

Dreyer and the National Film in Denmark

Casper Tybjerg

In January 1920, the young Carl Theodor Dreyer published an essay entitled 'Swedish Film', occasioned by the Danish premiere of Victor Sjöström's *Klostret i Sendomir* (The Monastery of Sendomir, 1920). In this essay, Dreyer contrasted the Swedish cinema with the Danish and American ones. He lambasted the Danes for mass-producing shallow, tawdry and formulaic films. The Americans are praised for their technical proficiency, but they are said to lack 'soul'. Dreyer reserves his complete approbation for the Swedes, particularly Sjöström: 'Through Sjöström's work, film was let into the promised land of art, nor was he disappointed in his conviction that sound literature should prevail over the penny dreadful, good dramatic acting over the puppet show, *atmosphere* over technique'.¹

The following is an investigation of how the Swedish example was felt in Denmark in a rather different way than in the other Nordic countries; I shall give particular emphasis to Dreyer's relatively little-known film *Der var engang* – (Once Upon a Time, 1922) and try to suggest some reasons why this film, which was held up as being distinctively Danish in the same way Sjöström's films were said to be distinctively Swedish, remained a relatively isolated instance in the history of the Danish silent cinema.

The Swedish 'Golden Age' and its impact

Dreyer's view of the Swedish cinema as artistically outstanding was shared by Swedish commentators, who gloried in the world-class quality of their films. Bo Florin, in his study of the Swedish 'Golden Age' (the period from *Terje Vigen* (1917) to *Gösta Berlings saga* (The Tale of Gösta Berling, 1924)), quotes a number of contemporary writers who took extravagant pride in the accomplishments of their film-making compatriots: 'The cinematic breakthrough

necessary for world film art, longed for by clear-sighted observers, has been made in Sweden!' wrote one.²

Both contemporaries and later film historians have often claimed that the virtues of these films sprang from something peculiarly national. Florin quotes the critic August Brunius (brother of one of the leading film directors of the 1920s, John W. Brunius), who wrote in 1919:

Ingmarssönerna has brought to attention what one might call 'the national film'. It is not yet an established genre like the ordinary film melodramas and film comedies, but in time it may come to play a certain role in the marketplace and offer a temporary delivery for the outworn and tired nerves of the cinema-going public. Until it in turn is discarded as outmoded and superfluous.³

This pessimistic conclusion to some extent proved prophetic, but it is also quite misleading, insofar as the era of *Ingmarssönerna* (The Sons of Ingmar, 1919) and other 'national films' was soon (by 1926, according to Florin)⁴ labeled 'the Golden Age of the Swedish cinema', and it was the films of the later period that were regarded as superfluous and disposable even by many contemporaries.

The term 'national film' – in Sweden as well as Denmark – thus referred not just to a picture made in a particular country, but one which bore a distinctive imprint of the nation's character. This was usually understood to mean that such films should be adaptations of established literary classics and shot on

Casper Tybjerg is an Associate Professor at the University of Copenhagen. Correspondence to: Department of Film and Media Studies, University of Copenhagen, 80 Njalsgade, 2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark. [Email address: casper@hum.ku.dk]

locations in characteristic landscapes; explicitly patriotic themes or a visual style inspired by famous genre paintings were optional extras.

Many commentators held that such films would be intrinsically more valuable as works of film art. They accordingly asserted that the outstanding artistic quality of Swedish films (on which everyone agreed) was due to their Swedishness, their Swedish peculiarity. The way forward for other nations was clear, and in July 1918 the Danish author and screenwriter Aage Barfoed described it as follows in the theatre and film magazine *Masken*:

Sweden has accomplished the feat of creating a distinctive film genre.

Now it is our turn, if we want to make our mark in the world market.

And what is to be done?

One thing! We must imprint our films, like all art, with Danish distinctiveness... . Our literature, our painting, our music has a rich, a deep and genuine cultural tone.

Seize that and make it come alive on the screen!

...

Krøyer's effects of light over sea and beach, admired the world over, Hammershøi's quiet rooms, Marstrand's lush vigour – could all that not be translated into images that would impress through their distinctively Danish character?

What an atmospheric masterpiece could not be made from *Hjortens Flugt*, with the living nature-poetry of Zealand coursing through it! And Blicher's stories of the heath! What Danish marvellousness do we not possess in the heath, the North Sea, the slopes of Jutland and the forest of Rold!⁵

Some of the names may be unfamiliar,⁶ but the choice is not exactly adventurous. All the artists named were established and admired figures, if in some cases rather old-fashioned (even in 1918).

Barfoed, somewhat surprisingly, goes on to insist on the importance of individual artistic vision. It is unclear, however, whether he is speaking of the director or the writer:

If only a film producer would understand that in film, as in any art, what matters is the personal voice! It is not a question of the distinctiveness of the plot, but in the way it is told.

There are healthy signs showing that the right men in our country are beginning to arrive at the proper comprehension, but the full step must be taken.

Trust the intuition of the artist.

Let the Danish film industry surrender itself to Danish art and culture!

It is the only thing that will allow us to triumph in the world market.⁷

The last idea, that both commercial and artistic success will follow from embracing national distinctiveness, was shared by another contributor to *Masken*, Gustav Bauditz. He urged the adaptation of nineteenth-century historical novels, adding: 'And finally we must recall that when it is the case that theatre, and all art for that matter, is stamped with nationality, it is only a plus abroad.'⁸ An anonymous contributor to the film trade paper *Filmen* (presumably the editor, Jens Locher) made the same point in an article entitled 'The Danish Film':

Danish literature must be taken into the film's service ... we must dig the true *Danish gold* out of lakes and forests, art and people; only then do we achieve what all art depends on – stamping the coin with our own image.⁹

What is quite striking, however, was how little heed Danish film production companies paid to such exhortations, especially when compared with the very different reactions in the other Nordic countries. A substantial majority of the feature films made in Norway and Finland during the 1920s can be said to be 'national films', but in Denmark there is only a handful.

As Bo Florin points out, the characterisations of the Swedish 'golden age' films offered not only by later film historians, but also by contemporary commentators, have been surprisingly similar – 'one is tempted to say stereotyped':¹⁰ the depiction of nature, the adaptation of renowned Nordic literary works, and the central importance of Sjöström and Stiller. One should note that some of the most prominent Swedish films were based on works from the other Nordic countries. Of Sjöström's major films, *Terje Vigen* was made from a poem by Norwegian Henrik Ibsen, and *Berg-Ejvind och hans hustru* (The Outlaw and His Wife, 1918) from a play by Jóhann Sigurjónsson, an Icelander; and the most successful of all the Swedish films, the masterful *Sången om*

den eldröda blomman (The Song of the Scarlet Flower, 1919), was directed by Mauritz Stiller from a Finnish novel by Johannes Linnankoski.

