

Aliki Caloyeras
University of Pennsylvania
May 2006

* Please do not quote without permission.

Close Up, G.W. Pabst, and the Entwined History of Film and Psychoanalysis

From the time of its inception in 1927, the early film journal, Close Up, looked to psychoanalysis to inform its emerging theories of film. The journal's editorial team was made up of the professional, creative, and sexual ménage of Kenneth Macpherson, Bryher (Annie Winifred Ellerman), and H.D., who had all been interested in the developing theories of psychoanalysis since the late teens. According to Laura Marcus, the imagist poet H.D. had met psychologist and sexologist Havelock Ellis in 1919, and both H.D. and her then lover, Bryher, had already undergone analysis with Ellis in the early 1920s by the time they turned to film in the latter part of the decade. Ellis introduced the women to Freud's writing, and Bryher in particular was captivated by psychoanalytic theory, becoming one of the first subscribers to the Journal of Psychoanalysis. Bryher, who "quickly became convinced that neurosis blocked the artistic talents of many of her circle," believed that psychoanalysis might be a panacea for the alienation and fragmentation of modern times, and she even toyed with the idea of becoming an analyst herself (Friedman xxxi). Ellis facilitated an introduction between Bryher, Macpherson, and Freud in May 1927, two months before the first issue of Close Up was published. In September of that year, Bryher, who was openly gay, married (her by this time ex-lover) H.D.'s current lover, Macpherson in order to appease her family and gain her inheritance--she was the daughter of the richest man in the world, shipping

tycoon Sir John Reeves Ellerman, who stipulated that she be married in order to receive her share of the family fortune.¹ In November 1927, the newlyweds flew to Berlin to meet filmmaker G.W. Pabst, who in turn introduced them to analyst Hanns Sachs, a disciple of Freud who consulted the first psychoanalytic film venture, Secrets of a Soul, which was directed by Pabst and released to great acclaim the year before.² In 1928, Bryher began analysis with Sachs, which “lasted for almost the entire duration of Close Up’s existence, moving between Berlin and Switzerland, in a pattern which also governed Bryher’s, and to a certain extent H.D.’s and Macpherson’s, reception of cinema” (Marcus 241). Sachs, furthermore, was a cineaste and regularly wrote for Close Up throughout its existence on the relationship between film and psychoanalysis. In 1931, after an unsuccessful course of therapy with British analyst Mary Chadwick, H.D. began analysis with Sachs, which ended when he moved to the United States the following year. Sachs and Bryher (who had by the early 1930s donated large funds to Freud’s clinic) arranged for H.D. to continue her analysis with Freud himself, which she began in March 1933, nine months before the end of Close Up.³

The publication of Close Up from 1927 to 1933 is tightly entangled with the editors’ interpersonal relationships and snugly enclosed in their personal involvement with psychoanalysis in the larger historical period from their childhoods to the mid-thirties. The writing about film in Close Up privileges psychological and psychoanalytic

¹ Bryher had previously been married to American editor and author Robert McAlmon, but that other marriage of convenience ended earlier in the year. Bryher and Macpherson also legally adopted H.D.’s daughter, Perdita, who was born in 1919, and the four lived as a family in the Kenwin mansion in Switzerland. H.D. and Macpherson remained lovers through the end of the twenties, but their affair ended shortly after she became pregnant and aborted his child. By the thirties, Macpherson, who had been openly bisexual, turned increasingly to men (see Friedman 567-8).

² I use the English translation of the original German title *Geheimnisse einer Seele*. It has also been translated as Mysteries of the Soul.

³ For further references see Marcus 334n2.

models for understanding film and film form. According to H.D. scholar Susan Stanford Friedman, during H.D.'s analysis with Freud, he became particularly interested in the family life that H.D., Bryher, and Macpherson created for themselves in the 1920s while they lived, made films and published Close Up together:

Psychoanalysis may center on the individual, but behind every person lurks a whole family constellation. "The family romance," Freud calls it in one of his papers--there is a story of entangled desires behind fragments of association in the scene of retellings. As Freud shifted through his parts in the drama of transference with H.D.--from mother to father--there was another family that captured his imagination. That was the unusual ménage in which H.D. lived, a family so different from what his own at least appeared to be, but perhaps not so different from the roiling emotions beneath the surface of the man who had tantalizingly revealed and concealed his own neuroses and mixed desires in the analysis of his dreams in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. H.D.'s oddly configured family and all the loves of her adult life clearly fascinated him--and not just as symbolic replays of earlier desires, but for themselves. In some sense, what she represented was the breakup of the patriarchal nuclear family, the blending of sexual and gender identities, and the growing recognition of the full spectrum of desires that has come to characterize the changing landscape of family life in the twenty-first century. (Friedman xxxi-ii)

