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PANDORA’S BOX/DIE BÜCHSE DER PANDORA
(133 minutes) 1929

Louise Brooks...Lulu
Fritz Kortner...Dr. Peter Schön
Francis Lederer...Alwa Schön
Carl Goetz...Schigolch
Krafft-Raschig...Rodrigo Quast
Alice Roberts...Countess Anna Geschwitz
Gustav Diessl...Jack the Ripper
Michael von Newlinsky...Marquis Casti-Piani

Directed by Georg Wilhelm Pabst
Written by Joseph Fleisler, Georg Wilhelm Pabst, Ladislaus Vajda,
based on Frank Wedekind’s plays Der Erdgeist and Die Büchse der Pandora
Produced by Seymour Nebenzal
Cinematography by Günther Krampf

GEORG WILHELM PABST (27 August 1885, Raudnitz, Austria — 29 May 1967, Vienna) directed 39 films. The first was Der Schatz 1923 (The Treasure), the last Durch die Wälder 1956 (Through the Forests and Through the Trees). Some of the others were Rosen für Bettina 1956 (Ballerina), Der Letzte Akt 1955 (Hitler: The Last Ten Days), La Conciencia acusa 1952, (Voice of Silence), Der Prozeß 1948 (The Trial), Paracelsus 1943, Jeunes filles en détresse 1939, Mademoiselle Docteur 1936, (Street of Shadows), White Hunter 1936, Don Quixote 1933, Kameradschaft 1931 (Comradeship), Die 3groschenoper 1931 (The Threepenny Opera), Die Weiße Hülle vom Piz Palü 1929 (White Hell of Pitz Palu), Das Tagebuch einer Verlorenen 1929 (Diary of a Lost Girl), Abwege 1928 (Crisis/Desire/The Devious Path), Die Liebe der Jeanne Ney 1927 (The Loves of Jeanne Ney/Lusts of the Flesh), Die Freudlose Gasse 1925 (Joyless Street/The Street of Sorrow).

LOUISE BROOKS (Mary Louise Brooks, 14 November 1906, Cherryvale, Kansas, USA—8 August 1985, Rochester, New York) is the subject of two documentary films, Looking for Lulu 1998, written by her biographer Barry Paris, and Lulu in Berlin 1984, a fascinating interview, mostly about her work with Pabst, by documentary filmmaker Richard Leacock. She seems to have enjoyed work on her early films made at the Famous Players-Lasky studio in Astoria, Queens, but she hated Hollywood and, after working with Pabst, pretty much let her career lapse rather than go back there. Her last film was a small part in Overland Stage Raiders 1938, which featured the still-unknown John Wayne (he would become a star the following year with Stagecoach). During the 30s she supported herself working as a clerk in a New York department store, turning occasional tricks, dancing, and taking a few small film roles. In her later years, she was supported by one of her former lovers. Some of the films on which her reputation rests are Prix de beauté 1930, Das Tagebuch einer Verlorenen, 1929, The Canary Murder Case 1929 (she was the canary and insisted that her costume have a removable tail so she could sit down between takes), Beggars of Life 1928, A Girl in Every Port 1928 and It’s the Old Army Game 1926. The most frequent complaint about her in Hollywood was that she read books on the set instead of exchanging gossip with the other actors. She wrote a biography—“Naked on My Goat”—but tossed the manuscript into
the incinerator because she didn’t like it.

FRITZ KORTNER (Fritz Nathan Kohn, 12 May 1892, Vienna, Austria—22 July 1970, Munich, Germany), one of Germany’s greatest actors, moved to London in the mid-30s after he became the subject of vicious attacks from the Nazis because he was Jewish. He then moved to Hollywood in 1941. He returned to Germany in 1949 to star in *The Last Illusion*. The film was a major success and he resumed his career there as actor, director, and writer. He appeared in about 50 films, the last as Shylock in a German made-for-tv film, *Der Kaufmann von Venedig* 1968; the first *Das andere Ich* 1918. Some of the others were: *Blaubart* 1951 (Bluebeard) 1951, *The Vicious Circle* 1948, *Berlin Express* 1948, *The Brasher Doubloon* 1947, *The Razor’s Edge* 1946, *The Hitler Gang* 1944, *The Strange Death of Adolf Hitler* 1943, *Abdul the Damned* 1935, *Der Mörder Dimitri Karamasoff* 1931 (The Brothers Karamazov/The Murderer Dimitri Karamazov), *Danton* 1931, *Dreyfus* 1930, *Sommambul* 1929 (*The Somnambulist*), *Orlacs Hände* 1924, *Die Brüder Karamasoff* 1918 (The Brothers Karamazov).


