines Ford's work as visual poetry. With characteristic grumpiness, Ford always denied that he was a poet and maintained that he did not know what such an expression meant. Here is an example from 1973, when Ford could look back on his entire career: "I am not a poet . . . I'm just a hard-nosed, hardworking, run-of-the-mill director." Quoted from Wagner 1975: 54, rpt. as Wagner 2001 in Peary 2001: 159. Ford deceived few if any. He also often denied being the *auteur* of his films and compared himself to an architect, but cf. this answer from 1965 to the question "How would you define yourself?": "John Ford, author of westerns, war stories where men count more than events, and comedies where the strength of feelings counts. Heroism, laughter, emotion: the rest is just the rest." Quoted from Leguèbe 2001: 72. On the cult of film directors see Pechter 1971: 52, with mention of Ford. Caughie 1981: 68–120 devotes an entire section to a "Dossier on John Ford."

[97] Except, perhaps, to note that belief in the death of the author in literary studies predictably resurrected belief in the death of cinematic authors and of the *auteur* theory, thus returning us to the older and rather unhelpful view that consideration of the collaborative nature of filmmaking can lead to more important insights into the medium than consideration of authorship. The former approach is more fruitful for our understanding of cinema from commercial or sociological points of view, the latter for that of cinema as art, if on various levels of achievement. Ford himself can serve as an illustration even today. Sharrett 2006, a recent article on *The Searchers* (1956), Ford's greatest work, elicited the following responses from a reader and, in return, the writer: "Apparently, news of the demise of the *auteur* thesis has not reached [Sharrett's] film studies department." – "On the demise of the *auteur* theory, it is manifest that cinema is a collaborative art form . . . but 'death of the author' claptrap is at least as dubious as the staunchest defenses of *auteur*ism . . . Theories aside, I consider *The Searchers* to be a film by John Ford. Ford's films are always very recognizable . . . For me, he is the principal author of his work . . . one of Hollywood's most acknowledged (justifiably so) *auteurs*." Quoted from Ceplair and Sharrett 2006. Apparently, Truffaut and Barthes stirred up quite a hornets' nest in their different ways. While siding more with Sharrett than with Ceplair, I do not think that the former's reappraisal does justice to the complexity of *The Searchers*, although I doubt that any one critic can.

philologies like English, French, German, or Italian have shown themselves to be equally capable of the serious study and explication of visual texts. A large amount of analytical writing about cinema is the work of such philologists, of scholars originally trained in literature who during their academic careers began to incorporate films into their courses or added entire film courses to their teaching, to write about literature and film side by side, or to turn exclusively to the cinema. Classical scholars have begun to follow suit.[98] But many are still skeptical about combining classics with cinema, the old with the modern. To show that such skepticism is beside the point I quote in this section a larger number of older and contemporary classicists than would otherwise be necessary.

One of the latter has pointed out "the value of cinema to classicists (and the value of classicists to cinema)" and concluded:

> It readily reveals connections and differences between antiquity and modern societies, and exposes the mechanisms whereby modern cultures use the classical past to interrogate the present; its study can illuminate classical cultures and their literatures . . . cinema brings classics out into a very public domain and makes the interrogation of antiquity and the classical tradition available globally.[99]

Classical scholarship is based on rigorous training that encompasses detailed and thorough knowledge of ancient literature in terms of linguistics, morphology, syntax, aesthetics, and literary history in addition to yet other aspects. Classical philology is the best training ground for interpretive approaches to all and any texts, literary or visual. Classical philologists are uniquely prepared to contribute exemplary work to the study of cinema and to give major impulses to this newer field.[100] At the same time classicists can enhance, from a new perspective, their own understanding and appreciation of classical culture and its modern reception and continuing influence. When classicists are prepared to regard their own scholarly discipline as a source of never-ending research – that is to say, when they adhere to the idea of *philologia perennis* (more on this below) – and engage in

[98] They are now beginning to teach and research cinema, primarily the reception of ancient Greece and Rome on the screen and the adaptations of classical themes or archetypes in films not ostensibly connected with or referring to antiquity. There is, however, no systematic theoretical engagement by classicists concerning their discipline and film. For brief early examples cf. Wyke 1998 and 2003 and Winkler 1991b and 2001b: 18–22.