Perhaps to Freud, the Close Up ménage represented the disruption of the traditional family dynamics that he had theorized as the basis for human development. And their

modern ménage reflected the more general changes of the modern world, which were represented by new technologies like film. Bryher, who was born in 1894, and Macpherson, who was born in 1903, grew up in this new modern world alongside developing film technologies and psychology. And it is perhaps no surprise that H.D., a bisexual American expatriate born in 1886 in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, to a Moravian artist mother and an astronomer father, was drawn to Bryher and Macpherson and more generally to psychoanalysis. In Tribute to Freud, her memoir of her 1930s analysis with Freud, H.D. states, “I am on the fringes or in the penumbra of the light of my father’s science and my mother’s art--the psychology or philosophy of Sigmund Freud” (145). One wonders how much the Close Up editors’ family life, both childhood and adult, might have influenced their understanding of modern psychology and in turn their conceptualization of film.

Bryher’s psychoanalyst, Hanns Sachs, whom H.D. reports Bryher ‘worshipped’ (H.D. Tribute 141), wrote regularly for Close Up. And Sachs’ writing for the journal revealed his own preoccupations with “the relationship between unconscious and conscious knowledge,” which he suggested could be emphasized by film form (243): “film. . . is ‘revealed as a kind of time-microscope, that is to say shows us clearly and unmistakably things that are to be found in life but that ordinarily escape our notice’” (241-2). In Tribute to Freud, H.D. notes learning something similar from psychoanalysis: “Little things, seemingly unimportant, take precedence. I remember how the Professor said that you never know until the analysis is over what is important and what is unimportant” (148). H.D. describes Freud’s early work with Jean-Martin Charcot

(in the year of H.D.'s birth) at the Salpêtrière, the women's asylum in Paris, in similar terms:

. . .there was the great crowd at large, under observation at the Salpêtrière.

But among the hysterical cases under Charcot's observation and the insane of the young Freud's own private consideration, there were incidents, unnoted or minimized by the various doctors and observers, which yet held matter worth grave consideration. [Freud] noted how the disconnected sequence of the apparently unrelated actions of certain of the patients yet suggested a sort of order, following a pattern like a broken sequence of events in a half-remembered dream. (78)

What H.D. does not mention is that Charcot used time-lapse photography in order to capture images of the women patients and thus more closely observe them: "Using procedures developed by Muybridge and Etienne-Jules Maray, [Albert Londe, the director of Charcot's project] used an electrical timing device to shoot several stills per second, This technique, a forerunner of moving pictures, allowed physicians to capture a patient's symptoms, especially bizarre movements or seizures" (Sklarew 1240). But H.D. does make the connection between Freud's film-like observation or close scrutiny of his patients and the work of dream-interpretation.

Similarly, the magnifying lens becomes an important motif in H.D.'s Tribute to Freud and recurs in terms of H.D.'s relationship to her father and older brother. Her father, who was a professor of astronomy is described as having telescopic vision: "He looked to the heavens," she reports. "He did not know what we wanted when he picked out, with his far-sighted grey eyes, the ten stars of the Dipper or the eight of Orion's

sword-belt. But he knew this satisfied him” (178). And H.D.’s earliest memory of her brother stealing her father’s magnifying glass from his desk in order to burn paper becomes an important subject of analysis with Freud. H.D. associates the magnifying glass with “wit and daring, . . .a love of the unknown, . . .experimentation,” and “as yet unexplainable forces,” likening her brother to Prometheus, who “has drawn down fire from the sky” (25). Furthermore, the glass becomes a symbol for something much larger: “besides being the magnifying glass from our father’s table, [it] is a sacred symbol. It is a circle and the stem of the circle, the stalk or support of this flower, is the handle of the glass that my brother is clasping behind his back. This is the sacred *ankh*, the symbol of life in Egypt. . .” (25). The glass as sacred symbol of experimentation, discovery, and (hidden) life comes to be associated with Freud as father figure as well. H.D. describes one scene of analysis with him:

He will sit there quietly, like an old owl in a tree. He will say nothing at all or he will lean forward and talk about something that is apparently unrelated to the progression or unfolding of the dream-content or thought association. He will shoot out an arm, sometimes somewhat alarmingly, to stress a point. Or he will, always making an ‘occasion’ of it, get up and say, ‘Ah--now--we must celebrate *this*,’ and proceed to the elaborate ritual--selecting, lighting--until finally he seats himself again, while from the niche rises the smoke of burned incense, the smoldering of his mellow, fragrant cigar. (22-3).

