Unconventional Story-weavers and their "Ecstatic Truth": An analysis of voice-overs in documentary film

Aurora Drummer

DRMAUR001

A dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Arts in Film Studies

Centre for Film and Media Studies

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

February 2014

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature:_____Date:_____

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This dissertation takes theories of voice-over narration that are typically applied to fiction film and applies them to documentary film. It looks at issues of representation and truth-values in the documentary films of Werner Herzog, John Marshall, Luis Buñuel and Karin Jurshcick. It argues that the choices filmmakers make regarding types of voice-over affect these issues and are therefore worthy of study. It argues that the unconventional story-weavers in documentaries like those of Marshall and Herzog's can inadvertently marginalise their subjects. It looks at Buñuel's *Land Without Bread* as an extreme example of an (intentionally) manipulative narrator. It suggests that a voice-over narrator that follows Chion's conceptualisation of the complete acousmêtre encourages audiences to engage on a more critical level. Finally, it argues that even a seemingly traditional narrator as seen in Jurshick's*It Should Have Been Nice After That* can be unconventional and reveal an ~~–e~~cstatic truth".

Special Thanks

The production of this work would have not been possible without a few special people.Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Lauren van Vuurenfor guiding me through this process and introducing me to valuable information, particularly in finding *It Should Have Been Nice After That*. I would like to thank my parents, Edward Drummer and Kathy Watters, for their financial and emotional support throughout the past three years. I would like to thank Matthew Jones for important library sessions and in his help in developing my ideas. Finally, I would like to thank Daniel Brownell for attempting to hold my brain together when it threatened to implode.

–Only in this state of sublimity does something deeper become possible, a kind of truth that is the enemy of the merely factual. Ecstatic truth, I call it." (Herzog, 2010)

Introduction

Voice-over in documentary film is an under-researched topic. Two of the major authors in analysis of voice-over in cinema, Sarah Kozloff and Michel Chion, focus only on fiction film. This seems strange, as the disembodied voice in documentary is often viewed as a commonplace tool in the traditional documentary. However, it is perhaps this very reason that makes theorists shy away from discussing the voice-over in documentary filmmaking. Voice-over in narrative film is somewhat rare, so its inclusion is a seen as point to be studied. It is less rare in documentary film; therefore it is not seen as worthy of study. This sort of rationalisation, however, denies the varying effects voice-over can have on a film. Including voice-over is *always* a choice. Once that choice has been made, whether it is sub-conscious or not, a variety of choices must still be made by the filmmakers. From the gender of the voice, to a multi-vocal perspective, choices made by the filmmakers affect the final effect of the film. In this study, I will look at the varying effects that different types of story-weavers have on their respective documentary films. In this dissertation, I will therefore address the question: "What choices in voice-over are available to documentary film-makers (from the decision to use voice-over to the language used in the voice) and how do these choices affect the truth values and issues of representation of the final films?"

In order to address this question, I will first examine the existing literature on voice-over in documentary film, particularly that of David Bordwell, Michel Chion, Mary Ann Doane and Sarah Kozloff. I will then develop a theoretical frame-work through which to gauge the work of several documentary film-makers who use voice-over in unusual manners, namely John Marshall, Luis Buñuel, Werner Herzog, and Karin Jurschick.

While it is commonly said that all journeys start with a single step, our journey will have to start with a few definitions. If I am to investigate how truth-values are affected by the presence of a non-traditional voice-over in a documentary film then it is important to be quite clear in what we mean by "documentary". Godmilow and Shapiro (1997: 81) argue that documentary is a term of convenience and that it implies a "conceit of the real". In other words, by merely using the term "documentary" we imply that the film asserts itself to be true, even though it may not be. "Non-fiction", too, they argue is classifying

something by what it is not, creating a strange, false, dichotomy between false fiction films, and true non-fiction film. It implies that fiction films cannot have truth, and that non-fiction films cannot have falsities. They prefer to define it as, "everything but scripted drama". For the purposes of this study, I find it best to use the term "documentary" in its loosest sense, that is, in its indexical quality. If a film is often referred to as a documentary (by the production team, by the reviewers, by the populace at large) then it will remain, for the purposes of this discussion, a "documentary". How this indexical system is constructed, whether it is at all relevant, or if it is even needed, is a topic for another time. It is important to this discussion to view documentaries as people see them.

This is important because I am going to investigate how different uses of voice-over narration affect the truth-values, gender politics, and identity in the documentary. I shall be investigating how these values change when told under the leadership of a voice-over that deviates from the norms of a traditional voice-of-God narrator. It is therefore not important here to discuss what makes a documentary a documentary. We only need to know that it is indexed as a documentary. If its viewers perceive the film as documentary then said viewers could judge it as a documentary.

This is Plantinga's (2005) account of the documentary. He characterises the documentary as having "asserted veridical representation" (Plantinga, 2005: 110). This means that we expect that the documentary filmmaker represents, and claims to represent, the visuals in a truthful manner. Plantinga indicates that while the filmmaker could seemingly follow strict protocols for veridical representation, it does not mean that the filmmaker has *actually* followed these protocols. This matter will be discussed further in Chapter Three, with regards to Bunuel's *Land without Bread* (1933). However, labelling a film as a documentary gives it this asserted veridical representation whether it has it or not.

We must also be clear, as Kozloff argues, to distinguish between the creator of the film, and the narrator himself (seldom a "herself). "Filmmaker" tends to imply a purely functional role in the creation of the work and this common usage may belie the specific way in which I intend to use the term. Therefore,following Kozloff (1988),I call upon Metz's "grand image-maker" (1974: 21) to signify the idea of the creative source rather than the functional team that actually creates the film. The voice-over narrator, instead,

would be the physical voice that is heard in the cinema, which may be unrelated to the image-maker.

Bordwell (1985) argues that the concept of an image-maker is superfluous. He argues that narration is best conceived of as a set of cues found in the text that is then constructed into a story. We like to think of a constructor, however, to paraphrase Bordwell, so we then project an author onto those cues. Kozloff (1986) argues against his approach, by pointing out that if a set of cues is present in the narrative then someone must have put them there. Therefore, while I will not fully embrace Bordwell‘s approach, I will recognise that the image-maker could take on attributes that the actual creator(s) do(es) not possess. One could take an alternative reading of a text that the author did not intend, and falsely attribute this intention to the author. When I use the term ―image-maker”, I will thus not only use it to signify the filmmaker‘s intentions, but also their perceived intentions, unless specifically stated otherwise.

There is next the seemingly simple task of defining voice-over. The name would imply that it is simply a voice that occurs over film. However, such a loose definition would include diegetic dialogue, as the soundtrack plays ―over” the image track. However, ―over”, as Kozloff (1988: 3) argues, implies ―more than screen-absence”, and that it suggests that the voice originates from a different time and place from the recorded image. ―Over”, Kozloff argues, implies some sort of hierarchy, or dominance ―over” the image, that the simple ―voice-off” (a voice originating from off-screen) does not possess. Doane (1980), in contrast argues that both ―voice-off” and ―voice-over” suggest a hierarchy between sound and the image. We define the voice by how it relates to the image, which either suggests an existing hierarchy, or helps create one.

Doane (1980) argues that ―the screen is given precedence over the acoustical space of the theater [sic]― the screen is posited as the site of the spectacle's unfolding and all sounds must emanate from it”. This suggests that the hierarchy of sound and image is founded on the fundamental fact that the speaker is placed behind the screen. However, we know now that this is not such a fundamental fact. While surround sound was first introduced with *Fantasia* (1940/Ferguson), it was deemed a failure, and was only seriously used for the first time in *Apocalypse Now* (1979/Coppola). It is likely that at the time of writing, Doane was not aware of these new technological innovations, and neither was Baible (1978 in Doane, 1980: 38), when he asked, ―What would be, in effect, a voice-off which

came from the back of the theater? [sic] Poor little screen…". His statement now seems laughable, as many non-diegetic sound elements arise from all areas of the cinematic space and even from surround sound systems in homes. A voice-off originating from behind does diminish the power of the screen — ~~"p~~oor little screen", but only in that it heightens the power of the voice. This new technology in fact supports Doane's (1980: 39) thesis that the image is not ~~"u~~ninflected by sound", and that the hierarchy is not as oppressive as suggested by the names given to ~~"v~~oice-off" and ~~"v~~oice-over". When an audience member hears a voice that originates from behind them, this voice will hold greater power than one that originates from behind the screen.

Furthermore, for the most part, this study will look only at ~~"~~voice-over narration", as our story-weavers guide us through the documentary. Narration can occur in many guises, but this study will concentrate on when it is revealed through a voice-over. This definition therefore denies the inclusion of the visible narrator, such as in *The Rocky Horror Picture Show* (1975/Sharman), as there the voice at least appears to have been recorded at the same time as the image-track. Also not included is narration that is presented through title-cards. I am specifically referring to sceneswherein a voice is applied over an image track. We thus have, as Kozloff (1988) explains, both an internal image and sound track, and a narration that is layered over this.

The voice-over that does not belong to the diegesis at all, but merely comments on it, is the one that we are perhaps most familiar with. The disembodied voice draws our attention to the fact that we are watching a film. The quality of the voice-over, too — the ~~"c~~ontinuous-level, low-reverb sound track comforts the audience with the notion that the banquet" is meant for us (Altman in Kozloff, 2000: 121), breaking with any notions of reality we had. This voice, Doane (1980) argues, occupies a privileged space in which it is free to interpret the image as the ~~"o~~thering" of the voice gives it power. We assume omniscience and honesty from it.

Most of the literature that exists on voice-over, as I have indicated, is limited to discussions of fiction film. However, these works can provide a foundation for the discussion on documentary, as I will do in this dissertation. Sarah Kozloff is one of the few theorists to argue that our image-centred approach to filmmaking is abstruse. As she shows, voice and image are obviously different sign systems and can and should present different types of information. I remember clearly being told in multiple

filmmakinglectures to show the audience something, rather than tell the audience. Show the man take off his wedding ring rather than have a voice-over say, ~~–~~Mike is cheating on his wife".

This preference for showing, rather than telling seems strange. As Mitchell in Kozloff (1988) argues, images were typically aligned with the feminine, while text was aligned with masculinity. Images were seen as sensual while words were seen as objective. We see a confusing flip in documentary film, where images are thought to be truthful, while words are thought to bring in a bias and oversimplify things. Furthermore, in film in general, words are seen as something to be avoided. Altman (1980) in Kozloff (1988: 9) argues that this ~~–~~primacy of the image", or bias towards the image, perhaps stems from a fear of becoming too much like the theatre, thus losing that special magical quality associated with the cinema. Film, she continues, is meant to be for the masses, whereas theatre is associated with the upper classes. Therefore there is a tendency in film to avoid unnecessary words.

Kozloff's claims, however, show that this is not always the ideal case.When it comes to a mundane fact, character development, or even story development, showing rather than telling may be the preferred medium of choice, but there are certain elements that cannot be conveyed through images alone. Kozloff reminds us of Saussure who argues that it is the signified that determines what kind of signifier should be used. This suggests that certain signs (such as ideas and informations) can only be conveyed through certain types of signs. For example, Kozloff argues how concepts such as generalisations and emphasis on repeated actions are best and most adeptly described by a narrator. There are many other examples where a narrator is greater at conveying information than images or dialogue.

Some have argued that narration in documentary can be redundant. It sometimes only explains what we are shown on screen, so the argument goes, and could be absent in its entirety. However, as both Chion (1999) and Kozloff (1988) argue, there really is little redundancy that can occur when two different sign systems overlap. To paraphrase, Chion argues that when we are told that there are ~~–~~three aeroplanes are on the screen" we notice that there are *three* aeroplanes. When the narrator says it, ~~–~~Is a sunny day for flying," we will notice the weather conditions, and may not count the number of planes.

The redundancy emphasises a certain element of the image, and forces our attention and interpretation in a certain manner. Kozloff also indicates how overlapping both images and narration can highlight the significance of a scene. A random shot of three planes may not be interesting, but when the narrator draws our attention to it, we may begin to realise its importance.

However, this may lead to the typical complaint against the narrator, that a "caption" restricts the image's polysemy (multiple interpretations) to only one (or fewer) interpretation(s) (Barthes,1977). If we argue that the narrator is not redundant in pointing out the planes, then we are definitely suggesting that the audience is no longer free to interpret it in their own way. However, Kozloff argues that this is not necessarily completely correct. While the voice-over may anchor the image, the image, in its way, also anchors the voice. Are the aeroplanes red? Are they flying in turbulent conditions? The voice-over does not tell us this, it merely summarises the scene. It is the image that provides us with this visual description. The image, thus, also captions the voice, just as much as the voice captions the image.