Whether the background was Swedish, Norwegian or Finnish, the overwhelmingly rural character of many of these films was a source of annoyance to some Swedish film critics at a very early date: even in 1920, there were those who expressed impatience with what they snidely called *bondfilmer* – ‘peasant films’. In fact, both Sjöström and Stiller released films that year which were clearly international in orientation: *Klostret i Sendomir* and *Erotikon*. To some historians, this partial turn away from the national marks the beginning of the decline of Swedish cinema, whereas others have seen it as a necessity, prompted by the exhaustion of the peasant film:

Wasn't the 'national' style getting tired? Incessant peasant films, incessant feasting and barn-dancing, endless historical outfits or national costumes, always the same deep, brooding, woeful, doleful people.¹¹

While some in Sweden felt that this style of film had exhausted itself, it was taken as a model in Norway and Finland.

In a recent essay, Antti Alanen has described the seminal influence in Finland of *Sången om den eldröda blomman*: ‘The film gave Finnish cinema some basic situations for decades to come: the village dance by the river, the couple dreaming in the midsummer night, love-making in the haystack, and the climactic shooting of the rapids.’¹² Stiller's film was a huge success in Finland, its only liability (in the eyes of local critics) the fact that it was made in Sweden. Tytti Soila quotes the patriotic newspaper *Uusi Suomi* (‘New Finland’): ‘A Finnish story ought to be produced by Finnish people, in Finland. It is but then that the world is able to meet with an authentic image of the Finnish folk soul.’¹³

The pattern is repeated in Norway. Swedish cinema took up Norwegian subjects as well in 1919; two films were released in that year that were both based on stories by the Nobel prize-winning Norwegian writer Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson (1832–1910), and both were shot partly on location in Norway: *Synnøve Solbakken*, directed by John Brunius, and *Ett farligt frieri* (A Perilous Proposal) directed by Rune Carlsten. These films were very successful in Norway, but also caused Norwegian critics to make the same sorts of objections as the Finns. When Dreyer arrived in Norway in May 1920 to make the Swedish-produced

Præsttjeneren (The Parson's Widow, 1920), again based on a work by a Norwegian writer (Kristofer Janson, 1814–1917), the editor of the journal *Film og Kino* wrote: ‘We Norwegians would only have wished that the play had been staged and directed by a Norwegian. Here, as with *Synnøve Solbakken* and *Ett farligt frieri*, we have Norwegian plays being shot in Norway. A Norwegian ought, then, to have been in charge of the production.’¹⁴

Partly as a result of such critiques, Norwegian film-making in the 1920s came to be dominated by *bygdefilm* – ‘village films’. It began with *Fante-Anne* (Gypsy Anne, 1920), a film said to mark a ‘national breakthrough’¹⁵ in the Norwegian cinema. It was based on an 1879 short story by the same Kristofer Janson, and according to producer-director Rasmus Breistein, Dreyer was asked for his expert opinion on whether the story was suitable for filming.¹⁶ He agreed, and the film was a big success. Many more films followed with rural and distinctly Norwegian stories and settings, mostly based on popular works of literature. This was very different from the Danish cinema, where the settings were generally non-descript and urban, broadly international.

Danish images?

There are very few silent films that have distinctly Danish themes or backgrounds (very few dramatic films, at least, since the tremendously popular farces with *Fy & Bi* (Pat and Patachon) often used picturesque Danish settings as background).¹⁷ Among the few exceptions are *Den sidste af Slægten* (The Last of His Line, 1922) and *Grænsefolket* (The Borderlanders, 1925/27), both of which ran into trouble with government censorship.

Den sidste af Slægten was called ‘a genuinely Danish film’ by one reviewer.¹⁸ It tells of Niels, a peasant's son who acquires an education and becomes a parson, thus giving a cinematic rendering of one of the most important social shifts of the late nineteenth century, when young men from poor rural backgrounds found the opportunity to rise to positions of social and cultural prominence and become accepted by the urban elites, something which had not really been possible before then. The film's plot is rather lurid, and censors demanded extensive cuts to scenes showing the big-city debauchery Niels encounters.

Grænsefolket, on the other hand, was banned outright. It showed the tribulations of those Danes in North Schleswig who had come under German rule

following the Danish defeat in the War of 1864 against Prussia and Austria. A blatantly patriotic tale, it was consistently referred to as a 'national film' by the Danish papers who reported on the shooting during the late summer of 1925. Members of the German minority in the area protested loudly against the film even before shooting started, and the Danish state censors justified the decision to ban the film with the offence it might give to German sensibilities. The ban caused a considerable stir, both because it was announced only hours before the film's gala premiere, and because it was rumoured that the censors' decision had been forced on them by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.¹⁹ After extensive re-editing, the film was eventually released in 1927, but it no longer survives.

Extant stills indicate that the film, at least to some extent, used images of characteristically Danish landscapes. So does *Den sidste af Slægten*, something emphasised by critics: 'It is a markedly Danish film – it tells us about town and country, its images present us with the heavy, slightly forlorn everyday beauty of the Danish landscape ...'.²⁰ A major provincial newspaper put it in slightly more flavourful terms: 'One frankly sat there and sniffed pleasurably at the scent of loam and grass and grain – in short, of the *countryside*, which was conjured up by the old family farm and its fields.'²¹

Both films were based on literary works, though not very prominent ones: *Grænsefolket* was taken from a short story by the poet Hans Hartvig Seedorf Pedersen (1892–1985), which seems only to have been published in a magazine. *Den sidste af Slægten* was filmed before the novel it was based on had been published; the book came out illustrated with stills from the movie. The author was the former folk high school teacher and actor Eduard Nielsen-Stevns (1880–1949), an eccentric with a chip on his shoulder, whose hopes for literary recognition were repeatedly frustrated. During the German occupation, he became a Nazi, and he has subsequently sunk into complete obscurity.

Other literary adaptations were based on better-known works. The one which seems to have been most similar to the Swedish films was the Nordisk production *Borgslægtens Historie* (History of the Borg Family, 1920), now lost. A two-part film, it was based on a cycle of four novels (published 1912–14) by the Icelandic author Gunnar Gunnarson (1889–1975), and was shot on location in Iceland. It was directed by Gunnar Sommerfeldt, who after-

wards went to Norway and directed the ambitious and rugged *Markens grøde* (Growth of the Soil, 1921) from Knut Hamsun's novel.