Freud is like a filmmaker in this scene, arranging and directing--“selecting, lighting”-- his analysand’s dream or free associations.⁴ He calls the shots as it were, choosing what to scrutinize, blowing it up, stopping it in time before returning to his burning cigar, which is itself linked with the Promethean magnifying glass.⁵

It must also be emphasized that the editors of Close Up were artists and filmmakers as well as aspiring film theorists, and their fixation on the parallel relationship between psychoanalysis and cinema is evident in their creative work of the period. Marcus reports that Macpherson, the journal’s figurehead and official editor, was interested in how psychoanalysis could enlighten the incestuous familiar relationships which preoccupied his fictional works, Gaunt Island and Poolreflection (both published in 1927)--and the editors’ literary and artistic “techniques are in large part modeled on H.D.’s prose writing, with its explorations of mirroring relationships and its palimpsestic ‘superimpositions’ of different times and spaces. These forms had their cinematic counterpart in Macpherson’s POOL films” (240). Thus, not only did the Close Up editors’ involvement with psychoanalysis shape their understanding of film and their own poetics, but it pushed them to experiment with filmmaking in order to push the limit of what film could do and be. Bryher, especially was interested in film’s educational or “developmental” possibilities. As various covers of Close Up attest, Bryher, H.D. and Macpherson wanted their writing on film to shape the cinema: “CLOSE UP, a English review, is the first to approach film from the angles of art, experiment, and possibility”

⁴ In his article, “Film Psychology,” published years before H.D.’s Tribute, in the November 1928 issue of Close Up, Bryher’s analyst, Hanns Sachs also suggests that film work is closely analogous to dream interpretation. This, we shall see in a moment, is at the center of the film Secrets of a Soul, for which Sachs acted as co-consultant with Karl Abraham in 1925.

⁵ I wonder if a connection could be made here to the early film base, cellulose nitrate, which was highly flammable and held the danger of auto-ignition.

(October 1927); “WE WANT BETTER FILMS!!!” (November 1927); and “THE OFFICIAL GUIDE TO BETTER MOVIES! With illustrations from the best films: technical. friendly. informative.” (March 1928).

For Bryher, H.D. and Macpherson, the quintessential model of ‘better movies’ were the films of G.W. Pabst, which “supplied something that struck them as the pinnacle of cinematic achievement: psychological realism” (Friedberg “Intro” 19). Although Susan Stanford Friedman notes that no letters between the Close Up editors and Pabst exist in H.D.’s or Bryher’s papers at Beinecke, Bryher, H.D. and Macpherson regularly invoked Pabst as their ideal in their personal correspondence and in Close Up (Friedman 570). Anne Friedberg notes that “they were totally charmed by him (‘We are both in love with Pabst’)” and they frequently wrote about him and published others’ writing about his work in Close Up: “throughout its publication, Close Up followed Pabst’s career in careful detail. At least sixteen articles were devoted to his film work and issues were generously illustrated with high-quality enamel-stock stills from each Pabst film as it was released” (“Intro” 21; 22). The feeling was apparently mutual: “From the many articles devoted to Pabst in Close Up and from the unpublished correspondence among its editors and writers, it seems that Pabst was also invested heavily in the power of the magazine’s ‘journalists’” (“Intro” 21).