However, the presence of voice-over narration in a fictional film should, in theory, alert the audience to its fictional nature. Mary Ann Doane (1980) argues that the voice-off "threatens to expose the 'material heterogeneity' of the cinema", while synchronous, simultaneous sound does not. In other words, Doane suggests that the viewer of cinema is not aware that film is multi-faceted; that it is made up of both a visual track and a soundtrack, and it does not simply just occur. This 'heterogeneity' should be revealed by the voice-off, because it is a non-diegetic element that has no place in the film's diegesis. Doane (1980) defines three spaces of the cinema to explain how the voice-off does not break the audience's involvement with the narrative. The three spaces of the cinema, according to Doane, are, firstly, the diegesis of the film story itself, the internal world of which we are allowed to glimpse. Secondly, there is the screen upon which the film is projected, and thirdly we have the acoustical space of the theatre itself. This third space is not located to a specific boundary point, as the sound is accessible from all parts of the room. Doane argues that it is generally the goal of narrative cinema to "deny the existence" of the latter two spaces (1980: 40). Doane argues that when a character looks at the audience, it acts against this goal by bringing our attention to the presence of the second space, drawing us out of the narrative's diegesis. Similarly, she argues that when a character's voice is not linked to the diegesis, this can too break our suspension of

disbelief. However, the voice-off is generally linked to a body within the film, and its presence in the ~~"a~~coustical space of the theatre" helps to join these three spaces into one (Doane, 1980: 39). The presence of surround sound also helps to join these spaces into one. Doane (1980: 38) suggests that:

> The placement of the speaker behind the screen simply confirms the fact that the cinematic apparatus is designed to promote the impression of a homogeneous space — the senses of the fantasmatic body cannot be split.

However, the placement of speakers around the space of the theatre actually serves this purpose to a greater extent. Surround sound further works to join these spaces, as the origin of the sound can now be located in a space to the side of, or behind the audience. However, it is important to note that surround sound is designed to promote ~~"t~~he impression of a homogenous space". Just as we cannot see behind us, but we can hear behind us, surround sound is designed to copy the auditory and visual experience of an individual moving through space. A bungled setting up of a home surround sound system has surely resulted in confusion from its audience. When sound is designed to originate from behind the viewer and it instead originates from in front of the viewer, this*would* threaten to reveal the homogeneity of the cinematic space. Therefore, it is with careful sound design that voice-offs function in surround soundscapes, linking together the three spaces of the cinema in a stronger manner than in the days of Doane.

However, the voice-over should be even more disturbing to the illusion of cinema's homegeneity than the mere voice-off, as it is an entirely non-diegetic sound with no recognisable origin in the imagery presented to the audience. As Doane (1980) argues, we do not see the source of the sound (by the very definition of the term), nor do we expect to see it (as we may from off-screen sound).

Much like the ever present non-diegetic musical accompaniment to dramatic cinema, the voice-over does not quite seem to break the verisimilitude of the film world in the way that, perhaps, a direct address may. It is part of our cinematic knowledge, part of our joint cultural understanding of how cinema works. The voice-over narrator is a convention of the documentary film.

There is also the possibility that our acceptance of voice-over narrators stem from the tradition of the oral storyteller, or the maternal (or paternal) voice lulling us into story-land. Many films only begin and end with a narrator, such as *No Country for Old Men*

(2007/Coen Brothers). This voice-over that starts and ends the film therefore bridges the gap between the fantastical and our reality. Their voice brings us to the story and it ends by bringing us back to reality.

However, we tend to imagine a physical presence for this disembodied voice. We perceive the storyteller as a person. This might explain why the voice-over is not able to move freely through our cinematic soundscape. One would not expect a voice-over to ~~r~~un" in circles through multiple speakers, but typically have one source of origin, typically at the front of the theatre. This could be explained through convention, but another solution presents itself.

Doane's (1980) answer to the inclusion of the voice-off in traditional cinema can also explain the inclusion of the voice-over. Doane, following Bonitzer, argues that it is because film often ~~e~~xploits the marginal anxiety connected with the voice-off within its dramatic framework" (Doane, 1980: 41). The voice-off occupies a strange space and so it is intentionally used as such within the film itself. The voice-over, Doane argues, is unlike the voice-off in that it is not localisable, and ~~e~~annot be yoked to a body" (1980:41) and it is this disembodied quality that grants it the power to interpret the image. The quality of the voice-over, too — the ~~e~~ontinuous-level, low-reverb sound track comforts the audience with the notion that the banquet" is meant for us (Altman in Kozloff, 2000: 121), breaking with any notions of reality we had. Doane suggests that the voice-over does not help to maintain the homogeneity of the three cinematic spaces, but that it rather exists outside of these spaces and speaks directly to the audience, working with the audience to interpret the image (1980: 42). This helps to explain how one does not expect voice-over narration to originate from multiple directions, but from a singular, directional source.

We can have unusual narrators in documentary film that function outside of standard documentary conventions. They can draw attention to their constructed states, reveal non-perfect knowledge and laugh at themselves. This may break the verisimilitude of the film world, but this is not such an important concern when it comes to making documentary film. Firstly, the documentary maker's goal is seldom to lull the viewer into a world of make-believe, wherein the suspension of disbelief is important to remain interested. We are meant to believe that what we are watching is real, that we are being offered a piece of social history, not a constructed, continuous region of time and space. Secondly, it may

be important to draw the audience‘s attention to the fact that they are watching a film. In order to encourage action, one must not be lulled into a state of narrative causality and perfect conclusions. In contrast to the requirements of a traditional fictional narrator, this narrator can be ironic, inconsistent and have us doubt them, without necessarily disrupting (perhaps even encouraging) the purpose of the film.

However, in a documentary film where there is no central —thesis statement", no desire to spur on action in the state of the viewer, then the typical purpose of the film is to convey information to the viewer. In this case, one would assume that the narrator should impart his (or, in rare cases, her) knowledge to the viewer with clear impartiality. The narrator will relay information to us in a *The March of Time* (1931-45), voice-of-God-like manner. Abrams, Booth, Chatman, Genette, Scholes, Kellog and Stanzel (in Kozloff, 1988: 80) define the omniscient narrator as one that knows much more than the characters in the film know. Knowing all, as Chatman indicates, is not the same as telling all. We can have a narrator who knows everything but chooses not to reveal some details.

However, we can only really expect this omniscience from a narrator located within a fiction film. Blessed with the perfect knowledge imparted upon him (or her) by the script-writer/s, he (or she) is able to know everything. In documentary film we cannot expect the narrator, or the author of her (or his) words, to be blessed with true omniscient knowledge. This would need knowledge of the script of the world, whose author is unfortunately currently unavailable for comment. If a documentary narrator had true omniscience, then there would certainly be no need for philosophy, science, anthropologists, or even psychics, because our grand narrator would be able to provide us with all of the answers. Narrowing these unrealistic expectations to within the realms immediate knowledge of the film making process, there are multiple versions of truth, and it is not something that one person can decide. Presenting information as legitimate, undeniable truth is a strange falsity.

It is the filmmaker‘s intention that the viewer takes —what is presented as asserted veridical representation" (Plantinga, 2005; 114) that is relevant here. While the voice-over narrator cannot be truly omniscient, various techniques can be undertaken by the image-maker to convince the audience that the voice-over narrator is omniscient. Examples of this, such as in *The Hunters* and*Las Hurdes*, will follow in Chapters Two and Four respectively.

In deciding to use a narrator, we can enforce a sort of linear storytelling that, as MacDougall argues, "go[es] against the grain of a way of thinking that is fundamentally multidirectional in recognising the different manifestations of objects and events" (1998; 145). Chion (1999) argues that we perceive sound with greater temporal continuity than we do sight. A sound bridge neatly ties shots and sequences together. He (1999: 44) describes Bergman's (1966) *Persona's* opening sequence with and without sound. With sound, we see a continuous action; without it, we see three separate shots. A voice-over can act with even more power than a mere sound clip or musical arrangement, given, again according to Chion, the voco-centrism of cinema. When we listen to a film, the voice is far more present than the sound effects or background noise. We foreground the voice as most important. Kozloff cites sound editor Norvel Crutcher – "The dialogue – that's what we go to the movies for" (2000: 119). While Crutcher may have been slightly simplistic in his dismissal of the rest of the cinematic soundscape, my personal anecdotal experiences suggest that he is right in suggesting that audiences tend to consciously focus on the voice, and it is the dialogue that they remember and recite.

Voice-over thus can function as part of a linear system of editing, giving temporal (and perhaps intellectual) continuity to separate shots. The Soviet filmmakers once argued that, "to use sound as [naturalistic speech] will destroy the culture of montage" (in Chion, 1999: 12). However, Eisenstein finally accepted that the "world fragmented by analysis falls back again into a whole" with sound (1987: 171). As I have argued, this is particularly true with voice-over.

Chapter Outlines

Werner Herzog is an incredibly successful filmmaker. His films are beloved by critics, and his documentary films have sometimes received theatrical releases. He is also a prolific filmmaker, in both fiction and documentary film. However, he maintains that his films should not be categorised as such, and just claims that he makes films, without categorisation. His films are also notable in their use of voice-over. These various qualities make an analysis of his work particularly pertinent to the needs of this thesis. He has also tackled the same subject matter in both documentary and narrative cinema, which makes for an interesting entry point into this analysis.

He made two films about Dieter Dengler. The first, *Little Dieter Needs to Fly*(1997/Herzog), generally referred to as a documentary, uses a large amount of voice-over. The second, an acted film, *Rescue Dawn*(2006/Herzog), has no voice-over, and one intertitle at the start of the film. While this may indicate the need for voice-over in documentary, this is not the case. Firstly, Herzog made a choice to include voice-over in his film. Secondly, he chose when to speak and what to say. Herzog's narration is often unreliable and ironic, and his voice is tinged with elements of corporeality. His accent and humour marks him as a character, a ~~"p~~ersonality". Despite these qualities, he is often perceived as an extraordinarilypersuasive voice-over narrator, and he is almost worshipped by his fans.

In Chapter One, I will suggest that it is Herzog's foot-in-the-door quality that endears him to his audience. Furthermore, this quality makes him into what Chion calls a ~~"c~~omplete*acousmêtre"*. Chion defines a complete acousmêtre as a voice that we do not see, but that is linked to the diegesis. Herzog's power, I shall argue, lies in this acousmatic quality. This argument will continue into Chapter Four, when I argue that this acousmatic quality only emerges in his later films, and that it is this quality that allows the freedom to produce ~~"e~~cstatic truth", without compromising the integrity of his subjects. I shall also argue in Chapter One that the differences between the voice-over in the documentary version of Dengler's life, and the voice-over-less scripted drama of *Rescue Dawn* are not as dissimilar as they appear. In *Little Dieter*, both Dengler and Herzog narrate the story. I will use MacCabe's narrative theory to argue that Dengler and Herzog both narrate the film as character and as image-maker, and that this is echoed in the film through mimetic narration. While the films both feature similar narration, the documentary film uses voice-over whereas the acted film does not. This ultimately suggests that even though Herzog is disinclined to categorise his films, he still uses traditional tools in their creation.

Chapter Two will look at a rather different sort of filmmaker, John Marshall. The chapter will demonstrate the differences between two ethnographic films, made about the same group of people by the same director, but separated by thirteen years.These films are *The Hunters* (1957) and *N!ai: The Story of a !Kung Woman* (1980).While the films are handled in rather different manners, particularly noticeable is the difference in the use of

voice-over in the two films. This makes these films particularly useful to this study, as one can see how different choices in the use of voice-over can affect interpretations of the subject matter.I will argue that *The Hunters* is reduced to a linear perspective through its use of a framing, heterodiegetic narrator that is conflated with the status of filmmaker. I will argue that *N!ai*reduces this linearity somewhat by introducing both N!ai and Marshall as narrators. However, I shall argue that Marshall still functions in much the same way as he did in *The Hunters*, as the ultimate authority, whereas N!ai is reduced to the status of an embedded narrator. I shall argue that N!ai‘s authority is further taken away as a narrator because her voice is replaced with another woman‘s voice, that of Letta Mbulu. I will argue that this, coupled with her status as embedded, homodiegetic narrator, lessens the effect of the two narrators in the film. Finally, I shall argue that the film places a false confidence in the authority of Mbulu‘s voice, and that this methodology would make it possible for anything to be attributed to N!ai.

In Chapter Three, I shall look at an altogether different sort of film, but one that is crucial to understanding the power that voice-over can have in documentary film. Buñuel‘s *Land Without Bread* (1933) intentionally deceives its audience by posing as a documentary. I will argue that Buñuelintentionally uses fundamental tools of the ethnographic film in order to cause his audiences to doubt in their trust of narrators, and of the methods of ethnographic film in general. The film uses a commentator-acousmêtre, as defined by Chion (1999), to convince the audience of its authority, and uses clever juxtaposition in the editing to convince the audience of falsehood. Unlike many readings of the film, I will review multiple versions of the film, and conceptualise them as a singular body of work. Due to the film‘s complicated production history, I will demonstrate how each of these versions demonstrates a slightly different interpretation of the events shown in the film, and that one‘s reading of the film is tempered by one‘s linguistic abilities and temporal location.