The publicity for *Borgslægtens Historie* noted that '*Nordisk Film* has learned from *Svenska Bio* to take the material from the nation's famous books'.²² But the comparison was not to the advantage of the Danish production. One reviewer wrote: 'Paladsteatret [a large Copenhagen cinema] has served Nordisk Films Co. ill by showing their big Icelandic drama *Borgslægten*, because we have not for a long time ... seen worse film-making than this; one must bear in mind that this film was meant to hold its own against the Swedish Selma Lagerlöf films.'²³ Furthermore, while Iceland was then under Danish rule, and both Gunnarson and Jóhann Sigurjónsson, author of the play *Bjærg-Ejvind og hans Hustru*, wrote in Danish, Iceland was very much a land apart, and Icelandic subjects could not really furnish the basis for Danish 'national films'.

The first Swedish-inspired adaptation of a properly Danish literary classic was made in 1919 by Astra, Olaf Fønss's company. *En Aftenscene* (An Evening Scene), first shown in February 1920 and now lost, was based on a short story by Christian Winther. Set in the seventeenth century, it told a melodramatic story of an ageing Danish doctor who recounts to his faithless fiancée how, in his youth, he saved the life of an Italian princess. The film was directed by Fritz Magnussen, who had been a director at Svenska Biografteatern with Sjöström and Stiller, and who was not re-engaged in 1916, when the company decided to make fewer, but more ambitious films. Fønss's biographer comments:

It was an excellent idea to choose Winther's short story, indeed, to do like the Swedes and take subjects for films from Danish authors ... Those who remember the film may recall that its whole ambience brought Victor Sjöström's films to mind, but it was no secret either that Magnussen had learnt from his eminent Swedish colleague.²⁴

Set mainly in Florence, the film featured large and very costly sets; it also included a battle scene, showing the successful defence of Copenhagen against the Swedes, who tried to take the city by storm in 1659.

Lasse Månsson fra Skaane (Lasse Månsson from Skåne, 1923) was also set during the seventeenth-century wars between Denmark and Sweden.



It was directed by A. W. Sandberg and based on a 1903 novel by Peter Frederik Rist (1844–1926), an infantry officer who saw the bloody and humiliating defeat in 1864 at first hand and wrote a number of patriotic books with military themes. The war of 1658–59 ended with the Swedish conquest of the ancient Danish territory of Skåne (Scania), the place from where the film's hero hails, and the story ends tragically with the death of the hero at the hands of the villainous Swedes; the heroine dies of grief. A rather stiff costume drama, set largely indoors, it does not give a great deal of attention to landscape.

There is somewhat more of that in another Nordisk production, *Præsten i Vejlbj* (The Vicar of Vejlbj, 1922), directed by August Blom, a tale of a seventeenth century country vicar innocently executed as a murderer. The film was based on one of the most famous short stories of Steen Steensen

Blicher, first published in 1829, which in turn was based on an historical incident. Blom shot the exteriors in the area where the events which inspired Blicher took place. The seriousness and care with which the film was made²⁵ impressed contemporary Danish reviewers: 'Is it in fact possible to pay the film a greater compliment than to say that it in no way falls short of the best Swedish films?' asked one.²⁶ An interesting newspaper item notes that the film has been acquired by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for showing among Danish emigrants in the United States – and that the ministry plans to buy more 'national films'.²⁷

'Happy, peaceful Denmark'

In 1919, the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs had set up a Press Bureau.²⁸ Among other things, it was charged with the acquisition and distribution of pho-

Fig. 1. 'Happy, peaceful Denmark' in Carl Dreyer's *Der var engang* – (Once Upon a Time, 1922). [Courtesy of David Bordwell.]

tographic slides and moving picture films – mainly documentary shorts – that could be shown abroad to promote a positive image of Denmark and maintain Danish emigrants' ties with the mother country. The earliest document in the file concerning the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' dealings with Nordisk (dated 14 April 1920) gives a good impression of the ministry's policies. It is a press bureau note concerning the decision to purchase three or four 'Danish nature films' from Nordisk:

The films in question will be provided with English and French intertitles, which will be composed in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Press Bureau, allowing it to have control so that the titles give spectators the same impression that the images should give, namely: '*Happy, peaceful Denmark*' [in English in original].²⁹

Roger Nielsen, the press attaché at the Danish embassy in Washington, D.C., was an enthusiastic distributor of such films to Danish emigré audiences. Eager to expand his repertoire, he wrote to A. J. Poulsen, the head of the Press Bureau, as soon as he read a review in a Danish newspaper of *Der var engang* –, pleading that Poulsen try to obtain a print of the film for exhibition at a Danish charity event in New York. As it happened, another fiction film was sent from Copenhagen instead: *Præsten i Vejlbj*. Nordisk had offered the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a print of the film free of charge, as it had ended its commercial run – whereas the ministry would have had to pay a considerable sum for *Der var engang* –.

A letter from Poulsen to Roger Nielsen sent at the same time as the print sets out his deliberations about the film:

With this film we are moving somewhat outside our programme as it has been hitherto, but we have considered it justifiable to make 'a step to the side' in this matter. I am of the opinion that this film in every respect serves the objectives we pursue: it is an excellent expression of what the Danish film industry is capable of achieving artistically, and in this respect stands at a very handsome level, in my opinion considerably above many American films; it will furthermore remind Danish spectators of a classic Danish work of literature, and finally it offers splendid pictures of Jutland scenery and of old Danish folk-ways, as it has been

photographed in the Grenaa area, the very surroundings where Blicher set the events of his tale.³⁰

Præsten i Vejlbj was duly shown in New York, but it proved a disappointment. Nielsen wrote to Poulsen:

No one can deny that *Præsten i Vejlbj* in many places stands at a high level artistically, although in technical respects it is very far from measuring up to the superbly photographed American pictures, but the story is too excessively sad: miscarriage of justice, heart stroke, death on the tombstone, evil, misfortune, grief and heart-ache all the way through without a single cheering moment – this is not the sort of thing around which one can gather the Danish-Americans when from time to time they wish to reminisce about Denmark.³¹

For such occasions, a film of a different sort was needed, Nielsen insisted (and the happy-end version of *Præsten i Vejlbj* Nordisk made for international distribution³² was not what he had in mind):