In the December 1927 issue of Close Up, Bryher published her “Survey,” of Pabst’s work in an effort to “decide whether a single film is a happy accident or a link in a chain of achievements; whether there has been retrogression or development” and “to attempt some estimate of the work of G.W. Pabst, whose films have interested me more to date than any others I have seen” (57). Bryher concludes that Pabst, “sees

psychologically and because of this, because in a flash he knows the sub-conscious impulse or hunger that prompted an apparently trivial action, his intense realism becomes its truth, poetry” (60). Over a year later, H.D. in “An Appreciation,” published in the March 1929 issue of Close Up, asserts that Pabst, “holds, as it were, the clue, must hold his position almost as the keystone to the vast aesthetic structure we call now unquestionably the Art of Film” (144). What he holds specifically is the ability to create characters--especially female characters--of psychological depth, as H.D. elaborates on Bryher’s previous statement: “G.W. Pabst is almost a magician, his people are ‘created, not made’[.] There is indeed ‘another side’ to every one of his women, whether it be the impoverished little daughter of post-war Vienna or one of the extras in an orgy scene, each and every one is shown as a ‘being’, a creature of consummate life and power and vitality. G.W. Pabst brings out the vital and vivid forces in women as the sun in flowers” (145). This predates H.D.’s description of the flower-like magnifying glass/ankh mentioned above in connection with H.D.’s brother and Father, and with Freud. The flower/life-force imagery connects Pabst to Freud. In H.D.’s writing, they are parallel figures who see the deeper life of people, especially women, through their work.⁶

What is perhaps even more striking is that despite their interest in the relationship between film and psychoanalysis and their near-apotheosis Pabst, H.D., Bryher, and Macpherson rarely discuss Pabst’s Secrets of a Soul, the most explicitly psychoanalytic of his films, in Close Up or elsewhere. The Close Up editors’ focus is most often on Joyless Street and The Love of Jeanne Nye no doubt because of their appreciation of the

⁶ Although, as feminist critics are aware, Freud’s theories about women were misguided at best, H.D. and Bryher were drawn to his theories and believed psychoanalysis could unlock the mysteries of female repression. Tribute to Freud offers a glimpse into H.D.’s conception or version of Freud. While she clearly took issue with his theories about female sexuality, she also extols her own feminized version of him.

female characters. As Janet Bergstrom attests, Pabst was, “not incidentally, famous as a director of women, such as Asta Nielsen and Greta Garbo. . . and Louise Brooks. . . . He gained a reputation for understanding and portraying feminine psychology as it could be seen during the Weimer period” (166). Although the absence is not total in the literature, it is curious, and thus a closer look at the film itself is warranted. The film takes an actual case history as its subject. Nick Browne and Bruce McPherson provide a synopsis of the narrative in their 1980 article on Secrets:

The film illustrates the case of a couple who are childless yet who want very much to have a child. On the return of the wife’s cousin (Eric) from a long absence abroad, Martin (who is also Eric’s close boyhood friend) suffers the onset of neurotic symptoms in the form of a knife phobia and a compulsion to kill his wife. The phobia incapacitates his daily life and he seeks treatment from a psychoanalyst who, through free association and dream analysis, helps Martin locate an early event from his childhood that is discovered to be the ‘kernel of the neurosis.’ The revelation of his suppressed desires and fears leads to his cure; he resumes his life and becomes a happy father. (37)

As Bergstrom suggests, the only character of any psychological import in Secrets of a Soul is the husband, Martin Fellman. “The wife and her attractive male cousin are important secondary characters, but only through the husband’s dream representations, fantasies and memories. Both of them are central to his cure because they have been causally been related to the origin of his phobia. Their screen presence as ‘real’ characters is negligible” (178). Thus, although the subject of the film is psychoanalysis,

the secondary characters, especially the wife, are “rendered devoid of psychological depth in a way uncharacteristic of Freud or these other films directed by Pabst” (178).

But one might expect the form and structure of Secrets of a Soul to register more strongly in Close Up. For the film’s focus on the family romance, dream analysis, parenthood and etiology parallels the Close Up editors’ interest in psychoanalysis. Browne and McPherson explain that “the narrative form of the film and the treatment of the process of memory determine the film’s dramatic structure” (36). And Anne Friedberg explains that “Secrets can be separated into the following sections: Pre-dream--coincident events that lead up to the nightmare; The Dream; Post-dream--the series of parapraxes which demonstrate the phobia and compulsion; The Analysis; and The Epilogue/ Cure” (“*Unheimlich*” 46). It is important to add that the dream section has its double in the analysis section of the film, where Martin remembers fragments of the previously forgotten nightmare and recounts them to Dr. Orth. Lee Atwell notes that the dream footage, which was so crucial to the film, took six weeks to produce. Without modern equipment and technology such as a modern optical printer, techniques such as superimposing images upon one another had to be done with the camera itself, by rolling film back and reshooting over previous footage (Atwell 42; Chodorkoff and Baxter 320). The repetition of important dream images in the film points to the process of dream interpretation itself as well as to the relationship between the analyst and analysand in psychoanalysis. The analysand’s dream content is not organized into the dream itself until it is recalled by the analysand and interpreted by the analyst. Both the dream and the film are palimpsestic.