Chapter Four will return to Herzog‘s works, except this time to present a small history of his body of works in the ~~“d~~ocumentary” mode. Primarily, the chapter focuses on Herzog‘s appropriation of speech from his subjects. Herzog‘s journey as an *auteur* is useful to the discussion of choices in documentary film. I will therefore analyse two films from his earlier works, namely *Land of Silence and Darkness* (1971/Herzog) and *Fata Morgana* (1971/Herzog), and three films from his later works, namely *White Diamond*

(2004/Herzog), *Little Dieter*, and *Wheel of Time* (2003/Herzog).I willargue that his more traditional role as voice-over narrator in the earlierfilms means that we are more likely to take his commentary at face-value, and that this is problematic when one considers his flexibility with the truth. I will argue that he often limits the way in which his subjects are able to express themselves by speaking over them or by writing dialogue for them. I shall argue that while his later films show even more control over the narrative, he reveals his personality through his voice-over and this allows us to engage with his films with a more critical eye. However, I shall also show that the mute native characters in *Little Dieter* seem to stand in to bolster Dieter‘s story and that they are reduced to props.

Chapter Five offers a female documentary filmmaker‘s take on the personal documentary. Karin Jurschick‘s film *It Should Have Been Nice After That* (2001) is offered as an alternative to the problems outlined in the appropriation of voices presented in the previous chapters. Like N!ai, her voice is present as both voice-over narrator and character in the film, but unlike N!ai, she is not dubbed, even though she speaks in German at all times. I shall argue that while she presents as a voice-of-God narrator, her detachment in voice-over is indicative of the detachment she feels in the rest of the film. This is evidenced through her use of third person, and wide-angle lenses, and personal testimony. The effect of subtitles will also be demonstrated, by utilising MacDougall‘s conceptualisation that the subtitles emphasise the verbal content of the film. I shall argue that the non-verbal sequences thus add to the sense of detachment in the film, through an addition of tension. The film serves as a counterexample to show that a disembodied, detached narrator can be a *stylistic choice* that suits the emotional content of the film.

There are many different kinds of voice-over narrators, and the type of narrator chosen by the filmmaker can affect the truth-values of the documentary, as well as other greater social or political concerns. In the following discussion I shall explore a few of these styles.

Chapter One: Voice-over in Documentary and Fiction: An Case Study of *Little Dieter* and *Rescue Dawn*

‗It's just a question of authenticity and credibility. I don't care whether my accent is a German accent or not, I can make myself understood.'

-- Werner Herzog (in Walters 2007)

In the films of Werner Herzog, the distinction between reality and fiction is blurred. His fiction films have elements of truth; his non-fiction films have elements of fiction. Elsaesser argues that in Herzog's films, a fiction "intermittently rises from a documentary flow". The image hovers between the "possibilities of precise meaning and obscure allusion" (1989: 2). Actors are made to suffer in order to portray suffering and subjects of documentary films are told to tell "lies" in order for truths to come across. Herzog's voice permeates through the images, undoubtedly allowing his soothing, melodic, rhythmic voice to guide the audience through his journey. *Rescue Dawn* (2006) and *Little Dieter Needs to Fly* (1997, hereafter referred to as *Little Dieter*) are both films of his creation about Dieter Dengler. Dengler crashed in Laos during the Vietnam War, and became a prisoner of war. Originally from Germany, Dengler came to America to join the airforce because Germany did not have an airforce. *Little Dieter* focuses on his dream of flying, his past, and his torture as a prisoner of war. *Rescue Dawn* primarily focuses on the torture, his life immediately before this, and his eventual rescue after twenty-three days on the run.

Fundamentally, this chapter will serve as a case study of narration in documentary and narrative cinema. It will also introduce the concepts of Herzog's "ecstatic truth", and Chion's (1999) acousmêtre, both of which will be further developed in Chapter Four. I shall argue that for all Herzog's protestations that his films should not be categorised, his preference for voice-over narration in documentary film shows a tendency for traditional forms of documentary filmmaking in his "documentaries". This chapter will explore narration through what Bordwell (1985) has referred to as diegetic and mimetic theories of narration. I shall argue that *Little Dieter* and *Rescue Dawn* both feature similar types of narration, but that *Little Dieter* has diegetic narration, whereas *Rescue Dawn* has mimetic narration. Dengler and Herzog both function as story-weavers in both films. Dengler is a character in both films, and I will argue that he provides character narration in both films.

I shall do this by using MacCabe‘s (1974 and 1978) narrative theory to categorise Dengler as ―object-language”, and show how he provides narration in both films in this manner. I will argue that Herzog provides narration through MacCabe‘s ―meta-language” in both films. However, I shall also argue that the distinction between these two modes is *always* blurred, but that it is particularly true in *Little Dieter* because of Herzog‘s acousmatic qualities. However, before this is possible, I need to allocate the films into categories of fiction and documentary, and explain why they are relevant distinctions to make when analysing the films.

Rescue Dawn, whichI shall call a ―fiction” film for now, stars Christian Bale as Dengler and features no narration at all. In the film, Bale reportedly ate real maggots in order to emphasise the action. He also is said to have exclaimed, ―I am not going to feckin' die for you, Werner!” when his safety in his rescue by helicopter scene was in jeopardy (Zalewski, 2006). While the scenes in the film were constructed, some of the scenes had elements of reality in them.

Little Dieter, which is at the very least indexed as a ―documentary” film, despite Herzog‘s protestations, has elements of fiction in it. Dengler‘s opening and closing of the door at the beginning of the film is entirely constructed by Herzog (Winter 2007). Winter also indicates that Herzog entirely created Dengler‘s description of death as a jellyfish swimming. Key moments that are meant to represent this character are thus falsified, to an extent.

Simon Amstell (in Brown 2012), a comedian, tells a story of how he once performed a set where he was not announced as a comedian. As his humour is incredibly self-deprecating, it appeared to the audience, who had never heard of him, to just be a very sad man, telling his story. He told the audience that people typically laughed at these things, and they requested that instead they just bring on the music. Similarly, it is important when a film is indexed as a documentary, because, like Amstell‘s jokes, we generally receive the film differently when we are told what kind of film it is. One‘s reaction to a film like *Shooting Bokkie* (De Mezieres and Riz, 2003), where a young child tells his life as a runner for gangs and shoots people on camera, or *Man Bites Dog* (Belvaux et. al, 1992), where a film crew gets too involved in the life of a serial killer, is ultimately changed when we know that they are not supposed to be true. If one watches either of these films with no

prior knowledge, believing them to be ―documentaries", then one's reaction to them will change. Instead of encouraging the viewer to question the moral responsibility of filmmakers, the viewer may actually be outraged at the lack of moral responsibility of the filmmakers (particularly in *Man Bites Dog*, where the filmmakers actively participate in the violence). Similarly, when we are presented with a film we believe to be a documentary, we follow in the belief that most of what we see at least contains an essence of the truth. Audiencesare generally visually educated enough to know that a re-enactment is not a filming of a live event, and that facts may have been manipulated slightly. However, we are likely to trust that someone telling their own story, live, in front of the camera, is doing just that — telling their story. While we could conceive of the fact that they may have been led into a certain way of speaking, or telling a specific story, we tend to think that they would only reveal truths, even if they are coerced truths.

However, Grierson (1932), in defining the documentary, spoke of it as the ―creative treatment of actuality". Actuality, in this case, referred to a type of film that used real footage of places and people, instead of the ―shim sham mechanics of the studio" and the ―lily-fingered interpretations of the metropolitan actor" (Grierson, 1932-4: 21). Documentary was more than mere actuality footage, according to Grierson, as it involved a creative component in its core conceptualisation. Herzog's manipulations of Dengler's character can then still be seen as documentary under this new definition. While he may not be entirely truthful in his depictions of Dengler, he attempts to get closer to Dengler's personality by manipulating the truth. The footage he uses would fall under the category of ―actuality", as it is Dengler representing himself, even if it is a slightly different version of himself.

Furthermore, even though the action Dengler performs may be entirely constructed, the essence of the action is not. When we do finally go into Dengler's house, we see many paintings of doors. We see vast expanses of glass windows. This is a man that deeply values the ability to leave and enter his house. When Dengler closes the door, he enters the house, and closes the door behind him. The film lingers on this shot of the closed door, and then it is linked by a graphic match to a painting of a door in Dengler's house. The film purposefully stays on a shot of Dengler's door after Dengler closes it, and then cuts to the interior. In doing so, the film emphasises the connection both through Dengler's voice as well as through editing and graphic choices. Thus, although Herzog

could be said to be embellishing the truth, he is in fact enhancing a truth that is already there.

This is what Herzog (2010) refers to as ―ecstatic truth". In his talk, ―On the Absolute, the Sublime, and Ecstatic Truth", he argues that a falsified quotation he gives at the beginning of the speech will bring the audience a greater understanding than the unadulterated truth alone. While he does not credit Flaherty, it is clear that this idea follows on from him and his tradition, as Flaherty argued that, ―Sometimes you have to lie. Often one has to distort a thing to catch its true spirit" (in Barsam 1988: 116). One might argue that Flaherty's gross misrepresentations of the Inuit people in *Nanook of the North* (1922) surpass Herzog's manipulations of the truth, as Herzog's subjects are generally film-literate and able to speak the language of the film.[1]

Herzog started his speech, and his film *Lessons of Darkness* (1992) with ―the collapse of the stellar universe will occur—like creation—in grandiose splendour" and attributed it to Blaise Pascal, even though he himself made it up. He claims that starting with such a quotation elevates the spectator to a ―state of sublimity" where ―something deeper become possible, a kind of truth that is the enemy of the merely factual" (Herzog, 2010). Herzog, like Flaherty, argues that we cannot achieve illumination from the purely factual. If truth is all that matters, he argues that the telephone book would be the best text, as it is full of facts (Herzog, 2010). Clearly there is more to a documentary than an assimilation of facts, and Herzog argues that it lies in the ―ecstatic truth" that he creates. In this fictionalised moment of *Little Dieter*, he creates a similar truth. It is a truth that is perhaps not entirely ―factual", but it is one that brings out a truth in his character.

White Diamond (2004), as an example, has even greater re-imagined moments. The film contains a sequence wherein a waterfall is reflected in a water droplet. Herzog (in an interview with David Sterrit, 2005) explains that the shot was conceived by one of his cinematographers, and that he thought it was kitsch and did not want to include it in the film. However, he realised that in ―a scripted context, all of a sudden it could be great", and proceeded to construct a narrative around it. He had one of the locals, Marc Anthony,

[1] I shall assess this claim in Chapter Four.

–stumble" across this droplet (actually made of glycerin) while gathering herbs and point it out to the crew. When Herzog asks him if he sees —an entire universe in one single drop of water", Anthony responds that, –I cannot hear what you say, for the thunder that you are." Herzog (in Sterrit, 2005) explains that this moment is completely scripted. The moment is convincing, although saccharine. It is a moment that does not necessarily reveal the truth of Anthony's thoughts, or character, but helps to bring the audience to a kind of sublimity, where the emotional content of the rest of the film is elevated to the same poetic levels. Furthermore, while obviously constructed, this moment does not sincerely affect what we take from the film. It is not as though the airship did not fly, or Graham Dorrington's emotional journey was insincere. Herzog's films may lie to us, but it is only so he can bring us to –ecstatic truths".

While Bordwell (1985) also deals only with narration in the fiction film (as rather obviously evidenced by the title of his book, *Narration in the Fiction Film*), some of his discussions over various theories of narration are relevant to the discussion at hand. His book begins with a breakdown of narrative theories into categories suggested by Aristotle; Mimetic and Diegetic. Mimetic theories relate to ways in which narration is conceived as showing. In film, this would primarily have to do with the way in which a filmmaker can construct a narrative through a careful construction of shot scale, editing, diegetic sound and mise-en-scène. This is essentially the filmmaker _miming' or imitating through the visual elements of the film.

Diegetic theories, in contrast, centre on narration as voice guiding the narrative, or –telling". The filmmaker's voice is diegetically present in the film, and recognisable as either his own voice, or through the voice of another. Bordwell (1985: 16) looks to Plato for the origins of the concept that —narration is fundamentally a linguistic activity". Interestingly enough, as we shall discover, similar threads of narration can function in both ways, as highlighted by the more mimetic narration in *Rescue Dawn*, and the diegetic narration featured in *Little Dieter*.

One of these diegetic theories of narration is useful when looking at the voices in *Little Dieter,* namely, Bordwell's discussion of MacCabe's narrative theory. MacCabe (1974 and 1978) compares narrative cinema to the 19th century realist novel, dividing them both into an –object language" and a –metalanguage". He defines metalanguage in the

realist novel as that which belongs to no identifiable speaker, or in other words, an unbiased observer. Object language he simply defines as words contained within quotation marks — dialogue. In film, he concludes that object language finds its place in the metalanguage of the camera‘s actions, and the dialogue of the characters. Bordwell‘s criticisms of MacCabe are many, but the most pertinent to our discussion is the lack of ~~“s~~emantic dimension” between the metalanguage and the language of dialogue. For example, if an author reveals inner thoughts of a character by indirect speech, this is not metalanguage, even though it is written in the same style as metalanguage. No quotation marks separate these thoughts from the prose, but it is clear that it is not the voice of the author.

There are two voices that construct the narrative in *Little Dieter*, namely, the voice of Dengler himself, and Herzog. Their voices often overlap, one finishing the others‘ story. Dengler, according to MacCabe, would be dialogue, as he speaks diegetically, and Herzog would be metalanguage, as he speaks only in voice-over and in making film choices.