A film like *Der var engang* – would be magnificent for this purpose, and I sincerely hope that we may get it over here in several prints as soon as possible, but it will not do for us to send out a film like *Præsten i Vejlbj* to the Danish-Americans. I can envision the disappointment spreading across people's faces if it were shown in Hampton, Iowa, or Claycenter, Minnesota, where people drive from 20 or 30 miles away to have a cosy Danish evening.³³

Nielsen's viewpoint was echoed in a long article about the film show from New York's Danish-language newspaper *Nordlyset*, which he included with his letter. The reporter also thought *Præsten i Vejlbj* an unhappy experience: 'An exceedingly sad story, and sighs, more sighs, and even more sighs rose from the audience. The festivities of *Der var engang* – would surely have been more appropriate.'³⁴ The Press Bureau did indeed negotiate for *Der var engang* –, but in August 1923, Poulsen had to write to Nielsen that the film 'seems impossible for us to get hold of'; the cost of the rights, 5000 kroner, was far too high.³⁵

One may well ask what it was about *Der var engang* – that made it seem so attractive to Roger

Nielsen, who had after all merely read a review of the film. The answer has a lot to do with the literary work Dreyer adapted for the screen.

Our land we love

By the time Dreyer made his film, the play *Der var engang* – had established itself as a popular favourite, one of the classics of the repertoire. Although its popularity has waned somewhat, it continues to be revived occasionally, most recently in 1998 as a summer open-air presentation by the Royal Theatre. It was written in 1884 by the prolific poet-playwright Holger Drachmann (1846–1908). Drachmann, who was a member of the artists' community in Skagen (although his relationship with Krøyer was somewhat strained), was an extremely gifted lyrical poet, but also an inveterately self-dramatising bohemian; after a youthful fascination with socialism, he turned to a romantic nationalism hostile to the mechanised vulgarity of the modern world.

Der var engang – is set in the fairy tale past and tells of how the Prince of Denmark, his suit rebuffed by the haughty but beautiful Princess of Illyria, disguises himself as a tinker. In return for a magic pot, the Princess allows the tinker to sleep in her bedchamber. He arranges for this to be discovered, and the Princess is thrown out by her father; she has no choice but to become the companion of the tinker-Prince and live with him in his wooden hut. She is forced to sell clay pots at the market, but they all get smashed by a careless cavalier. Through the travails, he tames her and brings her to love him, so that when she is offered marriage by the undisguised Prince, she rejects him in favour of her manly forester. He then reveals to her that the two men are one and the same, and the play ends with their happy union.

Most of the incidents are taken from a fairy tale, 'Graaben' (Grey-Legs), published in 1884 by the pioneering folklorist Svend Grundtvig (1824–1883). The latter was the son of the churchman and psalmist N.F.S. Grundtvig (1783–1872), the dominant figure of nineteenth-century Danish cultural life and a leading light of Danish nationalism. As in other European countries, the collection of folk tales and folk songs played a significant role in the building of national identity from supposedly authentic, deeply rooted popular traditions: in Norway, the folk tales published in the 1840s by Peter Christen Asbjørnsen (1812–1885) and Jørgen Moe (1813–1882) served this function. Indeed, the idea for the play initially

came from one of these tales: 'The subject is mainly that about which I spoke to Peter Heise [a composer (1813–79)] some time ago – it is entitled 'Håkan Borkenskjæg' in Asbjørnsen, but in his latest collection Svend Grundtvig has made it altogether Danish and much more delightful.'³⁶

In letters to friends who read the manuscript, Drachmann rather heatedly disclaimed any debt to Hans Christian Andersen's familiar tale, 'The Swineherd'. Nevertheless, the Prince's magic kettle certainly seems inspired by Andersen, and the character of the King of Illyria owes a lot to him as well. Finally, Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* was an important inspiration, acknowledged by naming the Princess Catherine.

Very important to the play was its music: melodious and vibrant late-romantic overtures for each of the nine scenes, as well as eight songs and three dances – more than an hour of music in all, written by the composer P. E. Lange-Müller. The music, one commentator writes, ties together Drachmann's 'rather loosely constructed' play 'into an organic whole'.³⁷ When the play was first submitted to the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen in 1885, it was rejected for being too much of a mish-mash, but after substantial revisions, it finally premiered in January 1887 and was an instant success.

The play brims with patriotic sentiment. It is particularly evident in two places: in Act 1, when the Prince pays suit to the Princess with a long speech in verse about his homeland, of which more later; and in the final scene, when the Prince and Princess are wed as the midsummer bonfires are lit; a huntsman sings, each verse of his song beginning with the line 'Our land we love', a song which has become an indispensable part of the midsummer celebrations held in Denmark every year.

The play also sets up a contrast between Illyria, with its snooty Princess who lives in a gilded rococo palace surrounded by luxuriant Mediterranean gardens, and Denmark, with its manly Prince, his home – besides the hut in the green beechwood forest – a renaissance castle of 'reddish walls and dark towers'.³⁸ Denmark is thus seen as a place both less modern and more natural than the foreign lands to the south. This is also evident from a letter Drachmann sent to his publisher along with the first draft, where he expresses his great satisfaction with his own work: 'I am sure that it will endure as a *folk-book* of our nation, because it possesses all the good Danish qualities (the old ones): cheerfulness, joy in

man and nature, and a surging, ever-youthful poetry.³⁹

The idealisation of the Danish homeland is energised by the battle of the sexes which provides the main story-line of the play. Drachmann's nationalism is thus neatly intertwined with his unabashed male chauvinism: the woman is like a child or a tender plant whose immature personality must be molded by the man, so that she understands that her happiness lies in submitting to the commands of her husband and master. Drachmann makes very clear that ideal love is the imposition of the man's desire, although recent stagings of *Der var engang* – have tended to suppress the most egregious passages. Even when the play was first performed, it provoked the ire of critics sympathetic to the women's movement.⁴⁰ It is worth noting that the Princess was played by Betty Hennings (1850–1939), who had been the first-ever Nora when Henrik Ibsen's *A Doll's House* had its premiere at the Royal Theatre in 1879 (a role she kept on performing until 1907).⁴¹ In 1918, the literary critic Julius Clausen wrote about Drachmann's play:

It is like a slap in the face of all the Nora-theories, and if *Der var engang* – had been a greater work of literature than it (despite many wonderful details) in fact is, one could reckon it as the antithesis of *A Doll's House*. Now, it is probably quite as much Lange-Müller's music and the changing interiors as it is the fairy-tale poem itself that has brought about the success.⁴²

Der var engang – certainly owes much to its music and its spectacle; at the Royal Theatre, it was particularly suited for festive occasions, not only because of its patriotic sentiment, but especially because the Royal Theatre houses several different arts, and *Der var engang* – provides not just actors, but also opera singers, ballet dancers, and orchestra with something to do. It works well as entertainment, the sometimes high-flown poetic passages interrupted by the comic antics of the Prince's sidekick Kasper Røghat ('smoke-top'). It also had a genuine popular appeal, not least through its populist insistence that the only true nobility is the nobility of the heart.