FRANK WEDEKIND (Benjamin Franklin Wedekind, 24 July 1864, Hannover, Hanover [now Germany]—9 March 1918, Munich, Germany). Dramatist, journalist and publicist. He worked on the staff of *Simplicissimus*. A forerunner of the expressionists, he employed grotesque fantasy and unconventional characters in order to attack the bourgeois ideals and hypocrisy of his society. Wedekind was particularly concerned with sexual themes, stressing the primacy of man’s instincts. His plays include *Frühlings Erwachen* (1891, *The Awakening of Spring*), *Der Erdgeist* (1895, *Earth Spirit*), and *Die Büchse der Pandora* (1903, *Pandora’s Box*). Alban Berg compiled the libretto for his opera *Lulu* (1934) from the latter two. (From Columbia Electronic Library)

PHILIP CARLI, pianist for tonight’s screening, began accompanying silent films at the age of 13, with a solo piano performance for Lon Chaney’s 1923 version of *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* at his junior high school in California. He has toured extensively as a film accompanist throughout North America and Europe, performing at such venues as Lincoln Center and the Museum of Modern Art in New York, the National Gallery in Washington, DC, the Cinémathèque Québécoise in Montreal, the National Film Theatre in London, and the Berlin International Film Festival. He is the staff accompanist for the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York, and performs annually at several film festivals in the United States as well as at Le Giornate del Cinema Muto in Italy. He has recorded piano accompaniments to over fifty films for video release by the Library of Congress, a number of film and video companies, and for broadcast on the American Movie Classics and the Turner Classic Movies cable channels.

The two best sources of information on Louise Brooks are Brooks’ *Lulu in Hollywood* (Knopf, NY 1982), seven essays about her film world experiences and opinions that originally appeared in *Sight and Sound* and other film journals, and Barry Paris’s *Louise Brooks; A Biography* (Knopf, NY 1989). Kevin Brownlow has a brief but informative interview with her in *The Parade’s Gone By...* (U. California Press, Berkeley and LA, 1968). There’s probably more about Brooks on the web than any other silent star. The best is the one maintained by the Louise Brooks Society, www.pandorasbox.com. The site is full of great material about Brooks and her films; it’s got a good filmography and bibliography, scores of photos and production stills, all the right links and more.

New Yorker editor William Shawn in his introduction to *Lulu in Hollywood*: “Louise Brooks is not only an actress who writes; she is a writer who acts. Long ago, she also danced. People who saw her dance say that she was a captivating dancer, and I am confident she was. Whatever she does, she is, indivisibly, an artist. In order to understand Louise Brooks, however, one first has to disentangle her from her most famous role: that of Lulu in G.W. Pabst’s 1929 silent film *Pandora’s Box*. There have been a host of Lulus, of course, since the German playwright Frank Wedekind created the character in his plays *Earth Spirit* and *Pandora’s Box*. A number of actresses have played the role on the stage. Since Alban Berg created his vocal, atonal Lulu in the opera of that...
name, a number of singers have sung the role. Yet it was Louise Brooks, in silence and out of her own person, who created the fundamental, the only Lulu. As the years have passed, the image of Louise Brooks as Lulu has persisted on the screen, and has haunted, and informed, all other performances.”