The first time Dengler speaks is in direct dialogue. He is in a tattoo parlour, explaining that the tattoo the artist has drawn is an incorrect interpretation of his dream. His voice begins in the diegesis, with the movement of his lips synched to the sound we hear. His voice continues while the film cuts to different shots. Through knowledge of the construction of film, this must mean that Dengler‘s voice is no longer diegetic, and that it is placed over other shots. However, as we remain in the same space, the voice does not seem to function as a voice-over, even though it technically does. Instead, Dengler‘s voice seems firmly grounded in the diegesis. The film zooms into the drawing, and then non-diegetic music begins, which then continues into the next shot of Dengler‘s car driving in the countryside. This is followed by the first time we hear Herzog and it is in voice-over, “~~M~~en are often haunted by many things that happen to them in life”. He provides an overview; a context for the viewer. At this stage, it seems the boundaries between the two voices are clear. Herzog functions as metalanguage, providing context and Dengler functions as dialogue.

However, in Yahnke‘s (2009) very detailed summation of the film, these first words spoken by Herzog are incorrectly assigned to Dengler. While Dengler continues Herzog‘s

voice-over in a structurally flowing manner, he does not speak these initial words. This mistake can be forgiven. To the untrained ear, both men's German accents may sound similar. Furthermore, both of these voices do have the same audio quality, the immediacy that Altman (in Kozloff, 2000:121) speaks about of being recorded in a studio for our ears only. Altman argues that when the voice is recorded in studio, we perceive it differently than voice that is recorded live. It has an immediacy in its pure form. It is designed to be heard only by our ears. In a way, one might argue that there is no ~~"s~~emantic dimension" that distinguishes their voices. In terms of the filmic and sonic quality, they both occupy the same style.

This provides clear evidence suggesting that drawing a line between dialogue(object language) and metalanguage is not that simple. In film, or at least in this film, there are both characteristic and functional similarities. Both voices, as I mentioned, appear to have been recorded in a studio environment. However, they also both have lexical and accent similarities. While I was able to distinguish the two voices, it is evident from Yahnke's (2009) discussion that this is not always the case. They are also both used as voice-over, telling a story. Dengler's voice is also used in linking scenes together with direct speech (i.e. not in voice-over).

He begins to tell us about his deep need to know where his food is at all times. It is then the diegetic speech that links us to the next shot — when Dengler tells that he has emergency provisions below the house. Immediately after being given this information, the film cuts to these provisions, where Dengler tells us that he is actually interested to see them too. This bit of dialogue was likely scripted and intended to function as a link. However, the typical viewer will not see the dialogue as such, and will instead see it as linking dialogue, with Dengler in control of the film's narrative. Later, at 00:21:40, Dengler tells us about a plane crash, and as he states that ~~"a~~eroplane started cartwheeling". The film cuts to archival image of a plane cartwheeling, and then there is a moment of silence. Then, the film cuts back to Dengler and he explains that he must have passed out. His story of the aeroplane cartwheeling and then his passing out is thus reflected in the film. While similar to the previous example, in this case, Dengler not only controls the speedthrough which we move through the diegesis, but also calls up non-diegetic elements, and removes sound. The film therefore uses direct speech that lacks the

immediacy in recording of the voice-over to link shots together. The line between object language and metalanguage is blurred even more.

For the most part, the lexical signifiers help to distinguish the two. Herzog refers to Dengler as ―him", or ―Dieter", and Dengler speaks in the first person. However, there are also moments where Herzog continues Dengler's speech, speaking for him. For example, Dengler tells us about his nutrition as a child and then Herzog continues Dengler's childhood stories. ―Dieter remembers the first time he saw sausage in the display window", Herzog tells us. The converse also occurs. At the beginning of the film, in the moment where Yahnke confused Herzog for Dengler, Dengler continues Herzog's speech. Their voices overlap over the same visuals. As there is no shift in visuals, the words flow into each other, which is perhaps why Yahnke confused their voices. Thus, while their voices often can be distinguished by lexical markers, the fluidity of the transition between them eases the viewer into hearing them as the same. The line between metalanguage and object language thus is blurred. When voices can be mistaken for one another, when two voices can portray the same thoughts, it is difficult to identify one as meta language, and the other as object language.

The main difference between Herzog and Dengler, however, is that Dengler is firmly situated in the film world. Before we hear Dengler, we see his face. We also hear him for the first time on camera, his voice existing simultaneously with the image of his mouth. Herzog only once speaks in the world of the film, and this is off camera (when he asks Dengler what it was like to be a war hero). In fact, Wong (1997) even notes that this is one of Herzog's few films without his ―classic lunge into frame". It seems as though he distances himself from the diegesis of the film. Wong (1997) continues to explain, however, that while Herzog is not present in the frame, he ―is clearly *there*" (emphasis in the original). His voice permeates the film, and his ironic commentary on the survival training video points to his character.

Herzog therefore seems to fit the characteristics of Chion's *acousmêtre*, inasmuch as we can apply this theory to documentary film. Chion (1999) suggests that sometimes, we see narrators with a different kind of omniscience and omnipresence because of their *acousmatic* nature. Acousmatic refers to a sound that is heard but the source of the sound is not seen (Chion, 1999: 18). Chion gives a few examples of acousmatic presences in our

every day life, e.g. the radio or the loudspeaker. The acousmêtre, as he defines it, is an acousmatic voice. In other words, it is a voice that originates from a character that has not yet been revealed. He further separates this into three categories: the ~~–c~~ompleteacousmêtre", the ~~–v~~isualised acousmêtre", and the ~~–c~~ommentator-acousmêtre". The visualised acousmêtre is a voice that belongs to someone that has already been seen, but cannot currently be seen. We know what they look like, but we do not see them presently. The commentator-acousmêtre is one we do not see as he or she is a step outside of the diegesis. Finally, it is the complete acousmêtre that is both disembodied and contains the possibility of becoming bodied. The complete acousmêtre is a voice that has ~~–o~~ne foot in the image" (Chion, 1999: 24).

Chion (1999) notes the distinction between the power of the commentator and the complete acousmêtre. The commentator is perceived to have absolute knowledge, and the ability to journey anywhere due to its disembodied nature. The complete acousmêtre, however, has limited knowledge and cannot journey anywhere because it is linked to the diegesis. However, Chion argues that limited knowledge is more disconcerting to the viewer than complete knowledge. When knowledge is limited, we do not know the constraints of the knowledge. The lack of this certainty may be terrifying. A childhood memory may serve us here to illustrate his point.

When growing up, I knew that my parents did not have complete knowledge of the world and my actions. I knew that they knew more than I did, but I did not know the limits of their knowledge. Did they know that I ate the last piece of chocolate? Their actions did not suggest that they knew, but *they might have known*. I did not know where the constraints of their knowledge lay, and that was terrifying. Furthermore, it is often difficult to comprehend what omniscience means. Limiting knowledge to a human ability, in a way, makes the comprehension easier, and thus makes it more frightening.

As the acousmêtre has ~~–o~~ne foot in the image", he occupies a particularly strange realm that is neither in the film, nor out of it. The lack of a body means that the voice can come from anywhere, and can see everything. Chion argues that this omnipresence leads to omniscience, or at the very least, that we expect omniscience from our narrator (1999: 23).

Herzog is both removed from the film and has one foot in the door. The first time he speaks is as a purely non-diegetic voice-over. However, three important factors here distinguish him from our typical voice-of-God narrator. Firstly, as discussed, the distinction between object-language and metalanguage in the film is distinctly blurred. Herzog‘s words and Dengler‘s words are often indistinguishable and the two voices provide similar sorts of information. Herzog introduces us to the idea of haunted men living normal lives, and then Dengler expands upon this, offering his own experiences in the matter. Beside from the change in accent, there is very little to signify that Herzog has stopped speaking and that Dengler has begun. As mentioned already, the continued visuals help to blur the distinction between the two. The switch occurs in the same medium close-up of Dengler in which Herzog began speaking. The music continues. This overlap between the voices puts the voices of Dengler and Herzog on equal standing. His voice is sonically linked to another person, who is another person entirely entrenched in the diegesis of the film. This links Herzog to the world of the film

Secondly, the quality of Herzog‘s voice does not seem to lend itself to feelings of omniscience. While his voice has a lulling quality, it does not grant him great power through resonance or timbre. His voice is filled with elements of personality. His accent, for one, marks him apart from the British Received Pronunciation (sometimes known as the Queen‘s English or RP) or General American (also known as Standard American Pronunciation) that we are used to hearing in the documentary‘s voice-over. ―I don‘t care whether my accent is a German accent or not, I can make myself understood” (Herzog in Walters, 2007). As we are used to the convention of these so-called ―standard” accents, we notice the difference. It grants Herzog a place in time and space, which links him to our world. His presence as something of a celebrity, too, connects his voice with a personality, again linking us to the world. While we may not see his face, many of his viewers probably know what it looks like. Herzog is a character that many viewers know. This is not a booming voice with no origin, but rather one that we know is real. However, because we do not actually see him, he still shares the absent body of the acousmêtre.

He does not ―lunge into frame”, but is made present in the film through the blurring of meta-language and object language and his accent. Furthermore, we hear him speak when he asks Dieter a question diegetically, although it is off screen, and so we know that he is present in the scene. However, he is also removed from it as we do not see him.

Furthermore, Dengler, who is present, responds to this question. This again affirms the idea that Herzog is present while the film is being made and while he speaks. Therefore Herzog functions as somewhat of a complete acousmêtre, and it is this that grants him power.

One might want to argue that the confusion between meta-language and object language means that Dengler could also be viewed as an acousmêtre. He has one foot in the imageand occupies the realm of the voice-over. However, his presence is firmly rooted in the diegesis, and this precludes him from the categorisation. Chion argues that one of the main sources of power for the acousmêtre is that it could at any stage be revealed. The anticipation of the reveal grants it power.

An example of this can be found in *Community* (2009 - current), a slightly unconventional television show oft criticised by its network for its offbeat and niche choices. The show recognises that much of its audience is well versed in cinematic conventions, and often comments on them in a self-reflexive manner. The episode that is relevant to this discussion, ~~–~~Dungeons and Dragons" (2011/Russo, S02E14) is centred around the main characters' quest to rescue a fellow classmate's life, when they learn he is suicidal. Instead of the show's traditional opening sequence, an elfin-style voice accompanied by a heroic soundtrack, introduces the characters. Their usual common status is elevated to a mythical quality, albeit with typical quirkiness.

This is clearly meant as a parody or homage to the Cate Blanchett style voice-over in *The Lord of the Rings* series (2001-3/Jackson). Along with the new soundtrack, and new imagery, these conventions call up the fantasy genre. The essential differences between *The Lord of the Rings* and *Community* is that the *Community* narrator is not present in the diegesis. We do not have a body that could anchor the voice and so the female voice is not anchored to the body. However, at the end of episode the source of the voice is revealed — the janitor. This voice that previously contained the ability to heighten the characters' statuses turns out to be a less than exalted person herself. It is this moment that the voice loses its power as the body and voice are reunited. The humour in this de-acousmatic moment comes from the disparity between the quality of the voice and the quality of the body. The voice loses its power in the revelation of its source. Chion uses the example of the wizard's unveiling in *The Wizard of Oz* (1939/Fleming). Before this

point in time, the wizard‘s voice contained most the powers of the acousmêtre; he is perceived to see all, to know all, and to possess omnipotence. When he is revealed, these mythical powers are stripped from him. Herzog is never revealed and thus he retains the power. Dengler, on the other hand, is firmly rooted in the diegesis, and thus he could never be an acousmêtre.

It appears that acousmatic voice-over narration can translate quite well as mimetic narration. In being knowledgeable and able to permeate most spaces of the film‘s world, the acousmêtre functions much as a director might. Herzog, particularly, in peppering his narration with his own personal viewpoints and emotional explanation of the film, can easily translate into mimetic narration.

Herzog can be argued to be an acousmêtre in *Little Dieter* and his role in *Rescue Dawn* is much the same. While he is never visible in the film, his presence is clearly marked. Furthermore, as his narration in the film offers mostly his own personal viewpoints and emotional explanation of the film, these ideas can smoothly transition into narration that is shown, rather than spoken. This is where *Rescue Dawn*‘s narration occurs. It is through mimesis. Herzog speaks to us through the voice of others, and through the camera. As Bale states in an interview with Roman (2007):

> He liked to do everything that we were doing. Literally, if we had to go into the rapids, he really wanted to get in the rapids with us. He was losing his toenails. He was willing to jump and grab a snake. I would watch him and he'd be performing half the movie right in front of us. He can't help it. It was like he was possessed.

Herzog‘s voice does not appear directly in the film, but rather other characters mime his thoughts, and his touch is ever present.

The primary Mimetic theory that Bordwell discusses (and dismisses) is that of the ―Invisible Observer”. The theory suggests that the ‗camera‘ or filmmaker posits himself as an invisible observer, standing in, as it were, for the viewers‘ eyes. A lot of narrative discussion stems from this idea. One might argue that in a scene, the film cuts from a long shot of a man, to a medium close up of his face, to a close up of the important document in his hand because this is essentially how a person may process the information. We observe the whole scene, and then move into the details.