[99] Wyke 2003: 445. Cf. in general Martindale 2006: 5–6: "Antiquity and modernity, present and past, are always implicated in each other, always in dialogue – to understand either one, you need to think in terms of the other."

[100] Winkler 2003 is an example of how the editorial practice of classical texts may be applied to a cinematic text. Following the model of editors' prefaces to their critical editions of classical texts, this short article is in Latin.

film philology alongside their other work, they are in a much better position to furnish the modern or postmodern world, which more and more often takes a dim view of the significance of classical teaching and research, with exemplary proof that such scholarship is anything but outdated or "irrelevant" – today's favorite term for the facile consignment of something insufficiently understood to disdain or oblivion.[101] As one classical and medieval scholar has put it:

> philologists must realize that making their texts relevant to a modern audience, which necessitates asking new questions of their texts, is not inherently meretricious; on the contrary, it is an urgent desideratum . . . Just as knowledge will be lost if old standards are dropped, so too fields will die if their representatives cannot find meaning for today's readers and today's new questions in the texts. At a time when literature in printed form has taken a back seat to television, film, and music, it is extremely important that scholars be able to articulate why students and colleagues should care about the books with which they work . . . we cannot allow our profession to be split into two castes, one of which devotes itself wholly to conceptual work, the other to textual or technical work.[102]

A moment spent on a brief recapitulation of the history of film criticism may be instructive at this point. Gerald Mast, whom I quoted earlier in this chapter, has summarized the two main phases of serious film criticism in terms that will immediately be familiar to literary scholars, not least classicists:

> While the roots of empirical-phenomenological film theory lie in the humanities (in literature, philosophy, art history, aesthetics) the roots of the new poststructuralist film theory lie in the social sciences (anthropology, sociology, psychology, economics). While the humanist film theorist-critic seeks to understand the work of art in its own terms and in its effect on the viewer, the poststructuralist film theorist-critic wishes to understand in so far as it reveals (and conceals) the cultural attitudes that produced it and the cultural interests which it serves.[103]

These words were written a quarter-century ago, but they apply today virtually without any change. So my call to classical scholars to turn to the cinema is anything but radical. Film philology is already being practiced in modern philologies and by theorists-critics whose roots are in the

[101] Unthinkable as it may have been only a few decades before, alarm about the relevance of their discipline and the ways classics, classical studies, and classical philology have been and continue to be pursued and taught in the academy has periodically led to much anguish and soul-searching on the part of professionals. I cite only Culham and Edmunds 1989, Hanson and Heath 2000, Wiseman 2002, and Pearcy 2005 – books from different places and perspectives whose titles speak for themselves.

[102] Jan Ziolkowski 1990b: 9 and 11.

[103] Quoted from the "Preface (1983)" to Mast 1977: vii–xii; quotation at x.

humanities and who turn to the modern social sciences alongside their traditional empirical-phenomenological studies. (Cf. the beginning of the present chapter.) But most importantly, my call accords with the spirit of the entire history and tradition of classical scholarship. I adduce a number of past and present scholarly authorities in support of this claim; to make it as convincing as possible, I quote them at some length.

What Rudolf Pfeiffer, both an influential classicist and one of the greatest historians of classical scholarship, wrote about the scholarly practice in Hellenistic Alexandria is fully applicable to all of today's scholarship in the humanities and social sciences. Pfeiffer defined textual scholarship in the following terms:

> Scholarship is the art of understanding, explaining, and restoring the literary tradition. It originated as a separate intellectual discipline in the third century before Christ through the efforts of poets to preserve and to use their literary heritage, the "classics". So scholarship actually arose as "classical" scholarship.[104]

At least in the Western hemisphere all scholarship was originally classical scholarship. In the preface to the book whose first chapter opens with the quotation just given, Pfeiffer had called the Alexandrians "our ancestors" as scholars. He concluded:

> it was in the course of time and the succession of peoples and generations that the full nature and the many forms of scholarship were revealed. The history of classical scholarship, therefore, is classical scholarship in the making... it is obvious that... we want to explore the continuity of knowledge, the *philologia perennis*.[105]