LB from *Lulu in Hollywood*: In May, when the studio wanted me in order to start production of *Beggars in Life*, under the direction of William Wellman, it had to track me from Hollywood to New York and on to Miami, then to Havana, to Palm Beach, and finally, to Washington, where I was visiting George Marshall, the owner of the professional football team the Redskins. While waiting for the capture of a seemingly reluctant actress he had never met, Billy Wellman came to the unfortunate conclusion that since I did not follow the pattern of the actors who haunted the studio panting after film roles, I did not care about films at all. Because he didn’t know that sycophancy had no merit in the New York studio where I had begun my career, and because I was unaware that prudent Hollywood actors wooed producers, directors, and writers with flattering attention, a coldness was set up between us which neither of us could dispel. Nor did hard work on my part and a willingness to do dangerous stunts under his direction alter Billy’s conclusion. In 1932, at the bar of Tony’s Restaurant in New York, he asked, ‘Why did you always hate making pictures, Louise?’ Those were the last words I ever heard him speak. Before that, this intricate man had offered me a part in *The Public Enemy*, then passed it on to Jean Harlow when I turned it down in order to make a trip to New York. Bewitched by his own success in Hollywood, he could not imagine my hating the place.” As a loner, I count as my two most precious rights those that allow me to choose the periods of my aloneness and allow me to choose the people with whom I will spend the periods of my not-aloneness. To a film star, on the hand, to be let alone for an instant is terrifying. It is the first signpost on the road to oblivion. Obviously, an actor cannot choose the people whom he will work, or when or how he will work with them. He goes to work at a time specified by the studio. He spends his working day under the control not only of his director but also of the scriptwriters, the cameraman, the wardrobe department, and the publicity office. Since publicity is the lifeblood of stardom, without which a star will die, it is equally obvious that he must keep it flowing through his private life, which feeds the envy and curiosity that bring many people into theaters.

For all actors know that truly natural acting is rejected by the audience. Although people are better equipped to judge acting than any other art, the hypocrisy of “sincerity” prevents them from admitting that they, too, are always acting some role of their own invention. To be a successful actor, then, it is necessary to add eccentricities and mystery to naturalness, so that the audience can admire and puzzle over something different from itself.

The tragedy of film history is that it is fabricated, falsified, by the very people who make film history. It is understandable that in the early years of film production, when nobody believed there was going to be any film history, most film magazines and books printed trash, aimed only at fulfilling the public’s wish to share a fairy-tale existence with its movie idols. But since about 1950 film has ben established as an art, and its history recognized as a serious matter. Yet film celebrities continue to cast themselves as stock types—nice or naughty girls, good or bad boys—whom their chroniclers spray with a shower of anecdotes.

Frank Wedekind’s play *Pandora’s Box* opens with a prologue. Out of a circus tent steps the Animal Tamer, carrying in his left hand a whip and in his right hand a loaded revolver. “Walk in,” he says to the audience, “Walk into my menagerie!” The finest job of casting that G.W. Pabst ever did was casting himself as the director, the Animal Tamer of his film adaption of Wedekind’s “tragedy of monsters.” Never a sentimental trick did this whip hand permit the actors assembled to play his beasts. The revolver he shot straight into the heart of the audience. At the time Wedekind produced *Pandora’s Box*, in Berlin around the turn of the century, it was
detested, condemned, and banned. It was declared to be “immoral and inartistic.” If in that period when the sacred pleasures of the ruling class were comparatively private, a play exposing them had called out the dogs of law, how much more savage would be the attack upon a film faithful to Wedekind’s text which was made in 1928 in Berlin, where the ruling class publicly flaunted its pleasures as a symbol of wealth and power.

And since nobody truly knows what a director is doing till he is done, nobody who was connected with the film dreamed that Pabst was risking commercial failure with the story of an “immoral” prostitute who wasn’t crazy about her work and was surround by the “inartistic” ugliness of raw bestiality. Only five years earlier the famous Danish actress Asta Nielsen had condensed Wedekind’s play into the film Loulou. There was no lesbianism in it, no incest. Loulou, the man-eater devoured her sex victims—Dr. Goll, Schwarz, and Schön—and then dropped dead in an acute attack of indigestion.