This conceptualisation of editing and filmmaking is present even in Pudovkin's *Film Technique*. Pudovkin describes the act of an "observer" watching a demonstration on the street, and the varying positions he will move to, in order to get a better view. Pudovkin (1933: 53-55) explains that "the Americans" replaced this "active observer" with the lens of the camera, arguing that the camera moves from simply being a spectator, to acting as a participant, actively creating what we see. Pudovkin gives an analogy of how a spectator trying to observe a demonstration might start by observing it from a roof, then move to a ground floor window inside the building, then move to the crowd itself to get a feel for the demonstration up close. The analogy here gives us our establishing shot (the roof), long shot (ground floor), and finally our close-up (the street).

Bordwell (1985) has two primary objections to this idea. The former is that there are certain stylistic choices that could be made that are not replicates of the way the human eye sees. Split screens, impossible camera angles and so on are not examples of how we perceive the world. This is particularly true when the split screen shows two actions that are not occurring simultaneously or even in the same space. Thus, Bordwell argues, the Invisible Observer is a method of filmmaking, rather than the only way of filmmaking. Secondly, while Pudovkin's observer is not a passive one, Bordwell points out that without the film's production team there would be nothing for this "observer" to observe. The demonstration is not simply passing through the town and can be observed; rather the demonstration exists because it will be observed. The film production team constructs the action. It is a fallacy to say that there is an invisible observer, when there would be no action were the observer not there.

These criticisms become interesting in the narrativisation of documentary film. With regard to the first criticism, there certainly can be stylistic play in documentary films. The non-fiction filmmaker can also use all of the non-invisible-observer options available to the fiction filmmaker. The documentary filmmaker can also utilise split screens and the like. Again, this implies that this is merely a style of filmmaking. However, the second criticism seems to be less valid. Except in the case of re-enactments, interviews and similar, the world is actually observed by a film crew. The camera is recording action that is actually happening, and does stand in for the human eye. The camera does act as observer, and multi-cam shoots often allow for the ability to change the perspective of the camera, without re-constructing the shots.

However, the presence of the documentary crew changes the behaviour of the subject behind the lens, and they begin to perform for the camera, in a manner. One might argue against this, as this is also true of subjects under the observation of the mere human eye. However, this is mostly true when the observer is not "invisible". Therefore, a camera crew may record events as they actually happened, but these events will be fundamentally changed by the presence of the camera crew. Furthermore, Herzog's documentaries seem to be more boundary blurring than what we conceive of as the traditional documentary, with all of its "asserted veridical representation". Herzog constructs shots such as Dengler's door opening and does not announce them as reality. Therefore, similar complaints against "The Invisible Observer" as a conceptualisation of mimetic narration in narrative cinema can still be seen as problematic in documentary film.

While the conception of the "Invisible Observer" may be problematic as an overarching conception of how narration works in film, its use as a style in *Rescue Dawn* is clear. For example, at 01:29:50, Duane and Dieter are floating down the river that they hope will lead them to Thailand, and safety. Duane hears a waterfall, and the two rush to the shore. The sequence starts in a long shot of the two of them on the river. As Duane says, "Listen," the film cuts to a close-up of Dieter. Naturally, at this point, an invisible observer would want to look at Dieter's reaction. The film then cut between the two men, and then cuts back to a long shot to show the increasing number of rapids that indicate a waterfall is near. This is very similar to the manner in which an observer might engage with the scene. As the men abandon the raft, the invisible observer also submerges into the water. The next shot after they leave the raft is shaky hand-held footage of the men. The camera is half in the water, and this encourages the viewer to experience the event as an invisible observer. Once the men are safely on the shore, the film cuts to a wide-angle shot of the waterfall. This shot is not representative of a typical observer, as it traverses an impossible amount of space in a short amount of time. However, it is the shot an observer would likely want to see. Furthermore, the sequence that follows this was partly based in reality. As Duane and Dengler pick leeches off themselves, so too did Zahn and Bale.

The dual system of narration, too, is worked into the fiction film through mimesis. Even though Dengler had died by the time the fiction film was made, his voice is still present

in the film. When we are not privy to words the main characters do not understand, this typically creates a greater identification with the main characters. We only know what they know. After Dieter, the character, is shot at, for example, we do not hear the Laotian man shouting at him. We hear what Dieter hears. Instead of encouraging identification through character backstory and colourful narration, we are encouraged to identify cinematically. In not allowing us to understand non-English speakers, in not showing aspects that Dengler was not privy to, Herzog encourages a high degree of identification with the main character, as he moves us along in his story.

Much like the documentary, the non-English speaking characters do not get a chance to speak for themselves. While subtitles could easily be present, the characters speak in their own language. This is an unusual practice in fiction films, where the audience typically is allowed to know more than the characters in the film. While Herzog explains that he dislikes subtitles believing that this creates a ~~"s~~tronger connection" (Herzog, 2002: 54), it still has the effect of rendering certain subjects mute. The effects of this will be discussed further in Chapter Four. However, this does have the effect in the film of encouraging stronger identification with Dengler, as we cannot understand what he cannot understand. Dengler thus, as deceased story-weaver, functions as a sort of ~~"I~~nvisible Participant" as we are made to undergo his experience and are rarely shown information that he does not know. This is similar to his role as character narrator, or ~~"o~~bject language" in the documentary film.

Herzog's presence as narrator is also clear. Like in the original documentary, Herzog inserts his own voice into the film quite early on. While in the documentary, he easily segues from his own voice to Dengler's voice, in the fiction film; he carefully inserts his own words into that of a character in the film. After the initial intertitles, followed by the credits and the rolling napalm shots used in the documentary, the film cuts to an army-trainingunit. Our location is given and the war is contextualised. Within the first four minutes of the film, we see the exact same poorly constructed jungle survival training video from the documentary, where Herzog originally gave sardonic commentary, criticising the American army's survival guide, which seems to rely heavily on the stranded pilot having a full medical kit, a knife, and tinned food. In the documentary, we have already seen the reality of what it was like to be a stranded pilot — Dengler's story.

We know that this survival guide was not useful to him. Herzog‘s irony is thus not lost on us, as the video appears weak in contrast to what we have heard before.

In *Rescue Dawn*, however, Spook, ~~–a~~ goddam daredevil”, talks over the film, while a group of bored soldiers watch the film. While he does not quite make the same comments, the feelings that are aroused are the same and the tone is the same. He tells us that, ~~–B~~oys back home don‘t know anything about the jungle.” In this example, it is quite clear that Herzog is speaking through this character. Furthermore, the character‘s comments are far more obviously critical and serve as foreshadowing for the inevitable tragedy the viewers know will happen.

However, this is a moment of diegetic narration. Herzog uses his own voice, and brings it through the voice of Spook. More common in *Rescue Dawn* is his presence as mimetic narrator. While Dengler‘s voice-over often provides historical background and context, in *Little Dieter* Herzog‘s voice-over often provides more flavour to the substance. The first words we hear Herzog speak in *Little Dieter*, he explains how people are haunted by their pasts. He tells of Dieter‘s childhood that appeared to ~~—m~~ke no earthly sense,” how viewing the ground appears ~~–as~~ a strange and barbaric dream”. This voice-over of emotion is not present in Rescue Dawn.

Instead, mimetic principles of narration and intertitles function to provide the emotional context that Herzog provides in the documentary film. Instead of telling us the emotional content, the film shows it to us. The film is told in chronological order, and is not quite the biopic that *LittleDieter* would be were it translated directly into fiction. We do not see much of his past, thus Herzog‘s descriptions of Dengler‘s childhood are mostly abandoned. The documentary focuses on Dengler as person – his childhood, his time as a pilot, and how he is at the time of the film. It examines how events in his past shape him into the man we see on camera, and how the events of his more distant past shaped the man we see in *Rescue Dawn*. In the fiction film, however, we focus on one event. Dengler‘s past, and how he came to be in this moment is not told to the audience. The fiction film, and many others in its category, seems to rely so heavily on showing, rather than telling, that it seems more appropriate to reveal that Dengler is German only through his accent than to have any expository dialogue explaining his heritage or his desires. Other mimetic narration is also present in the fiction film. Herzog, in the documentary,

tells us that Dengler experienced being a pilot as though everything ~~–d~~own there seemed to be so alien and so abstract" and a ~~–s~~trange distant barbaric dream". The fiction film does not tell us this. Instead, the opening shots of *Rescue Dawn* heavily imply this. After the initial intertitles, the film cranes over shots of fields on fire, with bombs landing on jungle towns. The footage is slowed down substantially. No diegetic sound accompanies this moment, and instead an instrumental piece abstracts the images we see. The music and the speed make the images abstract and strange, much as Dengler described the experience of being in a pilot in *Little Dieter.* Thus, once again ~~–D~~engler" and Herzog ~~–n~~arrate" the viewers' journey.

In the documentary, it is Dengler, not Herzog, who first tells us of his dream to become a pilot. In the fiction film, his character is also the first one to tell us of his piloting dreams in conversation. However, while the documentary film tells us more of his dream and the results of this; the fictional film rather seems to be about his torture and struggle as a prisoner of war. The names of the film reflect their content is a palpable manner. For Herzog and Dengler, though, the film was always intended to be a fiction film. ~~–I~~n a way, *Little Dieter Needs to Fly* was a remake of a feature film that was made some time later".

Some diegetic forms of narration in the documentary are present in the fiction film as action. For example, in *Little Dieter*, Dengler shows us how his captors used to make fire. This action is repeated as an event in the fictional version. Similarly, Dengler's tales of random torture are shown as action.

There are numerous practical reasons that could explain why the documentary tells, rather than shows. Herzog knew that *Rescue Dawn* would be made. A fiction film like that calls for action, and such a story can be better told through the ~~–s~~him sham mechanics of the studio" with its budgetary allowances. Herzog's disavowal of subtitles could extend to a hatred of re-enactments, or the sensitivities of Dengler may have proven too difficult for shooting of such sequences. However, no matter if it was for budgetary reasons or for stylistic choices, the end result is that *Little Dieter* is a film full of non-diegetic voices that tell, rather than show. Lying hidden beneath these claims, is a suggestion that Silverman's (1988) claims that voice-over is ~~–i~~nstitutional" in the documentary form is still in effect today. I have also argued that the system of dual narration can be present through both diegetic and mimetic narration. We move from a blend of acousmatic and

first person diegetic narration to a blend of first person perspective and directorial mimetic narration. Furthermore, Herzog‘s acousmatic qualities translate to an involved directorial presence in *Rescue Dawn.* Therefore, while both diegetic and mimetic narration can have similar effects, the needs of the documentary film called for a form of diegetic narration, while the fiction film of almost the same subject matter called for mimetic narration. This suggests that Herzog uses this traditionally documentary mode of representation in a ~~d~~ocumentary”, and that this shows that his films can be categorised, to some extent.

Chapter Two: Echoes of a Remembered Past: *N!ai* and the *Hunters*

In this chapter, I will investigate Marshall‘s use of voice-over in two films, namely *N!ai, the story of a !Kung* woman (1980; hereinafter referred to as *N!ai*) and *The Hunters* (1957). I will argue that while both films appear very different in their treatment of the subjects, both are problematic in their enforced linearity and in their appropriation in story telling. However, as I will show, *N!ai*has considerably less enforced linearity, and a novel approach to story-telling. I will first set out to argue that both films are documentaries according to the previously laid out framework, and can be thus assessed as such. I will then argue that Marshall‘s voice-over narration is portrayed as image-maker in both films, by using the taxonomy of narrators set out by Genette in Kozloff (1988). I will argue that N!ai, in *N!ai* is perceived as a framing, homodiegetic narrator, but that her voice occasionally shapes the imagery of the film as a heterodiegetic narrator might be expected to do. However, I will argue that her role in the film is actually that of an embedded, homodiegetic narrator. I will then contrast this to the narration in *The Hunters*, and explain the differences through the technological and stylistic innovations that occurred between 1957 and 1980. I will then argue away this power that seems to be granted to N!ai by suggesting that in replacing N!ai‘s voice with another woman‘s voice (Letta Mbulu), N!ai is delegated to the realms of universalised others. Finally, I shall argue that Mbulu‘s voice *has* the ―radical otherness” that Doane (1980) claims is needed to interpret the image. I shall argue that this means that her voice is granted authority, which means that we are likely to doubt her words less than we should. I shall argue that her voice is strongly linked to N!ai‘s body, which suggests that her voice speaks N!ai‘s thoughts (as she has authority).

Before I begin to dissect *N!ai* and *The Hunters*, I would like to state that my criticisms of the films do not mar their value. Both films have much to offer beyond the criticisms of the voice-over within the films. I do not wish to be like the student in Tim Asch‘s class whose thesis claimed that ―N!aiwas being prostituted by neo-colonial racists” (Marshall in Anderson and Benson, 1993: 166), as, like Marshall indicates I realise that producing a documentary is a difficult procedure and that certain creative choices must be made. A film must be an engaging piece of work, it must make sense to the viewer, and it must exist within a framework of filmic conventions that the viewer understands. Furthermore,

the documentary filmmaker has far more limitations than the fiction filmmaker, as they have to operate, to some extent, in the realm of ―what happened". Therefore, this discussion of the work exists merely to guide future filmmakers, and to acknowledge the effects of the choices that Marshall made. Furthermore, while there are many interesting avenues to explore within the film, this study will limit its focus to those of concern to the use of voice-over in the film. While much has been written of the films' relevance as ethnographic film, there has not been, to my knowledge, an in-depth look at the use of voice-over within the two films. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, I will limit my discussion of the films in general only to what is relevant in the greater discussion of voice-over.