Keeping these observations in mind, classicists can broaden their understanding of the reach of classical philology to encompass new areas for their work, not least those which did not exist in antiquity but which the Alexandrians would have been unlikely to disdain. What Pfeiffer said about the Alexandrian origins of scholarship in the words to be quoted next applies equally to the Alexandrians' successors in the twenty-first century; we need only understand terms like "cultural" or "artistically created" alongside Pfeiffer's "literary" and "written," hardly a radical interference:

> Now for the first time we find wide literary knowledge being acquired for the sake of the literary tradition itself, that is, for the works to be written in the present age and for the preservation and understanding of the works written in past ages. This is the new separate discipline of scholarship.[106]

[104] Pfeiffer 1968: 3. [105] Pfeiffer 1968: x and vii. For more on this see Pfeiffer 1961.
[106] Pfeiffer 1968: 134.

There can be little doubt that the Alexandrian scholars were interested in each and any text, art work, or artifact in any available medium which had some connection to the classic works they prized. The roots of modern reception studies are to be found in Alexandria. Nor can we doubt that the Alexandrians did not hesitate to include any detail of the survival of the past in their scholarly endeavors.[107] Callimachus, the greatest of them, was famous for the far ranges of his interests and knowledge.[108] Hellenistic scholars did not limit themselves to working on literature; those at Pergamon, another great center of learning with its own major library, "were primarily interested in the visual arts."[109] The Alexandrians were interested in acquiring encyclopedic knowledge. The environment that made their endeavors possible has been characterized as

> "a place for the Muses", a centre for all the kinds of intellectual activity which require imaginative inspiration... The Alexandrian Museum was an academy... devoted to creative work (in both arts and sciences), to research, learning and scholarship and with some emphasis too on education.[110]

If the Alexandrians were in principle ready and willing to regard anything new that was not trivial as an object worthy of curiosity, study, and preservation, then a wide interest commensurate with theirs is rightly to be expected from their modern successors in the same discipline. This is especially true in an age such as ours, in which scholars in the humanities and social sciences have begun to expand the traditional boundaries of their fields of study and to consider related areas of enquiry as legitimate objects for their own research and teaching. So the idea of a *philologia perennis*, a continuing and by necessity ever-increasing kind of philology, inevitably comes closer and closer to being a kind of all-encompassing undertaking,

[107] Cf. the chapter on the Mouseion and the library of Alexandria in P. M. Fraser 1972, vol. 1: 305–335 and vol. 2: 462–494 (notes), especially vol. 1: 317–319 (on the range of scholarly activities in the Mouseion) and 455–456 (on the *Laterculi Alexandrini*, inventories which include lists of painters, sculptors, and architects). The Stoic philosopher Chrysippus, too, dealt with poetry and painting, as Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 7.200–201, reports in his listing of Chrysippus' works: *On Poems* (one book), *On the Right Way to Read Poetry* (two books), *Against Touching Up Paintings* (one book). None survives. On Alexandrian scholarship cf. further P. M. Fraser 1972, vol. 1: 447–479 and vol. 2: 647–692 (notes), Canfora 1989, a general introduction, and Blum 1991; the last includes detailed studies of Callimachus' and other Alexandrian scholars' lists of authors and artists. Cf. Hopkinson 1988: 83 on the variety of Callimachus' works resulting from his "omnivorous reading": his catalogues (*Pinakes*, in 120 volumes) on authors' biographies, the authenticity of their works, stylistic and other criticism, and studies of "topography, ethnography, natural history, language and etymology."

[108] See especially P. M. Fraser 1972, vol. 1: 717–793 and vol. 2: 1004–1102 (notes), a chapter entitled "The Horizon of Callimachus" (i.e. as poet, scholar, and human).

[109] Green 1990/1993: 169. On Pergamene scholarship cf. Esther V. Hansen 1971: 397–433.