A success it certainly was. In 1921, the play notched up its performance number 300 at the Royal Theatre, a tally very rarely achieved,⁴³ and it has since been revived another 150 or so times there. To

this must be added many, many performances at provincial theatres and open-air stages. In book form, the play had been printed in 54,000 copies by 1922.⁴⁴

Frustrated efforts

Dreyer's film was released with great fanfare on 3 October 1922. It had been financed by Sophus Madsen, the owner of Paladsteatret, the biggest cinema in Copenhagen, where the premiere of course took place (the name of the production company is usually given as Sophus Madsen Film; a review refers to it as Dana-Film, however).⁴⁵ Drachmann's name was featured prominently in the promotion of the film, which also emphasised its Danishness. In Paladsteatret's publicity magazine, the film was presented with the headline 'The First Completely Danish Film' above a large picture of Drachmann. The text began:

It has now been quite a few years since people began making films in this country, but no film has hitherto been shown that one might call truly *Danish*.

A film making use of Danish nature, Danish literature and that which is typically Danish, is something altogether new, and to that extent, *Der var engang* – is the first completely Danish film.⁴⁶

The inspiration for making it, Madsen openly acknowledged, was the Swedish films (Madsen was also the Danish distributor of the productions of Svenska Biografteatern/Svensk Filmindustri):

Mr Madsen himself declares that it is the Swedish films that have galvanised him. Time and again he has had Swedish art films on the programme at Paladsteatret, and in that way he has been struck by the thought that in the same way the Swedes drew from their literary treasures and made them known all across the world, so Denmark too should find in its rich and beautiful literature the pearls whose luster could be transferred to the silver screen.⁴⁷

The reviews were generally though not unanimously favourable, and the film found a large audience, playing for almost four weeks at Paladsteatret. On 22 October, a newspaper item noted that it was the biggest success ever at Paladsteatret, seen by more than 45,000 people at that point,⁴⁸ and the total must certainly have been considerably higher by the

end of the engagement on 30 October. At the end of the year, the trade paper ads of the film's distribution company (Sophus Madsen's Dansk-Svensk Film) called *Der var engang* – 'The biggest Danish film success to date'.⁴⁹ Even allowing for hyperbole, it was clearly doing well and may indeed have been the biggest box-office hit of Dreyer's career.

In later years, Dreyer nevertheless tended to be very dismissive of *Der var engang* – 'A complete failure,' he said of his film.⁵⁰ It is somewhat difficult to assess whether this repudiation is justified; the film only survives in a single, incomplete print. Indeed, it was believed lost until the material we now have was found in a forgotten corner of Paladsteatret in 1964. The beginning, several individual scenes or parts of scenes, and the entire last third of the film are all missing. Most of the intertitles are missing as well; those that remain are in German. Dreyer's personal copy of the screenplay (with copious hand-written notes) survives, but when it is compared with the film material, it is clear that there are important differences between what Dreyer wanted to film and what he was in fact able to put on the screen.

The considerable practical difficulties that arose during production certainly played a part in this. The interiors for the film were shot at Benjamin Christensen's old studio north of Copenhagen, which he had convinced Svensk Filmindustri to buy and completely refurbish so he could make *Häxan* (Witchcraft Through the Ages) there. According to Neergaard, the negotiations between Madsen and Svensk Filmindustri over the rental of the studio dragged out for so long that the production schedule fell apart, and already-constructed sets had to be demolished because key actors were only available for short periods of time. This also drove up the cost of the film, which was rumoured to have been very expensive. The shooting lasted until 11 September 1922, just a few weeks before the premiere.⁵¹

Some of the scenes described in the screenplay were probably never shot. For instance, a parallel plot-line showing how Kasper Røghat (mis)rules the kingdom in the Prince's absence is missing. Since none of the incidents it contains are mentioned in the relatively detailed plot synopsis in Paladsteatret's publicity magazine, it seems likely that this entire subplot was scrapped. The most spectacular scene in Drachmann's play is the town market, where the Princess comes to sell her clay pots, only to have them smashed. In the typed screenplay, Dreyer describes this market scene in detail, but handwritten

notes outline how it in fact appears in the film: the Princess meets a few soldiers on a country road, and they overturn her wheelbarrow, smashing the pots. It is certainly an economical way of handling the scene, but it also suggests that Dreyer was forced to cut some corners during production.

Edvin Kau, who describes the discrepancies between the script and the picture in his book on Dreyer's films, suggests that *Der var engang* – was, if not exactly hack-work, at least something Dreyer made to keep himself busy rather than in order to pursue high artistic goals.⁵² In later interviews, he certainly did nothing to correct the impression that he was simply a hired hand. Yet there are indications that this impression is somewhat misleading.

It is certainly evident that Dreyer approached the project with customary thoroughness and concern for realism. The hut in the forest was reportedly constructed well in advance of the start of production, so that it would appear appropriately weathered.⁵³ Peter Jerndorff, the doyen of the Royal Theatre, who plays the king of Illyria, told an interviewer how impressed he was with the detail and authenticity of the sets: 'In the royal chambers at the palace the walls had silk linings, mounted in real gilded frames, and there were actual flagstones on the floors: marble tiles in the great hall and brick flooring in the kitchen.'⁵⁴ Clara Pontoppidan recalled that Dreyer had a real potter present during the shooting to teach her how to make clay pots herself.⁵⁵

The notes in the script indicate that Dreyer had studied old customs in considerable detail for the film. Dreyer's explanation (to an interviewer from a Swedish film magazine) of his decision to change the period from Drachmann's late sixteenth century shows how he sought not only verisimilitude but also cinematic effectiveness:

An important matter is that we have moved the story back in time to the Middle Ages, because I believe that this period has a great deal more romance and poetry than the somewhat too massive Danish Renaissance. It has been a difficult job getting hold of suitable costumes – a careful study of mediaeval church wall paintings and altarpieces has meant that we have also been able to make the outfits as authentic and as authentically Danish as one could wish. We have had our own tailor and have *not* ordered all the costume materials in



Fig. 2. Dreyer changed the period of *Der var engang* – from the renaissance to the middle ages. [Courtesy of David Bordwell.]

bulk from Germany – the way many theatres and film companies are wont to do. It will be more expensive for us, but also better.⁵⁶

Dreyer not only put a lot of work into the project; there are also indications that he was the originator of the whole plan. An article from early 1922 in *Kinobladet*, a trade journal, announces: ‘The director Carl Th. Dreyer is forming a new company for the production of Danish films.’ It continues:

The Danish cinema is presently experiencing a renaissance, and from what one hears, a new Danish film enterprise will very shortly be launched with the intention of making films of true artistic worth and partly on a national background.