Our first question should perhaps be to ask if *N!ai* is even a documentary. While it may have a few cases of re-enactment, I believe it is safe to say that the film is certainly promoted and indexed as a documentary. The film is listed on the Documentary Educational Resources website (der.org), for example. Thus, according the definition set out, the viewer expects that the film has ―asserted veridical representation" and I will assess it as a documentary.

According to DER's guide to the film, the scene wherein N!ai's wedding to /Gunda is depicted is in fact footage of a re-enactment of a girl's first period ritual. There is no explanation in the film itself that this is not actual footage of her wedding. It is perceived as it is. However, as the guide explains, these are elements of the wedding ritual, and not historically inaccurate. The footage may be deceptive in that it is not really footage of the wedding and does not proclaim itself to be a re-enactment, but it is not deceptive in that the actual footage could have very well looked like that, had it existed. While this may be a bit of fiction, it does not encourage its viewer to classify the film as fiction, even if they are made aware of the constructed nature of this shot. Even with knowledge of the fictional elements of the film, we still index it as a documentary, and we can thus call it this for the purposes of the discussion.

The Hunters is also an interesting case. The film presents itself as factual. The version of the film that I watched even begins with DER's logo. The film is also expository. The first part of the film gives us information about the !Kung people and their culture. What follows after this is the depiction of a traditional hunt, and results in the hunters returning

to their families and distributing the meat. However, the hunt depicted is actually spliced together from several hunts that took place (Loizos, 1993: 22). Furthermore, the film portrays the primary reason for the hunt as hunger, while, as Loizos (1993) and Marshall (in Anderson and Benson 1993) indicates, there were many social and cultural reasons for such a hunt that were not directly related to hunger. However, despite this misrepresentation through editing, the film still falls under the definition of documentary within this study, as it presents and is indexed as documentary.

In *The Hunters*, Marshall provides the voice-over, and there is no boundary suggested between his voice and that of the image-maker. After the introductory shots of the landscape, the title: "The Hunters" appears on the screen. We then see a map of Africa. Shortly after this, Marshall speaks his first words, "The northern Kalahari is a hard, dry land". The image-maker has shown us a map of Africa and then the voice confirms us our geographical location. The voice and the images provided coalesce, and show knowledge of one another. While the link is not as strong as in *Las Hurdes* or *Land of Silence and Darkness* (to be discussed in Chapter Three and Four), there is also no effort made to distinguish the two. Therefore the audience is likely to hear Marshall and the image-maker as the same person, and confer onto his voice the expectations of the image-maker.

One is positioned in this safe assumption that what oneiswatching is definitely a documentary and sooneislikely to believe what we are shown. One may buy into the codes and conventions of the documentary, and therefore trust in the omniscient narrator and believe that what oneiswatching is reliable footage. Cataloguing the film as documentary also means that onehasthe privilege of being able to criticise it as a documentary. Oneisable to hold it levels of truth that onemight not require of a fiction film.

Marshall's voice-over in *The Hunters* is fairly traditional. He speaks for the characters, informs the audience of hidden meanings that are not revealed by the film, and provides us with a framework through which to characterise the film. He tells us the characters' names, describes them and places their action in a specific time and place. The film starts by placing the characters within Southern Africa, specifically within Tshumkwe, telling us their names, their language, the name of their people. Marshall tells us information about their lives, how they live it, how they operate within society. He does not let the

characters speak themselves. Sound technology at the time was far less advanced than when *N!ai*was made, and so portable sound equipment and live dialogue would have been impossible. This makes Marshall‘s choice both a technical and creative one.

Given that the choice to overlay the entire film with voice-over and some indigenous music was mostly not a choice at all, we must look at the words employed by Marshall to investigate what kind of narrator he plays in *The Hunters*. He is the all-seeing voice who we do not see, the very essence of the voice-of-God style narrator. His language in the early part of the film is very straightforward. The adjectives he uses are practical, pragmatic and not very colourful. He still manages to produce some vivid imagery, despite these limitations on the words. For example, instead of merely describing their actions, Marshall tells us that the women, ―Squat, dig, get up, search again, squat, dig in the heat of the sun”. This repetition is uncommon in a documentary, but gives the audience a sense of what life is like for these women. By repeating the action, he makes the audience experience the boredom of the task. Furthermore, this action is emphasised by the repeated actions in the film. A woman sticking a stick into the ground over and over again emphasises Marshall‘s words. This also has the added effect of reaffirming Marshall as image-maker, as his words coalesce with the images.

We can find error in the narrator, but we do not find error in the image-maker, argues Kozloff (1988). Any deviance from the expected norm, such as choice of narrator, unexpected camera angles, or discontinuity editing, is perceived as a choice made by the image-maker to serve a specific purpose. The jump cuts in *Breathless* (1960) are not seen as mistakes, but rather as deliberate choices made by Godard. Similarly, a director pointing out his imperfect knowledge of the world is construed as an effort to illustrate the inability by filmmakers to have perfect knowledge. The image-maker can never be wrong, but the narrator can. We perceive that the image-maker chose the ―wrong” words to put in the narrator‘s mouth, and perceive that they probably serve a purpose. The only real way in which an image-maker could be perceived to be wrongis if they are a perceived as a poor filmmaker. The work of such a maker is unlikely to be studied in great depths.

However,Marshall does not offer the omniscience or omnipresence often equated to this kind of narrator. Thrice he says, ―apparently,” indicating a imperfect understanding of

their world. When the camera is not on the hunters, he cannot tell us their story. He does not know where the giraffe is. He also speaks in the present tense. He tells us, when Kxao returns from attempting to hit two steenboks, that he may tell the other hunters what had happened. Marshall does not know if he will tell them —even though he obviously does know, because the voice-over is recorded after the fact. Therefore, the voice-over is *intentionally* presented as having imperfect knowledge of the events, and the audience accepts this as the story is told in the present tense.

This lack of omnipresence and omniscience is interesting when regarding the way in which he chooses to present and represent the main characters. He does not speak of them in a merely factual way, but rather mythologises them. For example, =/Toma is described as

> A man of many words and a lively mind. One who had travelled to the edges of his world. He had a little of the clown in him.

Marshall provides us with facts, but does so in the voice of the storyteller. Furthermore, he appears to buy into the !Kung people‘s story and views the world in the same way that they do. As do the hunters in the film, Marshall anthropomorphises the giraffe by giving it human characteristics. He suggests that the animal has the ability to think by stating that the giraffe is —nervous” (00:38:54), that it has the ability to gain strength through their speaking of her (00:39:42), that it seeks company in ~~h~~er misery”, and that she has ~~i~~mpatient feet” (00:49:25). Marshall tells us that she no longer has her ~~p~~redicament clearly in mind”, suggesting that it could be possible for her to have anything clearly in mind at all. She is —crazy” for continuing west into the sun and gathers ~~h~~er endurance” to resist the hunters.

As Loizos (1993: 22) suggests, Marshall‘s narrative and voice-over narration operate in a similar manner to Flaherty‘s *Nanook of the North* (1922). Both films focus on a smaller section of the population, and dramatises ~~a~~n aspect of their lives into an epic struggle with the forces of nature”.

However, if this film was the only knowledge one had of the !Kung people, and of hunter-gatherers in general, one really only has Marshall‘s voice-over narration to suggest that this is the case. The problem with this sort of voice-over is that it brings in

the linear restriction indicated by MacDougall. In *Transcultural Cinema* (1998), MacDougall briefly speaks about how the development of direct cinema practices led to a heavy reliance on sequence shots to give the appearance of a singular viewpoint. This, like this singular expression of voice-over, gives us a singular perspective on a multi-perspectived event. While *The Hunters* was produced before the development of direct cinema, we still see in it a singular viewpoint of one event. The lack of any alternative voice is coupled with the strong connection made between Marshall the voice-over narrator and Marshall the image-maker. As discussed previously, audiences tend to trust in image-makers, particularly documentary image-makers, and so the story shown in the film could be perceived as the only perspective to be had on the event.

There is also some discussion in *Transcultural Cinema* on the domestication of the footage left in the final documentary, from the wildness of the rushes themselves. Footage that is ~~–in~~capable of being marshalled to the film's purpose" (Rosenthal in MacDougall, 1998: 216) is left out, and we are left with a condensed film. He argues that we lose excess meaning, context, and a freedom of interpretive space to create a polished, less historical document. As clarity is added through a meaning-enforcing voice-over on top of this, this loss becomes heightened. Marshall made up for this loss by using the excised footage to make a series of shorter films out of the footage gathered, but as a stand-alone film it still suffers from the linear structure.

Loizos (1993), too, notices these trends in *The Hunters*. He notes that the film creates the ~~–il~~lusion of a single continuous event" (Loizos, 1993: 22). The film gathers footage in order to create a singular viewpoint, which is enforced by the linear voice-over narration, and does not include footage that is external to this. Thus, the final result is a singular view-point of an event. *N! ai,* however, in its use of multiple voices, does not suffer from this effect.

The use of two voice-overs in *N!ai* allows for two perspectives on a multi-perspectived event, as well as providing the special kind of irony that Kozloff (1988) mentions is only possible with two voices. Kozloff argues that when you only have a first person narrator, there is no possibility for the narrator to comment on his or her own thoughts in a wry or ironic manner. In the case of many of the films studied, the image-maker and the narrator are the same person, but they still function as different people. They have different roles

in the presentation of information, and the audience perceives them in different ways. When this is the case, Kozloff argues that we have more ways for irony to work in the film. When they are the same, then the only potential way in which irony can be used is the narrator/image-maker making ironic commentary on the visual. When they are not the same, the image-maker can create a situation in which ironic commentary is placed upon the narrator him(or her)self, as well as ironic commentary upon the diegetic material.

In *N!ai*, with N!ai's voice-over narration and Marshall's voice-over narration, we can be presented with two perceptions of the same event. Marshall criticises N!ai's nostalgia in a subtle manner. When she tells us that in the past they could eat meat, —just like that"; he contrasts this opinion by informing us that it once took a group of four hunters five days to hunt one giraffe that could only feed fifty people sparingly for ten days. This information is not prefaced with any wry commentary laughing at N!ai, but is merely presented as fact. However, even without visual or any other kind of supporting evidence, we are likely to assume that it is Marshall, as image-maker, who is remembering correctly, not N!ai. Marshall, the omnipresent, omniscient voice takes authority over N!ai's nostalgia, and is assumed to be the bringer of truth. Therefore, while the voices allow for two different interpretations of an event, the criticism that it allows is not a two-way street. N!ai is never able to criticise Marshall in the way that he can criticise her memory of events because they are different types of narrators.

Another problem one might see in the method of narrating in *The Hunters* is that Marshall narrates the story of the !Kung people in much the same way as he narrates the giraffe. In this way, the !Kung people are granted as much reverence as a giraffe is granted. We are not offered any contradictory information on either, and he presumes to read the thoughts of the hunters in much the same way that he reads the thoughts of the giraffe. His diction also sometimes suggests that he speaks from a vantage point of omniscience: —for it is the custom of these hunters" (sixteen minutes into the film). One may read the film as treating both the animals and the people in the film in much the same manner.

A more forgiving explanation is that Marshall attempted to create a mythological tale out of the footage. Marshall looks back on this attempt as —a romantic film by an American kid [that] revealed more about [him] than it did the Ju/'hoansi" (in Anderson and

Benson,1993: 39). This quotation illustrates that Marshall sees it as less of a historical document, and more of a story. It is not meant to produce reality, it is meant to mythologise. This is particularly emphasised by the last words of the film. Marshall tells us that, ―Sothe story of the hunt was told.” In the film, the direct meaning of this is that the !Kung hunters tell the story to their people upon return. However, as the final words of the film, this takes on another meaning, which is that Marshall has just told us ―the story of the hunt”. The word ―story” implies more than a narrative that relies on cause on cause and effect. There is the expectance, or at least acceptance of exaggeration and exultation. ―Story” does not lead the viewer to infer that what has just been shown was entirely factual.

These previous criticisms are not absolved by the mythological status of the film. Marshall‘s place as both image-maker and voice-over narrator disallows this (presumably preferred) reading. The introductory sequence firmly cements him as image-maker, along with all the power we would usually grant to the image-maker. Furthermore, as the film is indexed as documentary, we are likelytotake his voice-over narration at face value. This is tempered by the lack of omniscience as well as the mythological quality in his voice, but ultimately the singular voice-over narration in the film presents a singular viewpoint that could be read as presenting animals and the !Kung people in much the same manner.

In contrast, *N!ai*‘s use of voice-over appears to be rather ground-breaking. N!ai tells us her own story. There is very little interference from Marshall. While he obviously provided the setting, and provoked stories from her, it is N!ai who speaks. Loizos (1993: 76-77) indicates that after 1970, it was fairly common to have direct dialogue from native people in ethnographic film, but that it was incredibly unusual to have a native person provide the leading narrative voice. He notes that we hear her voice for the first six minutes of the film, and that we hear more of her voice than we do of Marshall‘s.