[110] Bulloch 1985: 542.

a *philologia perennis et universalis*. It is in the nature of their discipline that classicists are virtually required to expand the horizons of their work. As Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, perhaps the most famous classicist of his day, wrote in 1921 as the conclusion to his overview of the field's history:

> What classical scholarship is, and what it should be, are clear from its history. Has this long [preceding] parade of its worthies taught us what a scholar should be? All those mentioned have been selected because they served the cause of learning, but they differed greatly in intellectual power and character, in interests and abilities. So the most modest definition will probably be the best. A scholar may do any number of things, and may do them in any number of ways; but there is one thing he must *be* if he is to achieve anything that will endure, and that is *vir bonus, discendi peritus*.[111]

Vir bonus, discendi peritus: "a good man, experienced in learning" – this definition of the scholar as someone with a sense of intellectual responsibility and the capacity for broadmindedness can hardly be improved on. Some time earlier, John Edwin Sandys, the eminent British historian of classical scholarship, had observed:

> The true scholar, though in no small measure he necessarily lives in the past, will make it his constant aim to perpetuate the past for the benefit of the present and the future . . . "Classical Scholarship" may be described as being . . . "the accurate study of the language, literature, and art of Greece and Rome, and of all that they teach us as to the nature and the history of man".[112]

Decades later American classicist Moses Hadas concurred:

> Classical philology in its broader sense . . . is not a subject but a complete curriculum.
>
> Nor can the student of antiquity blind himself to other knowledge. The political significance of Caesar, for example, was first appreciated by a scholar who had studied Napoleon, and of Demosthenes by one who had direct experience of the diplomatic problems of the 19th century. The student of ancient religion must today be grounded in the findings of modern psychology, and the student of literature in the new techniques of criticism. But for fruitful applications of new knowledge and techniques to ancient problems, a full knowledge of antiquity itself is essential.[113]

[111] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1982: 178. The Latin is a clever variation – *discendi* ("learning") for *dicendi* ("speaking publicly") – of Cato the Elder's famous definition of the Roman orator (Fragm. 370 Schönberger).

[112] Sandys 1920: 1–2.

[113] Hadas 1954: 120–121. Classics has always been an "interdisciplinary" area of intellectual enquiry; cf., e.g., Galinsky 1981a = 1981b. For examples of classicists' engagement with modern aspects of scholarship and theory cf. the various (and varied) essays collected in de Jong and Sullivan 1994, in

The same perspective applies today. The "other knowledge" that Hadas mentioned as being important for scholars, however, has expanded well beyond any limits he and earlier generations of classicists may have been able to envision. American classicist Charles Segal wrote in 1985:

> Literary study today is consequently less definitely literary than at any time in the past. It is extraordinarily hospitable to a wide range of extraliterary influences. Indeed, these are perhaps the most powerful determinants of current critical directions.[114]

That this applies specifically to classical – and classic – literature, perhaps more importantly so than to other kinds, had been shown a decade earlier when Frank Kermode observed in his study *The Classic*: "the books we call classics possess intrinsic qualities that endure, but possess also an openness to accommodation which keeps them alive under endlessly varying dispositions."[115]

Some contemporary classicists have restated these positions forcefully, if independently of the scholars quoted above. The words in my next quotation on continuity and change by two scholars writing jointly are worthy of our consideration:

> The aim of *Classics* [as academic discipline] is not only to *discover* or *uncover* the ancient world . . . Its aim is also to define and debate *our* relationship to that world . . . Over the centuries classical texts and commentaries have changed enormously, like every other aspect of *Classics* . . . Most striking of all is the range of what has been deemed to count as *Classics*, and how boundaries between *Classics* and other disciplines have been defined and redefined. Over the centuries questions brought to *Classics* and to classical texts have included (and still do) most of the core issues in subjects that we commonly think of as far removed from the study of Greece and Rome, but which arose directly out of work on the ancient world and its literature . . . *Classics* cannot ever be a subject safely locked away in a past, 2,000 years distant. For *Classics* continually finds richer texture in its works of art and literature – its meanings changed and renewed – from the multiplications of reactions and re-workings among its vast community of readers across the millennia . . . So much of Western culture turns on centuries of exploration of the legacy of the classical world that it lies *somewhere* at the roots of pretty well all we can say, see, or think.[116]

which especially Sullivan 1994; and Falkner, Felson, and Konstan 1999, in which especially Segal 1999 and Konstan 1999 on *Arethusa*, a classics journal founded as a kind of counter-traditional venue, which has now become mainstream. Sullivan 1994: 22–26 provides an introductory bibliography; cf. also the "General Bibliography" in de Jong and Sullivan 1994: 282–288. Since then, work on these and comparable lines of critical engagement has proliferated.