The author of the plan is the skilled director *Carl Th. Dreyer* ... in a short while, activities will begin with the production of Drachmann’s *Der var engang* – .⁵⁷

The article ends with the additional bit of information that Dreyer had obtained the film rights for the classic naturalist novel *Fru Marie Grubbe* (1876) by J. P. Jacobsen (1847–1885), famous for its exhaustively researched historical detail (it is set in the seventeenth century). Interestingly, in Dreyer’s article ‘New Ideas About the Film’, published on 1 January 1922, he uses a long quotation from this novel to make his point that the true author of a film is the writer, not the director.

Summer storm, summer calm

Dreyer explained his reasons for being dissatisfied with *Der var engang* – in an autobiographical summary he wrote in 1939:

From harsh realism [in *Die Gezeichneten*] I made the leap to fairy tale – with Holger Drachmann’s *Der var engang* – , which taught me the bitter lesson that one cannot build a film from atmosphere alone. Just as the film should have gathered dramatic force and the acting culminated in a tempestuous struggle between two people, the plot stood as still as a windless summer’s day. I learnt from this film that people are above all interested in people.⁵⁸

This passage is also quoted by both Neergaard, Kau, and Drouzy. Neergaard goes on to comment on the difficulty of filming Drachmann’s play, relying as it does on the melodious poetry of its lines. Drouzy’s gloss is different:

In other words, Dreyer here regrets having allowed the fable to eliminate reality completely, to tell stories [des histoires] to his audience that no longer have anything to do with History [l’Histoire].⁵⁹

This seems somewhat misleading, not only because of the efforts devoted to ensuring the verisimilitude of the mediaeval background, but also because the film has, as one newspaper article put it, ‘taken the fairy-tale figures and sought to turn them into living human beings with human passions and desires’.⁶⁰ A commendable aspiration, but probably also the source of Dreyer’s difficulties. Drachmann’s characters are in fact quite flimsy and rather two-dimensional; indeed, Drachmann himself referred to *Der var engang* – as ‘a toy theatre play’ in a letter.⁶¹ In the light of Dreyer’s exhortation to shun the ‘puppet show’ – quoted at the beginning of this essay – it seems rather ironic that he should have chosen to film this particular work.

In the course of making the characters more plausible, Dreyer has also given the shrew-taming a different complexion. In Drachmann, everything happens in accordance with the Prince’s plan; it is even the Prince himself (disguised as a man-at-arms) who smashes all the pots, all in order to bend her to his will. Dreyer emphasises that the treatment she is subjected to allows her true self to emerge – it is not a new self that is imposed on her. In this manner,

Dreyer extends Drachmann's populism to include the Princess also; as Drachmann's Prince reveals his true manliness in his tinker's guise, so too does the Princess's noble heart reveal itself in the tiny hut in the depths of the forest. The screenplay explains: '... poverty and want only bound them closer together. The Princess learned that it is the love between man and woman that makes kings and queens of them.'⁶² Nevertheless, making her transformation psychologically plausible was a very difficult task.

Dreyer tried instead to give the relationship of the Prince and Princess more resonance by connecting them with Denmark's nature. This can be said to be a cinematic parallel to Drachmann's intertwining of nationalist sentiment and conjugal conflict; still, the emotional pitch is very different. In the article 'Swedish Film', what Dreyer considers to be exemplary about Swedish film is the artistic autonomy and resolve of their makers; national character goes unmentioned. For Dreyer, it would seem that it was the creation of an 'atmosphere' that would enrich the characters as much as it was the celebration of the beauties of the Danish landscape that motivated the film's lovely landscape photography, justly praised by the critics: '... a paean to Denmark's nature, the Nordic summer, the light summer nights.'⁶³

In the screenplay, Dreyer makes the beauty of the scenery directly responsible for the transformation of the Princess; she happily bathes in the brook near the hut:

54. [...] He [the Prince] returns home and sees the bathing Princess from the door of the hut. He smiles: she has begun to take pleasure in nature. That is definitely an improvement ...⁶⁴

The scene was laid out in four shots by Dreyer, but they have been crossed out, so the scene was probably not shot; it is certainly missing in the film as it stands. More unfortunate is the loss of much of the sequence where the Prince describes his native land to the Princess and the Illyrian court. It is praised in most of the reviews; one remarks that it shows the change of the seasons, but now only two shots remain, one showing a sunlit tree, another a sparkling brook. The film did eventually reach the United States, though not through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' efforts, and the review in *Nordlyset* gives the most detailed description I have been able to find; it also gives a sense of what the intertitles were like:

Not only will any Danish-American be delighted to refresh the memories that must surely attach to this fairy-tale play, but even an American must become rapt with delight over the beautiful Danish landscapes that pass in front of you, while the Prince tells the Princess of Illyria that 'he is from that land yonder' – and then come these images that make our heart pound with joy, of dewy meadows where the marsh-wife brews her mist and the elf-maid dances with gossamer-light steps in magic beams of moonlight, of the ripe fields of grain at harvest-tide, 'when every cloud brings blessings to the field', of the beechwood with sunspots on the forest floor and a trickling, murmuring spring ... in short: all the beauty that tiny Denmark holds ...⁶⁵

In the review of *Der var engang* – that first alerted Roger Nielsen in Washington, D.C., to its existence, it says that the atmospheric images of Danish nature 'would serve as excellent propaganda abroad for our fine little country'; Nielsen underlined these words in red pencil.⁶⁶ What the audience saw was indeed 'happy, peaceful Denmark'. Happy and peaceful, however, is also fundamentally undramatic.

This is the probably the source of the film's weakness. The tempestuous clash between man and woman which should have been the backbone of the story could not be effectively presented: the characters themselves did not have the necessary density, and the natural scenery could not express their passions either.