This kind of film, with Pabst improvements, was what audiences were prepared for. Set upon making their disillusionment inescapable, hoping to avoid even any duplication of the straight bob and bangs that Nielsen had worn as Loulou, Mr. Pabst tested me with my hair curled. But after seeing the test he gave up this point and left me with my shiny black helmet, except for one curled sequence on the gambling ship. How Pabst determined that I was his unaffected Lulu, with the childish simpleness of vice, was part of a mysterious alliance that seemed to exist between us even before we met. He knew nothing more of me than an unimportant friendship, but even that friendship was the Pabst spirit on the set! He actually encouraged actors’ disposition to hate and back away from each other, and thus preserved their energy for the camera; and when the actors were not in use, his ego did not command them to sit up and bark at the sight of him. The behavior of Fritz Kortner was a perfect example of how Pabst used an actor’s true feelings to add depth and breadth and power to his performance. Kortner hated me. After each scene with me, he would pound off the set and go to his dressing room. Pabst himself, wearing his most private smile, would go there to coax him back for the next scene. In the role of Dr. Schön, Kortner had feelings for me (or for the character Lulu) that combined sexual passion with an equally passionate desire to destroy me. One sequence gave him an opportunity to shake me with such violence that he left ten black-and-blue fingerprints on my arms. Both he and Pabst were well pleased with that scene, because Pabst’s feelings for me, like Kortner’s were not unlike those of Schön for seeing him start with distaste and disbelief, and unwilling to be mistaken for one of those women who like to shock priests with sensational confessions, I went on to prove the truth of Lulu’s world by telling him of my own experience in the 1925 Ziegfeld Follies, when my best friend was a lesbian and I knew two millionaire publishers who, much like Schön in the film, backed shows to keep themselves well supplied with Lulus. But the priest rejected my reality exactly as Berlin had rejected its reality when we made Pandora’s Box and sex was the business of the town. At the Eden Hotel, where I lived in Berlin, the café bar was lined with the higher-priced trollops. The economy girls walked the street outside. On the corner stood the girls in boots, advertising flagellation. Actors’ agents pimped for the ladies in luxury apartments in the Bavarian Quarter. Race-track touts at the Hippegarten arranged orgies for groups of sportsmen. The nightclub Eldorado displayed an enticing line of homosexuals dressed as women. At the Maly, there was a choice of feminine or collar-and-tie lesbians. Collective lust roared unashamed at the theatre. In the revue Chocolate Kiddies, when Josephine Baker appeared naked except for a girdle of bananas, it was precisely as Lulu’s stage entrance was described by Wedekind: “They rage there as in a menagerie when the meat appears at the cage.”

Every actor has a natural animosity toward every other actor, present or absent, living or dead. Most Hollywood directors did not understand that, any more than they understood why an actor might be tempted to withhold the rapt devotion to the master which they considered essential to their position of command. When I went to Berlin to film Pandora’s Box, what an exquisite release, what a revelation of the art of direction, was the Pabst spirit on the set! He actually encouraged actors’ disposition to hate and back away from each other, and thus preserved their energy for the camera; and when the actors were not in use, his ego did not command them to sit up and bark at the sight of him. The behavior of Fritz Kortner was a perfect example of how Pabst used an actor’s true feelings to add depth and breadth and power to his performance. Kortner hated me. After each scene with me, he would pound off the set and go to his dressing room. Pabst himself, wearing his most private smile, would go there to coax him back for the next scene. In the role of Dr. Schön, Kortner had feelings for me (or for the character Lulu) that combined sexual passion with an equally passionate desire to destroy me. One sequence gave him an opportunity to shake me with such violence that he left ten black-and-blue fingerprints on my arms. Both he and Pabst were well pleased with that scene, because Pabst’s feelings for me, like Kortner’s were not unlike those of Schön for
Lulu. I think that in the two films Pabst made with me—Pandora’s Box and Diary of a Lost Girl—he was conducting an investigation into his relations with women, with the object of conquering any passion that interfered with his passion for his work. He was not aroused by sexual love, which he dismissed as an enervating myth. It was sexual hate that engrossed his whole being with its flaming reality.