[114] Segal 1985: 360. [115] Kermode 1983: 44.

[116] Beard and Henderson 2000: 6–7, 61, 104, and 122. Cf. also the following two statements: "the interpretation of texts is inseparable from the history of their reception. It follows that the classical

German classicist Friedrich Nietzsche had anticipated much of this in 1874–1875. In *Wir Philologen*, a work characterized as "the most radical critique of classical scholarship ever made from within the profession," Nietzsche had called for a new approach to classical studies that should emphasize the undiminished importance of antiquity for later generations.[117] He observed, if in a somewhat contrarian spirit:

> Classical studies as knowledge of the ancient world can't, of course, last forever; their material is exhaustible. What can't be exhausted is the always-new adjustment every age makes to the classical world, measuring itself against it. If we set the classicist the task of understanding *his own* age better by means of antiquity, then his task has no end. – This is the antinomy of philology. *The ancient world* has in fact always been understood only *in terms of the present* – and will *the present* now be understood *in terms of the ancient world*? More accurately: men have explained the ancient world from their own experience; and from what, by so doing, they have acquired of the classical world, they have *appraised* and evaluated their own experience.[118]

We may juxtapose Nietzsche's words with Ernst Vogt's recent assessment of F. A. Wolf's fundamental work on Homer, the *Prolegomena in Homerum* of 1795. Vogt sees Wolf's chief merit in the fact that he was the first to conceive of a comprehensive kind of scholarship on the ancient world that unites *all* individual disciplines dealing with antiquity into one meaningful whole.[119]

The endless tasks of the classicist require constant adjustments of perspective – in cinematic terms, ranging from close-ups on individual details to extreme long-shots of vast fields of knowledge.[120] In this context programmatic, if brief, statements made in 1982, 1987, and 2001 by different

world cannot be coherently studied in isolation, if we are to try to articulate the history and status of our current goals and assumptions." Quoted from Martindale 1993: xiii. And: "If Classics is to find a purpose and role in the third millennium, it needs to ask questions about its purpose and role in past centuries. 'Classics' needs to understand the history of Classics as practiced and enjoyed both within and outside the confines of academic institutions and published scholarship." Quoted from the editors' "Preface" to Hall and Macintosh 1995: vii–xxii, at ix.

[117] My quotation is from the "Introduction" by classicist William Arrowsmith to his translation of *Wir Philologen* as *We Classicists* in Nietzsche 1990: 307–320, at 307; the text is at Nietzsche 1990: 321–387. Arrowsmith notes in his introduction (Nietzsche 1990: 307) that Nietzsche's "critique of philology is coherent, consistent, and radical" and that "it is topical" today.

[118] Nietzsche 1990: 339–340.

[119] "Wolfs Hauptverdienst liegt in der von ihm entwickelten Konzeption einer umfassenden, alle [!] auf die alte Welt bezüglichen Einzeldisziplinen zu einer Einheit zusammenschließenden Altertumswissenschaft." Quoted from Vogt 1997: 125.

[120] Cf. Thomas 1990: 69 and 72: "philology . . . is as broad as the questions that its texts generate . . . Philology takes what it wants from wherever it wants – from theory, from technology, from a number of other, evolving disciplines – and brings it to bear on the text."

editors of the *American Journal of Philology* are representative of and instructive about changes in classical philologists' responsibilities.[121] But regardless of any individual scholar's preferences or areas of expertise, it should be evident to all that classical scholarship engages in and depends on a back-and-forth interaction between past and present. The same is true for all studies of the arts and humanities. If Sandys could extol the value of Greece and Rome for "all that they teach us as to the nature and the history of man" across time and space, then modern classical philologists may safely turn to the cinema, for it is an artistic medium whose aims and effects, at least where its highest levels are concerned, are closely related to the nature and history of man. What Robert Bresson once observed about the artistic potential of the cinema echoes rather closely what Sandys had written about antiquity: "I believe in a Muse of Cinema . . . I firmly believe in the cinema as a serious art . . . as a means of taking a deeper look at things, a kind of aid to the deepening of man, a means for the discovery of man."[122]