And like the dream in the film, which exists in multiple versions and must be reassembled and interpreted by the analyst and analysand, the film itself, Secrets of a Soul, too, exists in multiple versions. As Ira Konigsberg reports, “there exists a “restored print available at the Film Museum in Munich. When I finally was able to view this print, I was struck by a number of important shots, and titles missing from it and available in the Rohauer print--and also impressed by a number of shots in the Munich print not present in either the Rohauer or West-Glen versions. . . We may ultimately have a print that puts together all of the available shots, but I doubt we shall ever know the version exactly the way Pabst released it” (539). Multiple versions of films of this period are not uncommon. And perhaps not all prints retain the important frame of the film which Anne Friedberg’s aforementioned description of the film’s structure leaves out. Martin’s narrative, which begins with pre-dream events and ends with the scene where he takes his place as father in his family is framed by scenes of Dr. Orth writing in his notebook about the case history that is presented in the film. To be more specific, the film opens with a lengthy title explaining the science of psychoanalysis, followed by a close-up on a photograph of Freud, followed by Dr. Orth writing at his desk, presumably writing out the story we are about to see on the screen. The film closes with a return to Dr. Orth writing, “Case History # 326. Martin Fellman. Illness: Knife Phobia,” indicating that the narrative we have just witnessed is an illustration of another job well-done by psychoanalysis.⁷ Konigsberg suggests, “lacking both the author’s presence and any single originary version or verbal text, the film offers instead a play of texts and meanings” (539). This framing device, which may not be present in all versions of the film, may in one sense represent such a play of images and meanings. In other words, the

⁷ See Konigsberg’s discussion of this important framing device (528).

film, which is centrally about a case history of a man whose deep anxiety about becoming a father causes a knife phobia and compulsion to kill his wife, is in a larger sense about the complicated paternity of the film itself.

Adding to the complexity is the fact that film as a product always requires multiple authors. The problem is plain in the production history of Secrets of a Soul, for although Pabst as the director is often given credit as the “author” of the film, he in all actuality came to the project late in the process. Pabst was asked by Hanns Neumann of UFA to direct the film was already written and being supervised by analysts in Freud’s inner circle: “When Pabst began to direct the film, the script had already been written. Hanns Neumann, the producer, and Colin Ross, the writer, had asked Karl Abraham and Hanns Sachs earlier to collaborate on the film script” (Chodorkoff and Baxter 320).⁸ Still, like Dr. Orth, the analyst of the film who holds the key to Martin’s ailment, Pabst is often seen as (in H.D.’s words previously quoted) “the keystone to the vast aesthetic structure” of the film as a work of art. In the film, this metaphor is literalized when Dr. Orth find’s Martin’s keys, which he has left behind at a bar, and follows him home to return them. A title gives us some dialogue in the encounter. In a “trust me, I’m a doctor” moment, Dr. Orth returns Martin’s key to him and tells him, “you have a reason not to enter your house.” Later, when a distraught Martin finally decides to get help from the good doctor, we get a shot of Martin holding his key in his hand superimposed upon an image of Dr. Orth, linking and equating the key and the analyst.

⁸ Chodorkoff and Baxter suggest that Pabst had little to do with the film until very late in production: In 1925 Pabst was asked by UFA to try a unique experiment: produce a psychoanalytic movie. The original impetus came from the architect Erno Metzner, also a noted stage-set designer. Metzner suggested it to the producer, Hanns Neumann, who intended to direct it himself. The documentary department officials at UFA felt Neumann had not had sufficient experience and, impressed with the psychological and social realistic style of Pabst’s “Joyless Street,” asked him to direct “Secrets of a Soul” (319-20).

The aforementioned framing of the film reinforces the notion of the analyst as author who will unlock the secrets of the soul. As Konigsberg suggests, “While we are making, for ourselves, a host of interpretations from the husband’s life and dream, the analyst is creating a very limited and circumscribed story, one that emphasizes his own control over the material and over the husband. The powerful analyst has himself become an author in the act of reading, and the patient for him is a ‘readerly text’ on which to inscribe his own meaning. . .” (541). Thus, as Dr. Orth interprets Martin’s dreams and ‘cures’ him so that he can take his place as husband and father in his family, the doctor inscribes himself as author. And just as Martin must recall the primal scene that created the jealousy (of his cousin who stands in for his father) that prevents him from becoming a father himself, Dr. Orth must recall and take the place of his predecessor, the father of psychoanalysis, Freud, whose image is presented at the beginning of the film never to return again.