Unlike most directors, Pabst had no catalogue of characters, with stock emotional responses. D.W. Griffith required giggling fits from all sexually excited virgins. If Pabst had ever shot a scene showing a virgin giggling, it would have been because someone was tickling her. It was the stimulus that concerned him. If he got that right, the actor’s emotional reaction would be like life itself—often strange and unsatisfactory to an audience that was used to settled acting conventions.

In an effort to be funny, old actors and directors have spread the false belief that any clownish thing coming to mind could be said in front of the camera in silent films. They forget that the title writer had to match his work to the actors’ speech. I remember late one night wandering into the Beverly Wilshire suite of Ralph Spence, a title-writer, where he sat gloomily amidst cans of film, cartons of stale Chinese food, and empty whiskey bottles. He was trying to fix up an unfunny Beery and Hatton comedy, and no comic line he invented would fit the lip action. Silent-film fans were excellent lip-readers and often complained at the box office about the cowboy cussing furiously as he tried to mount his horse.

...a truly great director such as G.W. Pabst holds the camera on the actors’ eyes in every vital scene. He said, “The audience must see it in the actors’ eyes.” In his 1926 film, Secrets of a Soul, he sent the actor playing a psychiatrist to take a course in psychoanalysis so he could see it in his eyes. Pabst’s genius lay in getting to the heart of a person, banishing fear, and releasing the clean impact of personality which jolts an audience to life. With gross overconfidence in my rights and power, I at first defied Pabst with arrogance. Pabst chose all my costumes with care, but in scenes motivated by sexual hate he chose them as much for their tactile as for their visual seductiveness. He wanted the actors working with me to feel my flesh under a dancing costume, a blouse and skirt, a nightgown. The morning of the sequence in which I was to go from my bath into a love scene with Franz Lederer, I came on the set wrapped in a gorgeous negligee of painted yellow silk. Carrying the peignoir I refused to wear, Josifine approached Mr. Pabst to receive the lash. Hers was the responsibility for seeing that I obeyed his orders, and he answered her excuses with a stern rebuke. Then he turned it to me.

“Louess, you must wear the peignoir, and be naked under it.” “Why? I hate that bathrobe,” I said. “Who will know that I am naked under that big, woolly white bathrobe?” “Lederer,” he said. Stunned by such a reasonable argument, I retired, without another word, to the bathroom set with Josifine and changed into the peignoir.

Mr. Pabst’s perfect costume sense symbolized Lulu’s character and her destruction. There is not a single spot of blood on the pure-white bridal satin in which she kills her husband. Making love to her wearing the clean white peignoir, Alva asks, “Do you love me, Lulu?” “I? Never a soul!” It is in the worn and filthy garments of streetwalker that she feels passion for the first time—comes to life so that she may die. When she picks up Jack the Ripper on the foggy London street and he tells her he had no money to pay her, she says, “Never mind. I like you.” It is Christmas Eve, and she is about to receive the gift that had been her dream since childhood. Death by a sexual maniac.

In Hollywood, I was a pretty flibbertigibbet whose charm for the executive department decreased with every increase in her fan mail. In Berlin, I stepped onto the station platform to meet Pabst and became an actress. ...To other people surrounding him, he would talk endlessly in that watchful way of his, smiling, intense; speaking quietly, with his wonderful, hissing precision. But to me he might speak never a word all morning, and then at lunch turn suddenly and say, “Louess, tomorrow morning you must be ready to do a big fight scene with Kortner,” or “This afternoon, in the first scene, you are going to cry.” That was how he directed me. With an intelligent actor, he would sit in exhaustive explanation; with an old ham, he would speak the language of the theatre. But in my case, by some magic, he would saturate me with one clear emotion and turn me loose. And it was the same with the plot. Pabst never strained my mind with anything not pertinent to the immediate action.

from LB’s interview in Kevin Brownlow, The Parade’s Gone By...
You know what makes an actor great to work with?
Timing. You don’t have to feel anything. It’s like dancing with a perfect dancing partner. Osgood Perkins would give you a line so that you would react perfectly. It was timing—because emotion means nothing.