A significant new area of classical philology then ought to be classical film philology, a *philologia classica et cinematographica*. Antiquity has played a major part in film history since the earliest days of the medium.[123] Through films about ancient Greece and Rome the classical world has stayed alive in the awareness of a larger percentage of the world's population than would otherwise have been possible. Therefore all classical philologists and historians who are concerned with the reception and survival of the ancient cultures in our rapidly changing age are called upon to take seriously the cinema and its digital-media offshoots, which preserve films and disseminate them more easily and more rapidly than ever before, and to make them a part of their professional work. The reception of the great classics of *their* antiquity was close to the Alexandrian scholars' hearts; the reception of antiquity in the entire history of civilization from their time to ours

[121] Cf. Clay 1982 and Luck 1987 (with reference to "an ever-broadening profession"). See especially Gold 2001: iii, describing her editorial aim as proceeding "by preserving [the journal's] venerable traditions and its strong roots in classical philology and by continuing to open up the journal to the exciting interdisciplinary and contemporary developments that now characterize some of the best work done in our field . . . I am interested in publishing work that stands at the intersections of various aspects of our discipline, that incorporates new and innovative approaches, and that opens up classical philology to different ways of thinking." In the spring of 2003 she restated this position in a four-page brochure mailed to prospective journal subscribers. A testimonial in this flyer by another scholar says that the journal "has evolved to embrace the more diverse approaches to the ancient world that are currently revitalizing the discipline" (4).

[122] Quoted, with some adaptations, from the subtitles to "Un metteur en ordre: Robert Bresson," a 1966 French television discussion with Bresson about his film *Au hazard Balthazar*.

[123] French film pioneer and *auteur* Georges Méliès was especially interested in classical subjects. (His two-minute-long *Cleopatra* of 1899 was recently rediscovered.) Cf. Solomon 2001: 3–4 on Méliès and on other early films on ancient themes.

should be – and now is becoming – a prominent area of modern classicists' interests.[124] This field is wide, even daunting in its ramifications.[125] The cinema is an integral and major part of it. Even the two classicists cited at the beginning of this chapter state about the cinema "that it may well represent the most powerfully effective medium of the reception of antiquity that has ever existed."[126]

There is also the other side: classical scholars' engagement with their own contemporary culture, their interpretations of modern artists' works and of current social, intellectual, political, and other trends. This includes classicists' interpretations of cinema, for instance in pointing out archetypal ancient themes in individual films or film genres whose plots are not set in antiquity or, beyond this, analyses of the body of work by a particular filmmaker. Examples of the former approach will appear in subsequent chapters of this book. An example of the latter is classicist William Arrowsmith's book on Michelangelo Antonioni. Arrowsmith's understanding of Antonioni as an *auteur* and exemplar of the cinema of poetry indicates how fruitfully classical training can be applied to cinema as a modern poetic art. Arrowsmith is quite forceful about the importance of his subject's work and about its place in film history and in the history of modern literature:

> Let me be clear about what I think: that Antonioni is one of the greatest living artists, and that, as a director of film, his only living peer is Kurosawa; and that he is unmistakably the peer of the other great masters in all the arts. As an innovator and manipulator of images, he is the peer of Joyce in the novel; in creating a genuine cinematic poetry, he stands on a level with Valéry and Eliot in poetry proper; and that his artistic vision, while perhaps no greater than that of Fitzgerald or Eliot or Montale or Pavese, is at least as great and compelling.[127]

[124] Proof is the existence of the International Society for the Classical Tradition, founded in 1991 and affiliated with the Institute for the Classical Tradition at Boston University, and of its journal, the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, which began publication in 1994. *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*, the modern successor to the nineteenth-century *Realenzyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Pauly-Wissowa), devotes five of its eighteen volumes to reception and the history of classical scholarship. For an overview see Cancik and Mohr 2002.