However, saying that she ―narrates” the film is not so straightforward. Firstly, unlike Marshall, her face appears on the screen simultaneously with her voice-over at the start of the film. She identifies as herself in the context of the diegesis. This makes her a first-person narrator in the common use of the word.

She is also not an acousmêtre. Her body and voice are linked from the very first frames of the film. Her position in the film is firmly grounded and made known as subject. One is unlikely tosee her as possessing any sort of external knowledge that the acousmêtre is perceived to possess.

In order to understand N!ai‘s narrative role, we need to borrow some key terms from Kozloff (1988). Narrators, she argues, can be classified according to Genette‘s taxonomy. This taxonomy has two axes; namely, whether they are framing or embedded narrators, and whether they are heterodiegetic or homodiegetic. Rather than merely using the terms ―first-person” and ―third-person”, these terms add an extra dimension. A narrator is homodiegetic if he or she belongs to the diegesis and heterodiegetic if he or she is external to the diegesis. A narrator is framing if they are in the primary story world and they are embedded if they are in a secondary story world, or even doubly embedded within a ―story-within-a-story-within-a-story” (1998: 42). Genette provides Magwitch in *Great Expectations* (Dickens, 1860-1) as an example of an embedded narrator, as he tells his story from within the framing narrative. N!ai, in this instance, is thus a homodiegetic narrator, as she firmly belongs in the diegesis, and appears to be framing as she exists on a primary level of the story.

However, Kozloff (1988) goes onto argue that while this taxonomy may work for the written word, in film the narrators are not framing, but merely secondary to the image-maker‘s creation. The voice-over narrator in film is not as ever present as it is in literature. However, the image-maker is still in control, as there are various cinematic techniques such as cinematography and editing which also reveals the story to us, rather than just the written script that the narrator reads. Both the voice-over narrator and the image-maker weave our story.

The breakdown is nicely illustrated by the final scenes of *The Nine Lives of Tomas Katz* (2000/Hopkins). In the film, a lowly CCTV guard, Dave is given the power to remove objects from the world — cars, buildings, people, anything of which he can conceive. Eventually the film ends on a landscape. Dave then orders, ―No sound,” and the diegetic sound and buzz track are removed. However, Dave‘s voice is not. He next proclaims, ―No light,” and the image is remsoved from the screen. His voice almost appears to exist outside of the realm of the diegesis. ―No sound” does not include Dave‘s voice. His

disembodied voice is granted ownership of the image and he occupies a special place in and outside of the diegesis. However, eventually he orders, ―No Dave". The film ends on a blank screen, and no voice. However, next the credits roll. His orders take us out of the film, and back into the world, but the image-maker still exists. Someone has put the credits into the final film. Thus, our framing, homodiegetic narrator, who even seems to be able to control the image, is never actually in control and the text can exist without him.

In *The Hunters*, we know that both the image-maker and voice-over narration are the same, but it is quite a different matter with regards to *N!ai*. Marshall's presence as image-maker is made clear by the presence of the intertitles that mark the beginning of the film. The tone of the intertitles is factual and impersonal. They declare an external force that operates outside of the narrative. It is one that does not reinforce N!ai's narration and it does not give her status as a narrator that appears to control the film. Marshall also often interjects into the voice-over narration, proffering factual voice-over to complement N!ai's storytelling.

In Chapter Three and Four, we shall see how the opening shots of*Land Without Bread*(1933/Buñuel) and *Land of Silence and Darkness* (1971/Herzog) give the framing narrator the status of image-maker, even if it is in appearance only. As I have argued, a similar correspondence is indicated in *The Hunters*. The opening intertitles of N!ai instead reveal the presence of someone who is quite ―other" to the subjects of the documentary. The intertitles use third person pronouns in referring to the !Kung, and they refer to the shooting of the film. This establishes the maker of the film, and suggests that they exist outside of the film's community. Therefore it seems that the original categorisation of N!ai as a framing narrator is incorrect. While she starts the narrative of the film, her narration seems to fit into a greater story: that of Marshall's creation. Thus, N!ai is made an embedded homodiegetic narrator as the film acknowledges the existence of a framing narrator through these intertitles and Marshall's intermittent voice-over narration.

N!ai sometimes has a little control over the narrative of the film, but sometimes the film (or image-maker) seems to control her narrative. ―Her" words are queued by the images. The film shows archival footage of !Kung women and children with ostrich shells, and

then N!ai comments about the usage of said ostrich shells. Later, however, she tells of her history as a child (00:04:20), and then the film cuts to an archival image of her as a child. The former example should demonstrate that N!ai does not have the narrative power to call up images. The latter, however, suggests that she does. This interplay between the order of narration and images gives N!ai some authority.

Marshall's voice's status as narrator and image-maker in *The Hunters* is strengthened by his ability to control the narrative. For example, he tells us that the giraffe ran "eastwards into the evening" (00:39:35), and then the film cuts to a shot of the giraffe at night. The characters in *The Hunters,* in contrast, show no control over the narrative. They barely seem aware of the presence of the camera, or of any crew. The closest that we get to any sort of reference to the camera is when a dying mongoose stares directly into the lens. Without the ability to record sound live, giving the subjects their own voice was a technical impossibility. However, the ability to recognise or acknowledge the camera had more to do with the evolution of documentary between the two films, rather than anything technical.

Creating *N!ai* marked Marshalls return to the Ju'/hoansi community. In the late 50s, he was banned from the country because it was believed that he had impregnated a woman there, and in the eyes of the Immorality Act, he had committed a crime. Marshall (1993: 74) maintains that this was certainly not the case, but nevertheless, he was not able to return to the area until the mid 1970s. Life carried on for the people there, so did it for Marshall.

It seems to me that one of the more shaping films he made during this leave of absence, was Marshall's cinematography on Wiseman's *Titicut Follies* (1967). This film was one of the earlier Direct Cinema films and his cinematography is praised for bringing "passion and emotion" to the film through a "closeness and immediacy" that is not seen in other Wiseman films (Anderson and Benson, 1993: 151). Direct Cinema, often confused with *Cinéma Vérité,* is a documentary style that emerged in America in the 1960s. Direct Cinema looked to "accord and represent reality, and not to make interpretations" (Platinga, 2005: 112). Rather than speaking for the subjects of the film, the subjects are supposed to speak for themselves. The editing isunobtrusive and the camera is generally unacknowledged by its subjects, resulting in a fly-on-the-wall style

document. *Cinéma Vérité* was developed in France around the same time, as seen in Rouch's*Chronicle of a Summer* (1961). Unlike Direct Cinema, Cinéma Vérité encourages reflexivity from the filmmaker, and the audience is made aware that they are watching a film.

These two movements both have their opponents and proponents, but they are important to consider when tracing the differences in style between *The Hunters* and *N!ai*. Both movements were made possible by the invention of lightweight cameras, and more portable sound equipment. Their influence can also be seen in *N!ai*. N!ai tells her own story, but not from a point of omniscience. However, there is also direct camera address, which is atypical of Direct Cinema, but encouraged by Cinéma Vérité, The film also shows interaction and acknowledgement of the effect of this interaction between N!ai and Marshall. For example, N!ai/Mbulu explains that, "When white people take pictures of me and pay me everyone is jealous." She says this while staring at the camera, as a seemingly deliberate indictment of Marshall.

However, one would not classify the film as belonging to either movement. Their influences are there, but Marshall's additional presence as narrator takes us out of either mode. Marshall (1993: 90) explains that he spoke as narrator when he knew something that the people in the film could not reveal themselves. His first words in the film inform us that, "The San were the gatherer hunters of southern Africa." He gives us historical and geographical information on the people in the film. This is not the kind of information that N!ai herself would proffer. One should note that Marshall does not say that he only speaks when he has privileged information. For example, Marshall informs us that N!ai married /Gunda in 1953, when she was eight and he was thirteen. We learn through Marshall that N!ai only began to live with /Gunda five years later. This is information that N!ai would know, but she does not speak it herself. However, she expands on his statement, filling in the emotional context of the story. Thus, while Marshall gives facts, N!ai tells the story by giving colour and causality to the anecdotal evidence provided.

Geiger (1990: 173), in her discussion of Shostak's (1981) book on another !Kung woman, Nisa (*Nisa: The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman*), argues that Nisa's selection as the subject of a book is unusual in that she is not used as representative of the culture at large.

Nisa is not a typical !Kung woman, and many of her beliefs contradict the !Kung lifestyle. She is therefore treated as a subject in her own right, worthy of study. Geiger, following Mohanty argues that it often appears that ―third wo‖ women in particular are represented as ―a kind of universalized "other", while it is only westernised women that are presented as ―true subjects". In giving N!ai her own voice, to an extent, it would appear that she is allowed to ―rise above [her] generality" (Mohanty, 1986: 14 in Geiger, 1990). She is her own character, and does not merely stand in for !Kung women in general.

However, at the same time using Letta Mbulu to stand in for her augments her generality. N!ai's own voice is taken away from her, and replaced with that of a South African singer, Mbulu, who had sung the title song for *Roots* (1977/Wolper) three years before the release of N!ai. As Mbulu comes from an entirely different culture, N!ai is therefore generalised to the status of ―southern African woman".This means that some viewers might recognise her voice, associate it with the mini-series, and then see N!ai's voice as even more generic because of the association.

Loizos (1993: 77) argues that the use of the English voice to stand in for N!ai's own voice gives her narration a ―strongly personal character". He does not expand upon this idea, but his hint that the character comes from the ―actual English-speaking woman" suggests that he believes Mbulu to apply her own personality into the words, rather than merely acting the part of N!ai. Furthermore, one might extrapolate that the use of English makes her more relatable to the English speaking audience. While he lists this as a credit, it seems to me that this actually decreases the ―actual" character of N!ai as it passes it to Mbulu.

Marshall uses many filmic devices, whether conscious or subconscious, to merge the voice of Letta Mbulu and N!ai together. The first time we hear N!ai, it is through her own voice, and is coupled with a shot of her face, receiving mealie meal from a government worker. She tells us that she gets mealie meal for five children, and that she is a TB person too. The meaning of her words is revealed to us through subtitles. She is also the first character to be foregrounded. This establishes her as the primary character in the film, as we are often likely to establish the first character seen as the main character of the film.

We see her again a few moments later, almost crawling on the floor, exclaiming that it, whatever it may be, is ―too much". While she speaks in her own language, the voice-over begins. Letta Mbulu begins to speak in the !Kung language and tells us that ―*Me--o N!ai* – I am N!ai". Saying these words first in the !Kung language, and then again in English, establishes her as someone connected to both our realm, and the realm of the people in the film. We have already established N!ai as the central character, so when this voice-over begins over an image of the same woman, we are likely to presume that this woman is speaking for the central character, who is also the character on screen.

It also, quite literally, establishes her as N!ai. In Mbulu's own voice, she refers to herself N!ai. We do not see N!ai herself say these words, and thus it is almost as though Letta Mbulu claims to be N!ai herself. An alternative reading of the film therefore presents itself, in that someone may become confused and believe that Letta Mbulu is herself, N!ai, articulating the scenes that she sees. The woman on the screen is not N!ai, according to this reading of the film, but merely another member of the community.

Perhaps it is necessary that soon after this introduction to the voice, the voices of Letta Mbulu and N!ai are clearly linked together. After a brief introduction to the land and the people by the N!ai/Mbulu voice, we see N!ai introduce herself in a medium close-up shot. Through the sub-titles we learn that she is, ―N!ai short face". She continues to introduce herself. Then as she repeats the !Kung words for ―little squirrel" and ―short face", Letta Mbulu begins to also speak the words, in !Kung for a moment, and then in English. Their actual voices overlap, and Mbulu begins, for the first time, to simultaneously translate for N!ai. It is now certain that this voice is meant to stand in for the woman we first saw.

As N!ai/Letta tells us that, ―We sang about my face, my sister and I", the film cuts to a medium close-up of a young girl, and as she sings, so does N!ai in voice-over. The title ―N!ai" comes up on screen, and if there was any doubt about who the young girl is, the text now captions her, and doubt is removed.

N!ai's individuality as a subject is thus somewhat negated through the use of voice-over to dub her narration. However, like the other !Kung people in the documentary, when

N!ai speaks diegetically she is translated through subtitles. Thus her story as narrator is somewhat removed from its status as a ―true subject" that could ―rise above her generality", as she herself is not granted the power to tell her own stories through subtitles. When she is a character she is presented in the same manner as the other !Kung people. When she tells her own story through voice-over narration, another woman tells her story in a translated dub.

One might argue that this is merely stylistic. After all, Marshall uses his voice to stand in for the game ranger who speaks Afrikaans. The ranger tells us about the hunting of giraffes in the community, and Marshall translates him in voice-over. The ranger/Marshall's voice is also used to link shots together, as the ranger/Marshall's voice speaks over a montage of shots of giraffes. This suggests that the preference for voice-over is linked to its ability to carry over multiple shots, when the voice is no longer yoked to a body. However, unlike N!ai, the game ranger does not tell his own story. He is not a main character, and so he does not need to rise above his generality. He is also providing contextualising information. Marshall therefore takes the voice of contextualisation, as has been his voice-over role up until this point. Furthermore, Marshall does not attempt to link his voice to the ranger's body in any way. It is clear that he is merely translating the man's words. This is not a valid counter-argument as he could not be a ―true subject" anyway, and his voice is not presented as replaced by Marshall.