Look at Adolphe Menjou. He never felt anything. He used to say, “Now I do Lubitsch number one,” “Now I do Lubitsch number two.” And that’s exactly what he did. You felt nothing, working with him, and yet to see him on the screen—he was a great actor.

A director works fast who knows everything ahead of time. He sees the picture finished, whole, cut, titled. Pabst would take one shot, and—that was it. I remember I was going to do my famous Follies-girl walk across the stage in the theater scene of Pandora’s Box. I’d planned it all out. I took four steps on stage and Pabst said “Cut.” That was the end of it. I had give him all he wanted.

When I worked in night clubs, and in the theater, I knew all the real gangsters. Men like Capone. They were the most disgusting, idiotic boors. But, oddly enough, they had one great talent. During Prohibition, they owned a lot of nightclubs and they would hire people for these clubs that nobody else would have. A girl like Helen Morgan, for instance; nobody wanted her. She had a delicate little voice, she had very long legs, she had a large bosom, which wasn’t fashionable then; she wasn’t very animated, and she sat on the piano and wouldn’t use a microphone. The gangsters loved her. They put her in a nightclub called The Backstage, and all of a sudden Zigfield “discovered” her.

Wallace Beery used to scheme all day to figure out ways to get my back to camera in two-shots. Billy Wellman said to me, “Don’t let him do that to you.” I said, “I don’t give a damn what he does. You’re the director. If you don’t want him to back me up, you tell him.” The result was that he’d have to take close-ups of me to get my face in the pictures. So I’d be in a close-up while Wally would be in a two-shot! Looking through an old dictionary with the flyleaves pasted with quotes form Goethe, I came upon this one: “The novel [film] is a subjective epic composition in which the author begs leave to treat the world according to his point of view. It is only a question, therefore, whether he has a point of view. The rest will take care of itself.”

In a 1972 letter to her brother Theo: “How I have existed fills me with horror. For I failed in everything—spelling, arithmetic, riding, swimming, tennis, golf, dancing, singing acting; wife, mistress, whore, friend. Even cooking. And I do not excuse myself with the usual escape of ‘not trying.’ I tried with all my heart.”

Louise to Leacock in 1974: “You are the first person to make me really laugh—which I really adore—since I banned Jimmie Card in 1963.”

LB: I have a gift for enraging people.

Howard Hawkes: I wanted a new type. I hired Louise Brooks because she’s so very sure of herself, she’s very analytical, she’s very feminine—but she’s damn good and sure she’s going to do what she wants to do. I could use her today [1967]. She was way ahead of her time. And she’s a rebel. I like her, you know. I like rebels. I like people you can look at and remember who they are.

LB: I never try to feel sexy. . . .The people who try hardest to be sexy only fool other fools.

Marlene Dietrich: Imagine Pabst choosing Louise Brooks for Lulu when he could have had me!

Henri Langlois: There is no Garbo! There is no Dietrich! There is only Louise Brooks!

LB: I just didn’t fit into the Hollywood scheme at all. I was neither a fluffy heroine, nor a wicked vamp, nor a woman of the world. I just didn’t fit into any category. I just didn’t interest them because I couldn’t be typed.

LB: In writing the history of a life, I believe absolutely that the reader cannot understand the character and deeds of the subject unless he is given an understanding of that person’s sexual loves and hates and conflicts. It is the only way the reader can make sense out of innumerable apparently senseless actions. . . . I too am unwilling to write the sexual truth that would make my life worth reading. I cannot unbuckle the Bible Belt. That is why I will never write my memoirs.

LB: If I ever bore you it’ll be with a knife.