[125] For a first orientation see, e.g., the essays collected in Dummer and Kunze 1983.

[126] Korenjak and Töchterle 2002: 8 (in their "Vorwort"); my translation. The original reads: "dass es [das Kino] das vielleicht wirkungsmächtigste Rezeptionsmedium der Antike darstellt, das je existiert hat." Cf. Paul 2005: 688 (in a review of Winkler 2004b): "successfully – and fruitfully – the study of classics and cinema has asserted itself as a leader in the field of reception studies." It is appropriate that schools and universities should begin offering their students the opportunity to learn about antiquity and cinema in conjunction. King's College London offers a three-year full-time "Classical Studies with Film Studies BA" program; an outline is at http://www.kcl.ac.uk/ugp07/programme/131.

[127] Quoted from the editor's "Introduction" to Arrowsmith 1995: 3–19, at 4. Arrowsmith died in 1992. For a different approach to Antonioni on the part of a classical scholar and poet see Carson 2005: 43–57 ("FOAM [Essay with Rhapsody]: On the Sublime in Longinus and Antonioni"). Besides

These words may stand as an eloquent piece of evidence in support of my claim that classical scholars are justified to work on cinematic and literary authors. Decades earlier, however, Arrowsmith had already made a passionate case for the importance of cinema in education:

> In humanistic education the future lies with film. Of this I am firmly convinced . . . This conviction rests upon a faith that human society cannot do without the humanities, cannot forsake its faith in the project of making men more fully human, helping men to "become the thing they are." If real education – and not merely the transmission of knowledge – is to take place, a curriculum is required which corroborates and exemplifies moral discovery, the making of a fate, the hunger for identity. Literature and the arts have always been at the heart of the humanities because they provided just such corroboration; our most enduring use for art has been precisely in education – and it is an end worthy of art, this "expansion of love beyond ourselves," as Nietzsche called education.[128]

Frequently in the past, however, and occasionally in the present, as we have seen, classical scholars have disdained cinema, particularly films set in ancient Greece or Rome, pointing to their inaccuracies as the basis for value judgments. I have here attempted to show the narrowness of such a view. The cinema may not be one of the "media of salvation" for classical studies, as classicist George Hadzsits memorably called it almost nine decades ago in his plea to classical scholars not to ignore film.[129] But a critical interpretation of all aspects of popular adaptations of ancient literature illuminates these texts' influences on modern culture. This process is nothing new. It is already evident in the Homeric epics at the birth of Western literature. As George Steiner has put it, the *Iliad* as we have it is "the product of an editorial recension of genius, of a wonderfully formative act of combination, selection and editing of the voluminous oral material" that existed before it and that served as its source. This in turn set the pattern for the "perennial ubiquity of translations from Homer, of Homeric variants, re-creations, pastiches and travesties." Steiner appropriately refers to "the complexity of modulation" that is found in English-language adaptations of Homer.[130] Steiner refers only to literary texts, but we may also think

being a filmmaker, Antonioni was also a film critic, literary author, and painter. For his perspectives on cinema see especially Antonioni 1996 and Cardullo 2008.

[128] Arrowsmith 1969: 75 (opening paragraph). Carr 2006 is a recent example of such an approach from an educator's perspective. Cf. Cavell 2005c.

[129] Hadzsits 1920. I omit quoting and discussing this article and its implications here because I have already done so in Winkler 2001b: 3–9 and 2007a: 202–204 (section entitled "Classical Educators and the Cinema"). I refer readers to these *loci*.

[130] "Introduction" to George Steiner 1996: xv–xxxiv; my quotations are from xxviii, xvii, and xvi. – Genette 1997 has developed the concept of the *hypotext*, a literary work that shapes subsequent

of visual narratives told in the complex language of film. Classical scholar Eleonora Cavallini extends Steiner's view beyond textual narratives:

> The idea that antiquity conveys to us of Homeric epic is . . . that of an "open work," continually susceptible of re-readings, re-interpretations, transformations: a kind of work in progress, destined to perpetuate itself across the centuries until it has availed itself of new, sophisticated media made available by modern technological society.[131]