Conclusion

It could be argued that Denmark's gentle, rolling countryside simply does not afford the expressive opportunities of the dramatic, 'Nordic' landscapes of its neighbours, with their rocks, pine forests, snow, and surging rivers, and that this could be the explanation for the scarcity of Danish 'national films'. It is certainly worth noting that most of the Danish 'national films' were costume pictures, many of them set during the seventeenth century (including Dreyer's unrealised plan to film *Fru Marie Grubbe*). Even when they avoid stuffiness, such films rely on elaborate sets and fancy costumes; there is little of the bracing conviction of the Swedish films, energised by the potent reality of the landscape. The power of these films, so exhilarating for contemporary audiences,

was eloquently expressed by one reviewer of *Sången om den eldröda blomman*: 'This does not try to be – this is life itself with all its reality and with the sub-surface of unutterable beauty that lives and breathes behind the things we see!'⁶⁷

A different sort of explanation would claim that because Norway and Finland had only been independent countries for a short time (since 1906 and 1917, respectively), the creation and sustenance of a national identity was a far more urgent and pressing project there than it was in Denmark or Sweden.

Finally, however, it seems to me that the most likely explanation is to be found in the difference between the kinds of audiences sought by producers in Norway and Finland on one hand and Sweden and Denmark on the other. Norwegian and Finnish films were primarily directed at a domestic audience, whereas the more fully industrialised production companies in Denmark and Sweden had their eyes firmly fixed on the international market. While films like *Ingmarssönerna* were widely praised abroad,

there were many people in the Swedish film world who felt that they did not provide a viable model, and that Swedish filmmakers should work in a more international style in order to appeal to the worldwide audience which all the participants in these heated debates agreed they should aim for.

With respect to Denmark, we have seen how the commentators who spoke up in favour of making 'national films' argued that their distinctiveness would make them popular abroad. A persistent theme of the reviews of *Der var engang* – is the hope that the film will be an international success, reviving the market for Danish films and displaying the riches of Denmark's scenery and art.⁶⁸ But *Der var engang* – did not fulfil these hopes; however popular domestically, it did not make waves abroad. The experiment of making a film filled with Danish atmosphere was neither commercially nor artistically a success, and both Dreyer and the Danish film producers took very different roads ahead.

Notes

1. Carl Th. Dreyer, 'Svensk Film', *Dagbladet*, 7 January 1920. The translation in Donald Skoller (ed.), *Dreyer in Double Reflection: Carl Th. Dreyer's Writings About the Film (Om Filmen)* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1973), 21–29, is inaccurate.
2. Eilif Skaar, 'Svensk filmindustri förr och nu', in *Sveriges film och biografmän* (Stockholm 1920), 101; quoted in Bo Florin, *Den nationella stilen: Studier i den svenska filmens guldålder* (Stockholm: Aura förlag, 1997), 39.
3. August Brunius in *Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning*, 18 March 1919, quoted in Florin, op. cit., 210.
4. Florin, 12.
5. Aage Barfoed, 'Hvad er nødvendigt for at –?', *Masken* 8 (21 July 1918): 274–75; original emphasis.
6. Peder Severin Krøyer (1851–1909) was the most celebrated of the *plein air* painters who gathered in Skagen, the northern tip of Jutland, during the 1880s and 1890s. Wilhelm Hammershøi (1864–1916) is famous for his evocative interiors. Wilhelm Marstrand (1810–1873) was acclaimed for his Roman scenes and his paintings of characters from Holberg's plays. *Hjortens Flugt* (1855) is a verse novel of mediaeval derring-do, written by Christian Winther (1796–1876), perhaps the most influential lyrical poet of the nineteenth century. Steen Steensen Blicher (1782–1848) was the first master of the short story, his tales filled with realistic atmosphere.
7. Aage Barfoed, 'Hvad er nødvendigt for at –?', *Masken* 8 (21 July 1918): 275; original emphasis. Somewhat surprisingly in view of these declarations, Barfoed's own screenplays tended to be set in exotic places: Japan, Arabia, New York.
8. Gustav Bauditz, 'Tilfældigt om Film', *Masken* 8 (4 August 1918): 301.
9. 'Den Danske Film', *Filmen*, 15 January 1919: 86; original emphasis.
10. Florin, *Den nationella stilen*, 66.
11. Bengt Idestam-Almquist and Ragnar Allberg, *Film, igår, idag, imorgon* (Stockholm: Bonnier, 1932), 139, quoted in Florin, 56.
12. Antti Alanen, 'Born Under the Sign of the Scarlet Flower: Pantheism in Finnish Silent Cinema', in John Fullerton and Jan Olsson (eds.), *Nordic Explorations: Film Before 1930* (Sydney: John Libbey, 1999), 78.
13. *Uusi Suomi*, 4 October 1919, quoted in Tytti Soila, 'Five Songs of the Scarlet Flower', *Screen* 35, 3 (Autumn 1994): 270.
14. Quoted in Sigurd Evensmo, *Det store tivoli: Film og kino i Norge*, new edition, (Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1992), 101.
15. The term is used as a title for chapters on the Norwegian cinema of the 1920s in both Lars Thomas Braaten, Jan Erik Holst, and Jan H. Kortner (eds.), *Filmen i Norge: Norske kinofilmer gjennom 100 år* (Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, 1995) and Tytti Soila, Astrid Söderbergh Widding, and Gunnar Iversen, *Nordic National Cinemas* (London: Routledge, 1998).