Britain’s most important contributor to filmmaking was unquestionably James Williamson, who stumbled on two of the most basic essentials of creative cinema: editing and the close-up. Williamson’s twin discoveries happened in 1901 in the film he called A Big
Swallow. In it he has a reluctant still-camera subject approaching nearer and nearer to the camera until he appears to swallow the camera and photographer, munching both as he retreats from the scene.

Williamson’s trick was outstandingly popular but regarded by competing cameramen of the time as being too difficult technically for the imitation, which was the usual procedure that resulted in the appearance of a successful picture. Without the follow-focus devices of modern cameras, it was necessary to construct a bellows extension to achieve his famous close-up that becomes ever larger until the whole screen is filled only with the subject’s mouth.

A Big Swallow consists of only three shots: the approaching, protesting man; the photographer and his portrait camera as both are seen toppling into blackness; and third, the swallower backing off. According to Williamson, who responded to requests for an account of how he managed to achieve the effect, the middle scene was made some time after the shots of the advancing and retreating subject. The second scene, which had been shot last, was only put in its place when the negatives were prepared for making positive prints. Thus Williamson, by 1901, had discovered the principle of film editing, had created filmic time and had brought to the medium its earliest full-frame close-ups.

A decade later, David Wark Griffith believed that he had invented the close-up. And film editing and the moving camera and even restrained acting. Griffith staked out his claim to the “invention” of all these basic elements of cinematic art by taking out an ad in the New York Dramatic Mirror of December 3, 1913. And such is the power of the printed word, and so rarely have pre-1913, non-Griffith films figured in preserved study collections, that too many historians have believed Griffith’s preposterous claim.

In considering the effectiveness of the silent film both in the past and in present-day reexamination, one can think of some great films deficient or even totally lacking in good cutting, in photographic quality, in lighting, in story construction; in short, lacking nearly every device known to cinema, save only one: the close-up.

Multiple exposures, dissolves, wipes, fades, crosscutting—all of these might never have come to the film, and without them but with the close-up alone, it is possible to think of the movies reaching the astonishing degree of emotional impact they did. For if the technological achievements of photography and the intermittent movements of cameras and projectors were able to give the illusion of life to the screen, it was the close-up that gave the medium its soul. A mysterious soul exemplified by the shimmering images of a Greta Garbo, Clara Bow, Asta Nielsen or Louise Brooks.

I will even go so far as to say that there has never been a great film without close-ups. In fact, a great film was never made until close-ups came into general use. All that the silent film contributed, apart from what it borrowed from the theatre (settings, movement and arrangement of the players), from the graphic arts (composition, spatial concepts, lighting) and from music (rhythmic cutting), is embodied in the close-up.

In the close-up the motion picture is in its own world. Only in the close-up can the cinema practice the utter concentration, employ the power of emphasis, the artistry of selection and the magic of revelation, strengths that are all unique to the medium.

It is in the close-up that the film player enters a realm of acting undreamed of in the whole tradition of theatre. The pitiless demands of the enormously magnified image shattered the hopes of many of the theatre’s best people when they turned to film. In a large measure it was the overpowering intimacy of the close-up that turned film watchers into something approaching drug addicts as they flower, ninety million of them every week, to the movies of North America during the greatest years of the silent drama.

Not that all other factors of filmic construction were unimportant, but they had less to do with the effectiveness of the silent film than did the close-up. Cutting, continuity and lighting all modified the motion picture but the close-up characterized it.

Carl Dreyer, the famous Danish director, was fully aware of this unique power. He wrote: “Nothing in the world can be compared to the human face. It is a land one can never tire of exploring. There is no greater experience in a studio than to witness the expression of a sensitive face under the mysterious power of inspiration. To see it animated from inside and turning into poetry.”

The Myth According to Hesiod (from Wikipedia)

The titan Epimetheus ("hindsight") was responsible for giving a positive trait to each and every animal. However, when it was time to give man a positive trait, as Prometheus, his brother, had taken much longer to create man, there was nothing left. Prometheus ("foresight"), his brother, felt that because man was superior to all other animals, man should have a gift no other animal possessed. So Prometheus set forth to steal fire from Zeus and handed it over to man.