The central theme of the film as well as the *production of the film* is the absent father, which always takes us back to the question, who is the author/father of the film? The Close Up editors struggled with this question: Although Bryher propounds a kind of auteur theory in her “Survey” of Pabst--she says, “the ultimate value of a film depends upon its director. He is to it what an author is to a book” (56)--her larger interest in psychoanalysis complicates the issue, for the film authorship is rarely a simple matter. And it is striking that Bryher barely mentions Secrets, a film that is all about authorship and paternity, in her survey. What is even more striking is that Freud, whose photo at the start of the film suggests his paternity, refused to be involved in the film, evidently because he was skeptical of film as a worthy art form. Freud was in general not

interested in film, and although records of his ideas about film are sparse, his letters to Karl Abraham around the time of the production of Secrets indicate his lack of interest in the project: “*My chief objection is still that I do not believe satisfactory plastic representation of our abstractions is at all possible*” (italics Freud’s, qtd. Greenberg 19).⁹ Harvey Roy Greenberg notes that Freud showed little interest in various modern technologies: “one is struck by the lack of reference to telephones, automobiles, radios--the entire jangling paraphernalia of twentieth-century life. Freud’s avoidance of cinema may ultimately reside in his identification with the comforting ethos of the preceding century, and an aversion to a medium identified with the rush and press, the avid technology of modern times, particularly after the debacle of World War 1” (19). But Anne Friedberg among others has suggested another reason for Freud’s aversion to film: “Freud, who sired and literally engendered his theories, was a protective and possessive father. The cinema, polymorphously conceived, a culmination of inventions and marketing strategies on an international scale, was much more promiscuous in its outreach” (Friedberg “*Unheimlich*” 41). According to Friedberg, film in general (and UFA in particular) was still in the early process of legitimating itself as an artform, and Freud was anxious about getting mixed up in a project that might mire psychoanalysis, new science that itself was struggling to retain its legitimacy (42). Chodorkoff and Baxter suggest that Freud was anxious about becoming involved in film because it could discredit the authority of psychoanalysis. Even as Abraham assured Freud that “our influence should extend into every detail in order to avoid anything that might discredit us in any way,” Freud remains skeptical, replying:

⁹ As one of Freud’s few comments on his lack of interest in film, this sentence is quoted in nearly every article on Freud’s connection (or lack thereof) to film.

. . . then it struck me that what these people are willing to pay for is obviously the authorization. That they can get only from us. If they do something completely wild because we refuse, we cannot stop them and are not implicated. After all, we cannot stop anyone from making such a film without obtaining our consent. (323)

Much to Abraham's chagrin, Freud never gave his consent and refused all involvement with the film, and thus the production of the film went on without its authorizing father.

It is interesting, too, that the anxiety at the center of the film is one of paternity. A key scene in the Martin's dream, which gets interpreted in his analysis, shows Martin's wife in a boat with her attractive cousin Eric, Martin's childhood friend who represents the absent father. The wife pulls a baby doll from the water and gives it to Eric. (The scene is shot in reverse--that is, they filmed the actress throwing the doll into the water and then rolled it backwards for the scene--in order to create a more dream-like quality.) Dr. Orth comments that, "dreams of water denote impending or desired birth." Through his analysis, Martin realizes that the image comes from a photograph of Martin, his wife, and Eric as children, which in turn recalls a childhood memory of his wife as a girl giving a baby doll to Eric. Dr. Orth helps him realize that this representation of the primal scene is the key to his phobia and compulsion. Once this memory is recalled, Martin is cured and can go on to sire his own children with his wife. The film ends with an epilogue, as Friedberg calls it, where Martin is fishing in a country pond (denoting impending or desired birth?). All of a sudden he hears the call of his wife, he throws the bucket of fish back into the water, and runs up a hill to where his wife and baby are waiting. He takes the baby from his wife's arms, and they presumably live happily ever after. Friedberg

comments that this ending turns the film into an ad for psychoanalysis--embrace this new science of the soul and you get a happy family and idyllic life (51). This oddly overly-happy ending is very Hollywood and very un-Freudian.¹⁰ Could we read the fishing scene--the body of water and the unknown beneath the surface, or perhaps the throwing back of the multiple fish for the singularly-sired baby--as a metaphor for film and psychoanalysis? If so, it is a metaphor that is complicated and destabilized by the absent father both within and of the film. And how might this relate to Freud's later fascination with H.D., Bryher, and Macpherson's modern ménage and fatherless family?