One ancient author provides us with the best justification for the kind of tradition described by Steiner and Cavallini and encountered in the present book. He can speak with particular authority because he was both a practicing poet and a literary theorist, highly influential in both aspects. Concerning those who disdain recent versions of works by revered and usually long-dead authors like Homer, he unequivocally states that those who judge nothing to be comparable to the old masters are in serious error. Their judgment is wrong because it is no more than a prejudice against anything modern. "I find it offensive," he says, "when something is criticized . . . merely because it is new." The ultimate problem with blind adherence to everything ancient and with quick condemnation of everything modern is that this attitude denies the great authors of the past one of their most important achievements – their creation of a never-ending tradition of influence. Or, in this author's words: "If the Greeks had hated anything new as much as we do now, what would now be old?" Our poet had previously observed about the ancient Greeks that their earliest works are the greatest of all, so the attitude with which he takes issue, had it prevailed, would have stopped any literary creativity since the time of Homer dead in its tracks.

But who is this author who is so outspoken in his attack on the diehard traditionalists, the precursors of some of today's critics and scholars? It is none other than Horace, whom we already encountered earlier on the subject of text and image. In an open letter addressed to Emperor Augustus Horace anticipated much of the seventeenth-century *Querelle des Anciens*

hypertexts by exerting strong influences on their authors. To Genette the most powerful hypotext of all is the *Odyssey*. The essays collected in Erhart and Nieberle 2003 take Homer and Stanley Kubrick's film *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968) for their starting points.

[131] Eleonora Cavallini, "Introduzione" to Cavallini 2007: 1–6; quotation at 5 (my translation). The original reads: "L'idea che l'antiquità ci trasmette dell'epica omerica è . . . quella di un' 'opera aperta,' continuamente suscettibile di riletture, reinterpretazioni, trasformazioni: una sorta di *work in progress*, destinato a perpetuarsi nei secoli fino ad avvalersi dei nuovi, sofisticati *media* messi a disposizione dalla moderna civiltà tecnologica."

et des Modernes.[132] Horace firmly came down on the side of the Moderns, among whom he numbered himself, but without being in the least disdainful of the Ancients or denying them their high standing. Virtually all his works, most famously his *Odes*, demonstrate how sensible Horace's position is in balancing the old and the new and in finding praiseworthy qualities in both. Horace's view on "the folly of archaism" applies not only to poetry but also to all creative endeavors in literature and the visual arts.[133]

I close this chapter with a quotation from a modern scholar who possessed a virtually Alexandrian breadth and depth of interests and who eloquently restates Horace's view. Looking back over the history of aesthetics from antiquity to the eighteenth century, a history that continues to our day, Paul Oskar Kristeller refers to the cinema. His judgment is applicable to classical film philology, and all scholars working in the humanities today can only profit from heeding it:

> There were important periods in cultural history when the novel, instrumental music, or canvas painting did not exist or have any importance . . . the moving picture is a good example of how new techniques may lead to modes of artistic expression for which the aestheticians of the eighteenth and nineteenth century had no place in their system. The branches of the arts all have their rise and decline, and even their birth and death, and the distinction between "major" arts and their subdivisions is arbitrary and subject to change . . . historical understanding might help to free us from certain conventional preconceptions and to clarify our ideas on the present status and future prospects of the arts and of aesthetics.[134]

[132] Horace, *Epistles* 2.1, especially lines 45–49, 63–65, 76–77 (quoted above), and 90–91 (quoted above); my translations. On these lines and their contexts see especially Brink 1982: 57–132.

[133] The quotation is from Brink 1982: 74. The preceding discussion is expanded from Winkler 2007c: 84–85.

[134] Kristeller 1951–1952: 45–46 (= Kristeller 1990: 227). This passage concludes his essay.

CINEMA AND CLASSICAL TEXTS

Apollo's New Light

MARTIN M. WINKLER

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521518604

First published 2009

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Winkler, Martin M.
Cinema and classical texts : Apollo's new light / Martin M. Winkler.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-521-51860-4 (hardback)
1. Motion pictures and literature. 2. Classical literature – History and criticism. I. Title.
PN1995.3.W56 2009
791.43'6 – dc22 2008037147

ISBN 978-0-521-51860-4 hardback

Contents