Zeus, enraged, decided to punish Prometheus. To punish Prometheus, Zeus chained him in unbreakable fetters and set an eagle over him to eat his liver each day, as the eagle is Zeus’s sacred animal. Prometheus was an immortal, so the liver grew back every day, but he was still tormented daily from the pain, until he was freed by Heracles during The Twelve Labours. Another possible reason for Prometheus’ torment was because he knew which of Zeus'
lovers would bear a child who would eventually overthrow Zeus. Zeus commanded that Prometheus reveal the name of the mother, but Prometheus refused, instead choosing to suffer the punishment.

However, Zeus also had to punish mankind. The punishment was woman. More specifically, Pandora, her name meaning ‘all gifts’. Pandora was given several traits from the different gods: Hephaestus molded her out of clay and gave her form; Athena clothed her and the Charites adorned her with necklaces made by Hephaestus; Aphrodite gave her beauty; Apollo gave her musical talent and a gift for healing; Demeter taught her to tend a garden; Poseidon gave her a pearl necklace and the ability to never drown; Hera gave her curiosity; Hermes gave her cunning, boldness, and charm. Zeus gave her insatiable curiosity and mischievousness. Thus the name Pandora—"all gifts"—in Hesiod’s version derives from the fact that she received gifts from all deities.

The most significant of these gifts, however, was a pithos or storage jar, given to Pandora either by Hermes or Zeus. Before he was chained to the rock, Prometheus had warned Epimetheus not to take any gifts from the gods. However, when Pandora arrived, he fell in love with her. Hermes told Epimetheus that Pandora was a gift to the titan from Zeus, and he warned Epimetheus not to open the jar, which was Pandora’s dowry.

Until then, mankind lived life in a paradise without worry. Epimetheus told Pandora never to open the jar she had received from Zeus. However, Pandora’s curiosity got the better of her and she opened it, releasing all the misfortunes of mankind: "For ere this the tribes of men lived on earth remote and free from ills [kakoi] and hard toil [ponoi] and heavy sickness [nosoi argaleai] which bring the Keres [baleful spirits] upon men; for in misery men grow old quickly” (Hesiod, Works and Days).

Once opened, she shut it in time to keep one thing in the jar: hope. The world remained extremely bleak for an unspecified interval, until Pandora “chanced” to revisit the box again, at which point Hope fluttered out. Thus, mankind always has hope in times of evil.

In another, more philosophical version of the myth, hope (Elpis) is considered the worst of the potential evils, because it is equated with terrifying foreknowledge. By preventing hope from escaping the jar, Pandora in a sense saves the world from the worst damage.

COMING UP IN THE SPRING 2007 BUFFALO FILM SEMINARS (REDUX) XIV:

Feb 13 Jean Renoir, Rules of the Game/ La Règle du jeu 1939
Feb 20 Vittorio De Sica, Bicycle Thieves/ Ladri di biciclette 1947
Feb 27 Yasujiro Ozu, Tokyo Story/ Tokyo monogatari 1953
March 6 Orson Welles, Touch of Evil 1958
March 20 David Lean, Lawrence of Arabia 1962
March 27 Jean-Luc Godard, Contempt/ Le Mépris 1963
April 3 Stanley Kubrick, Dr. Strangelove 1964
April 10 Sergio Leone, The Good the Bad and the Ugly/ Il Buono, il brutto, il cattivo 1966
April 17 Robert Altman, Nashville 1975
April 24 Stanley Donen and Gene Kelly, Singin’ in the Rain 1952

Study for Pandora by Dante Gabriel Rosetti 1869

Contacts:
...email Diane Christian: engdc@buffalo.edu
...email Bruce Jackson bjiang@buffalo.edu
...for the series schedule, annotations, links and updates: http://buffalofilmseminars.com
...for the weekly email informational notes, send an email to either of us
...for cast and crew info on any film: http://imdb.com/search.html

The Buffalo Film Seminars are presented by the Market Arcade Film & Arts Center and State University of New York at Buffalo with support from the John R. Oishei Foundation