This returns us to Close Up, which took Pabst, Sachs, and Freud as authors *and* father figures of film and psychoanalysis, but which also, as a forum that allowed for multiple voices to be heard, refused the singular-sire model of creation. If Secrets of a Soul begs the question, who is the father in/of the film, then Close Up asks, what is the nature of the offspring? What is born from the project is new multifarious theory of film based on Freud's psychoanalysis, but more complex, more like the Close Up ménage. As Ann Friedberg suggests in her dissertation on Close Up, the journal sought to describe film at a time when "this 'institution' was not describable as 'fully formulated' and was being challenged on a variety of fronts" (3). She continues, "The journal Close Up, published from 1927-1933, as a pronounced advocate of these three national cinemas [French, Russian, and German], in an exemplary site of aesthetic, economic, ideological and technological questions posed to the 'institution' struggling to form" (4), and concludes, "Close Up never advocated a single direction of development but argued

¹⁰ Freud, according to Paul Roazen, "had a predominantly grim, stoic outlook on Mankind. . . He was skeptically convinced that humanity was capable of doing some terrible things. His whole concept of the unconscious, which he made so central to all psychology, hinged on the presence in each of us of a kind of hellishness" (24).

instead for alternatives to existing forms of cinematic style, production, and consumption of films” (328).

Bibliography:

Atwell, Lee. G.W. Pabst. Boston, Twain, 1977.

Bergstrom, Janet. "Psychological Explanation in the Films of Lang and Pabst." Psychoanalysis & Cinema. Ed. E. Ann Kaplan. New York : Routledge, 1990. 163-80.

Brown, Nick and Bruce McPherson. "Dream and Photography in a Psychoanalytic Film: Secrets of a Soul." Dreamworks: An Interdisciplinary Journal. Dream and Film. 1.1 (Spring 1980): 35-45.

Bryher. "G.W. Pabst: A Survey." Close Up. 1.6 (December 1927): 56-61.

Chodorkoff, Bernard and Seymour Baxter. "Secrets of a Soul: An Early Psychoanalytic Film Venture." American Imago. 31.4 (Winter 1974): 319-34.

Donald, James, Anne Friedberg, and Laura Marcus, eds. Close Up 1927-1933: Cinema and Modernism. Princeton, Princeton UP, 1998.

Friedberg, Anne. "An *Unheimlich* Maneuver between Psychoanalysis and Cinema: Secrets of a Soul (1926)." The Films of G.W. Pabst: An Extraterritorial Cinema. Ed. Eric Rentschler. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers UP, 1990.

---. "Introduction." Donald, Friedberg, and Marcus. 1-27.

---. Writing About Cinema: Close Up 1927-1933. Dissertation. New York University, 1983.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. Analyzing Freud: Letters of H.D., Bryher, and Their Circle. New York: New Directions, 2002.

Greenberg, Harvey Roy. "Reel Significations: An Anatomy of Psychoanalytic Film Criticism." Screen Memories : Hollywood Cinema on the Psychoanalytic Couch. New York: Columbia UP 1993. 13-37.

H.D. "An Appreciation." Donald, Friedman, and Marcus. 139-48.

---. Tribute to Freud. New York: New Directions, 1984.

Holland, Norman N. Holland's Guide to Psychoanalytic Psychology and Literature-and-Psychology. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.

Konigsberg, Ira . "Cinema, Psychoanalysis, and Hermeneutics: G.W. Pabst's "Secrets of a Soul." Michigan Quarterly Review. 34.4 (1995): 518-547.

Marcus, Laura. "Introduction to Part 6: Cinema and Psychoanalysis." Donald, Friedberg and Marcus. 240-6.

McCabe, Susan. Cinematic Modernism: Modernist Poetry and Film. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Pabst, G.W. Secrets of a Soul. Ufa, 1926.

Roazen, Paul. Historiography of Psychoanalysis. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 2001.

Sklarew, Bruce. "Freud and Film: Encounters in the *Weltgeist*" Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association. 47.4: 1238-47.