16. Anne Marit Myrstad, 'Fante Anne: "Det nasjonale gjennombrudd" i norsk film', *Z. Filmtidsskrift* 8, 33 (1990): 58.
17. See Marguerite Engberg, 'Palladium and the Silent Films with "Long and Short"', in *Nordic Explorations: Film Before 1930*, 59.
18. Review of *Den sidste af Slægten*, *Aarhus Amtstidende*, 10 November 1922.
19. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' file on *Grænsefolket* contains mostly newspaper clippings; there is, however, also a letter sent by the press attaché in Paris in 1929, when the film was finally shown there, which refers to a coded telegram sent by Count Moltke, the Danish Foreign Minister, to the ambassador in Paris just a few days after the ban, when the film's director and producer was apparently on his way to France to get the film released there. While this coded telegram is not found in the file, it does suggest that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs took an active interest in blocking the film.
20. Review of *Den sidste af Slægten*, *Berlingske Tidende*, 11 November 1922; original emphasis.
21. Review of *Den sidste af Slægten*, *Jyllands-Posten*, 10 November 1922; original emphasis.
22. 'Om Borgslægtens Historie', *Paladsteatrets Films-Nyheder* 2, 2 (1920): 15.
23. Review of *Borgslægtens Historie*, *Københavns Amts Folkeblad*, 17 September 1920.
24. Arnold Hending, *Olaf Fønss* (Copenhagen: Urania, 1943), 164.
25. A print of the film survives, but I have not been able to see it.
26. Review of *Præsten i Vejlbj*, *Dagbladet*, 21 March 1922.
27. *Aarhus Stiftstidende*, 13 November 1922.
28. See Carl Nørrested, 'Udenrigsministeriets Pressebureau 1919–1935', in Carl Nørrested and Christian Alsted (eds.), *Kortfilmen og staten* (Copenhagen: Eventus, 1987).
29. Referat fra Pressebureauet, 14 April 1920, Danish National Archives [Rigsarkivet], UM 1909–1945, 'Billedarkivet: Forhandlinger med Nordisk Films Comp'. (pakke I), Journal no. 115.K.1, Pakke no. H 115–44; emphasis in original.
30. Poulsen to Nielsen, 14 November 1922, Danish National Archives [Rigsarkivet], UM 1909–1945, 'Films-Propaganda i USA' (pakke I), Journal no. 115.F.101, Pakke no. H 115–20 (hereafter UM 115.F.101).
31. Nielsen to Poulsen, 16 December 1922, UM 115.F.101.
32. For those who know the original story, this seems a terribly philistine idea, and Nielsen was quite derisive about it. But Nordisk didn't stop there: in the promotional booklet printed for distribution in England (*Præsten i Vejlbj* folder, DFI Archive), the names of all the characters and most of the actors were changed (Viggo Wiehe, who plays the vicar, becomes 'Victor Worth'). The film itself became *The Hand of Fate* – 'From the novel by H. Steensen Blicher' [sic].
33. Nielsen to Poulsen, 16 December 1922, UM 115.F.101.
34. Review of *Præsten i Vejlbj*, *Nordlyset*, 14 December 1922, UM 115.F.101.
35. Poulsen to Nielsen, 22 August 1923, UM 115.F.101.
36. Holger Drachmann, letter (to William Bloch?), quoted in Robert Neieindam, *Det kongelige Teaters Historie*, vol. 5: 1886–1890 (Copenhagen: Jespersen og Pio, 1930), 12.
37. Niels Bo Foltman, sleeve notes for CD, P.E. Lange-Müller, *Der var engang* – , conducted by Michael Schønwandt (Dacapo, 1997), 5.
38. Holger Drachmann, *Der var engang* – (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1922), 67.
39. Letter to Frederik Hegel, 1 July 1884, in Holger Drachmann, *Breve fra og til Holger Drachmann*, ed. Morten Borup (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1970), vol. 3, 113; original emphasis.
40. See, for example, 'Kjerlighed er aldrig for haard', *Morgenbladet*, 2 March 1887.
41. Kela Kvam, Janne Risum, and Jytte Wiingaard (eds.), *Dansk teaterhistorie*, vol. 2: *Folkets teater* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1992), 34.
42. Julius Clausen, 'Det moderne danske Drama. En Oversigt, II', *Masken* 8 (3 March 1918): 91.
43. Neieindam, *Det kongelige Teaters Historie*, 26.
44. Neieindam, *Det kongelige Teaters Historie*, 25.
45. Review of *Der var engang* – , *Berlingske Tidende*, 4 October 1922.
46. Jens [unsigned] Locher, 'Den første helt danske Film', *Paladsteatrets Films-Nyheder* 1922.
47. *Berlingske Tidende*, 1 October 1922.
48. *Dagbladet*, 22 October 1922.
49. Advertisement for Dansk-Svensk Film, *Kinobladet* 10, 11 (1922): n.p.
50. Michel Delahaye, 'Between Heaven and Hell: Interview with Carl Dreyer', *Cahiers du cinéma in English*, no. 4 (1966), 15.
51. *Berlingske Tidende*, 13 September 1922.

52. Edvin Kau, *Dreyers filmkunst* (Copenhagen: Akademisk forlag, 1989), 77–81.
53. Torkild Vogel-Jørgensen, 'Der var engang som Film: Den store, nye danske Æventyrfilm: et lille Apropos paa Forhaand', *Verden og Vi* 12 (1 October 1922): 1272.
54. Peter Jerndorff, 'Interview: Talescenens Mester paa Film', *Nationaltidende*, 3 October 1922.
55. Clara Pontoppidan, *Eet Liv – Mange Liv: Erindringer*, vol. 2: 1910–1925 (Copenhagen: Westermann, 1950), 74.
56. Carl E. Hansen, 'Der var engang –', *Film-Journalen* 4, 15 (1922): 492.
57. 'Dansk Films-Renæssance', *Kinobladet* 1922: 47.
58. Carl Th. Dreyer, 'Selvbiografisk notat', in *Kildemateriale til en biografi om Carl Th. Dreyer*, ed. Martin Drouzy, Sekvens særække (Copenhagen: C.A. Reitzel, 1982), 66.
59. Maurice Drouzy, *Carl Th. Dreyer, né Nilsson* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1982), 206.
60. *Berlingske Tidende*, 1 October 1922.
61. Letter to Peter Nansen, 2 February 1896, Drachmann, *Breve*, vol. 4, 64.
62. Screenplay, *Der var engang –*, p. 29, Dreyer collection, DFI Archive.
63. Review of *Der var engang –*, *Berlingske Tidende*, 4 October 1922.
64. Screenplay, *Der var engang –*, p. 22, Dreyer collection, DFI Archive.
65. Karen Albertsen, review of *Der var engang –*, *Nordlyset*, 4 September 1924, UM 115.F.101.
66. Review of *Der var engang –*, *Socialdemokraten*, 4 October 1922, UM 115.F.101.
67. Review of *Sången om den eldröda blomman*, *Kino-Revyen* 1, 4 (August 1919): 61.
68. *Berlingske Tidende (Aften)*, 4 October 1922; *Berlingske Tidende*, 1, 3, 4 October 1922; *Ekstrabladet*, 2 October 1922; *Dagbladet*, 7 October 1922; *Social-Demokraten*, 4 October 1922; *Nordlyset*, 4 September 1924; also Jens [unsigned] Locher, 'Den første helt danske Film', *Paladsteatrets Films-Nyheder* 1922.

Copyright of Film History (08922160) is the property of Indiana University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.