Mbulu's voice, in contrast, is granted an almost mythical quality through its lyricism. Hers is a voice that is only tenuously ―yoked to a body". While her voice has been strongly linked to N!ai's body, and N!ai's voice, the audience is unlikely at any stage to imagine her able to step into the world of the film and appear as herself. The smooth, clear, quality in the voice invokes imagery of a mother telling a story.

She is also not a voice that has power, at least in the way the traditional voice-over might have. This makes us unlikely to presume that she has omniscience or omnipresence. This is almost certainly because of the way that Marshall so carefully links her voice to N!ai's actual voice. She cannot speak for anyone other than N!ai, because she essentially is N!ai.

However, her freedom from being tethered to the diegesis does suggest a certain level of infallibility. Even though her voice is strongly linked to N!ai, it has a radical otherness

from its studio recording auditory quality that grants it the quality Doane (1980) argues is necessary to interpret the image. Thus, this quality suggests to us that the story that Mbulu tells us is accurate.

The possible problem with this is that at any stage, the words that appear to come from N!ai could come from a different source entirely. As we do not see her speak, nor do we hear her, anything could be attributed to her. We trust in Mbulu‘s interpretation because she is seen (or heard) as infallible. Furthermore, Marshall‘s joining between the words of N!ai and the voice of Letta mean that we are almost forced to accept all words spoken by Letta as having origins in N!ai‘s mind. At the end of the film, Marshall attributes some of N!ai‘s story to early anthropological work done by Marjorie Shostak. According to the Documentary Education Resources (der.org) information booklet on the film, Shostak interviewed the N!ai of our film in 1975. A large part of her narration is taken from these transcripts. The style and nature of the documentary appears to attribute these words to belonging to the here and now, rather than narratives spoken five years prior. While Marshall would have done some of the interviews himself, some of the voice-over derives from these transcripts.

In the last moments of the film N!ai tells us not to look at her face. The camera lingers unwaveringly on her in an almost oppressive medium close-up, which, forces us to look at her face. Eventually the camera zooms out, and it fades to black. This can almost be seen as an acquiescence to N!ai‘s demands. However, in the context of our discussion here, these final shots take on a rather different meaning. It is, after all, not N!ai‘s voice that tells us not to look at her face, but the Mbulu/N!ai hybrid. Mbulu‘s status as voice-over narrator only has strength in that we cannot look at her face. Therefore the final moments of the film can be seen as an imploration from both Mbulu and N!ai not to look at their respective faces.

In this chapter, I have suggested that both of the films present as alternatives to more traditional voice-over, but that both approaches lead to problems in their enforced linearity and appropriation of voice. I have done this by asserting that both *N!ai*and *The Hunters* can both be assessed as documentary by using Plantinga‘s framework of ~~a~~sserted veridical representation”. I have argued that Marshall is presented as both image-maker and voice-over narrator in *The Hunters*, and that this cementation makes

readings of the film as mythological problematic. I have argued that the absence of perfect omniscience, and story-teller quality in Marshall‘s voice lessen this effect, but that ultimately the film can only offer a singular, linear, perspective on the events that transpire in the film. I have suggested that a broader reading of Marshall‘s other films produced in the same time period offer a less singular and less linear perspective. I have also argued that *N!ai’s*use of two voice-over narrators allows for multiple perspectives on events, but that ultimately Marshall is marked as the image-maker, and thus his voice-over narration is seen to provide the ultimate authority. I have argued that while N!aiappears to be a framing homodiegetic narrator, Marshall‘s narration operates on a higher status than hers and so he is the framing narrator and N!ai is the embedded narrator. Finally, I have argued that N!ai is not completely able to rise above her generality as a subject, because her voice is taken away from her, and given to another English-speaking woman. Mbulu, in contrast, is made to possess the qualities of a voice-over narrator that is not yoked to a body, and is able to freely interpret the image. Her voice has been carefully linked to N!ai‘s, which means that we view her narration as infallible, and having origins in N!ai‘s thoughts. As I have argued, this is problematic as the words could potentially derive from another source, but we do not have N!ai‘s original words to which to compare them. Both *N!ai*and *The Hunters* present two different ways of dealing with subjects that do not speak the same language as their audience. One ends up with a singular, linear perspective on an event. The other allows a character to emerge from the story, but it is one that is removed from its original context and allows for error in reportage.

Chapter Three: The Intentionally Deceitful Narrator in Buñuel's*Las Hurdes*

Buñuel's *Land without Bread* (1933[2]/Buñuel) has seen many names and many release dates. Originally named *Las Hurdes*, it became *Terra Dans Pain*, which was deemed a more marketable name. It is also titled as *Land without Bread* in English speaking countries. However, in order to not show a preference to either language, I shall hereinafter refer to the film as *Las Hurdes,* when speaking about it generically. The film poses as a straight-forward ethnographic film, but actually serves to demonstrate the flaws in the straight-forward ethnographic film. This chapter will argue that indexing the film as a documentary ultimately leads to the audience doubting the infallibility of the narrator, and then of narrators and ethnographic film in general. The film also illustrates an interesting phenomenon: the unconventional story-weaver as an array of voices. The film exists in many versions, and each tell a slightly different story. This chapter will argue that the film‘s multiple versions belie a unified reading, and that these multiple versions are linked to the function of the film.

It is important to this discussion to outline the multiple existing versions. There are at least five versions of the film: the 1937 MOMA print with an American narrator, two French versions (1936 and 1995) and two Spanish versions (1933 and 1965). Ibarz (2004) indicates some of the reasons for the changes in the films. Initially the film was released in Spain without voice-over. The Spanish government subsequently banned this version. The film then saw a re-release in France (1936) and the United States of America(1937) with voice-over written for those versions in French (narrated by Abel Jaquin) and English respectively. However, the French government censored several scenes, the effect of which will be discussed later in this chapter. Braunberger encouraged a re-release of the film in 1965 when these scenes were recovered, with narration provided by Francisco Rabal in Spanish. However, as Ibarz (2004) continues, the original version of the film no longer existed, and new voice-over had to be created.

Most of these versions start in a fairly similar manner, although their specific execution changes slightly (which will be discussed later). The film has a voice-over narrator who

[2]Ibarz (2004: 27) notes that Buñuel dated the film 1932 for political reasons, but that it was actually shot in 1933 and released for the first time in 1933.

plays the part of commentator-acousmêtre, which is defined by Chion (1999: 21) as an acousmatic voice that has no ~~–p~~ersonal stake in the image". The voice-over acts as omniscient and unbiased observer. Thus, for the first few minutes of the film the unsuspecting spectator will thus take the narrator's words at face value. The narrator tells us that we are viewing the village of La Alberca, to which many of the Las Hurdes residents are in debt. Clear visual links are made between the narrator's words and what we see on screen. ~~–M~~ost homes have three stories" occurs at the same time as the camera pans up a three-story house. The ~~–s~~trange and barbaric" ritual involving a strung up rooster and newly-wed men seems to be accurately represented. There are no disparities between what we hear and what we see, and thus, with no reason not to do so, we begin to believe the narrator's words.

While the narrator is not granted the ~~–i~~mage-maker" quality by any of the pre-film intertitles (as we shall see Herzog is), he still seems to reflect the intentions of the image-maker, as he is perceived to be omniscient and he shapes the imagery that we see unfolding. As explained in Chapter One, I showed how Kozloff (1988: 45) argues the narrator and image-maker are often presumed to be one and the same. Furthermore, when the film was first screened, Buñuel himself would attend screenings and read out the voice-over live with the film. Buñuel was also one of the authors of the text of the voice-over. The tone of the voice-over thus reflects the authorship of Buñuel. The tone of the narrator also reflects the tone of the intertitle that begins the film. The connection between the two voices of narrator and image-maker is made stronger, and we see the narrator as omniscient.

However, this acceptanceof the narrator as an infallible image-maker is quickly made suspect. The narrator tells us how the goats sometimes fall off the mountain. Then the film shows us a goat falling off the mountain. Ruoff (1998) explains that this sequence directly follows from the book Buñuel based the film on: Legendre's 1927 *Las Jurdes: étude de géographiehumaine*. In the book, Legendre explains that the villagers only eat goat meat when they are killed accidentally. Ruoff (1998) goes on to explain that in order to recreate this moment, Buñuel and his team shot the goat and then carried its corpse up the mountain and threw it off again. Even without this knowledge, the observant viewer can see a gunshot in the right corner of the screen, and see the camera cut mid-fall to an angle that would not even have been possible with a multi-cam shoot. It is clear from this moment that the filmmaker is not merely presenting footage and explaining or

contextualising the content, but is rather drastically *re-presenting* the footage. When the narrator later tells us that a clearly elderly woman with gout is thirty-two years old, everything becomes contestable. We need not accept that the diagrams of mosquitoes are accurate (even though they are). The narrator‘s claims that a fancy church is located in one of the poorer regions need not be true. The film-literate viewer may begin to doubt all manipulations by the narrator.

Previous claims could now also be brought under suspicion. On re-examination, the strange ritual represented two minutes into the film seems to involve merely clever editing. We see the chicken being strung up, and then this shot is followed by a shot of men on horses. However, it is only in the strength of the voice-over that these two shots are linked together in any causal way. We never see a man reach for the chicken‘s head, as the voice-over proclaims. Even the shots of celebration that follow after this are not necessarily linked to the event. The scene starts with a rooster in medium close-up, strung up by its legs. As the voice-over tells us that the riders will have to take the head of the rooster, the film cuts to an extreme long shot of the crowd and the rooster. There is a match-on action between these shots as the movement of the rooster continues from one shot to the next. This creates spatial contiguity and temporal continuity between the two shots, even though such a transition had to be staged due to the requirements of camera placement. The crowd has created a pathway around the rooster, and so, when we cut to the next shot — riders in a medium long shot, it is assumed that they will ride along this pathway. We then see a variety of crowd shots, while the narrator tells us that after they have walked around with the rooster head, they will offer wine to everybody. With the clever use of the word ~~a~~fter”, the audience does not realise that we see neither the grabbing of the rooster head, nor the walking around with it. Ruoff (1998) notes that the inclusion of such a spectacle is a palpably surrealist visual, comparing it to the eye-slitting of *Un ChienAndalou*(1950/Buńuel). This perhaps should have alerted us to its potential invalidity immediately. Furthermore, a change in music can be heard, denoting a sly omission of material. The juxtapositions of a series of shots, coupled with a narrator that we trust, means that we are likely to infer that the story telling is real, even though it may not be. Thus, the montage involved in this sequence is undermined by the following sequences in which the montage is clearly exposed.

However, in the newer versions the earlier sequences are more straightforward in their revelation of the action. The newer versions of the film do show the men riding down the

empty path, and also show the decapitation in close-up. This is one of the scenes that was censored from the original versions, and brought back in the versions made after 1965. However, while it may have been the intention of Buñuel for all viewers to see this scene, early audiences could have interpreted this sequence as manipulated. As we shall discover, this break in possible interpretations is a common thread, and this shall be further explored. However, first we must determine the reason for the misleading narrator.

Previous discussions of the film have criticised the narrator for being inappropriate or flawed. Ruoff (1998: 49) cites Wright, who states that, ―Unfortunately, someone (presumably not Buñuel) has added to the film a wearisome American commentary, plus the better part of a Brahms symphony. As a result, picture and sound never coalesce" (1971: 146). Ruoff (1998) and Gubern (2012) explains that it was Buñuel who added the commentary, and intentionally so. Gubern states that Buñuel began this work in 1935. Wright, among others, misattributed the intentions of the voice-over as they saw it as a voice-over extraneously added. The later French and Rabal (Spanish) versions of the voice-over lack this weariness that Wright heard, although they still maintain the tone of expository narrator. With their dulcet tones, the picture and sound do at least seem to coalesce with regard to register if not to fact. Furthermore, if, when watching the American version of the film with the full knowledge that Buñuel purposefully added the narration, the link between narrator and image-maker is made concrete. The information that one brings to the film can thus change one‘s perception of said film.

This choice appearsintentional for a number of reasons. While we may know that it is Buñuel‘s intentions, there are key aspects of the film itself that make this clear. Kozloff (1988: 115), following Pratt (1977), argues that it is presumed that the image-maker never makes intentional mistakes because the film is presumed by its audience to have undergone ―rigorous selection and preparation”. Except in the case of the awful student film, the choices made by the image-maker are thought to be intentional choices. Characters in the film, in contrast, can be seen to have imperfect knowledge, and their mistakes can be seen as human error. In *Las Hurdes*, the clear connections between image-maker and narrator that are made by the first section of the film compounds the idea that they are the same, or at least belong to the same realm. Wright‘s interpretation of the film is flawed because he was not equipped with the knowledge that the narration was intentionally added, and thus he views the narrator‘s mistakes as a human error.

With the Spanish or French narration, or even with the American narration together with the knowledge that it is intentional, we do not assume that the narrator is merely misattributing the facts. Following Kozloff (1988) and Pratt (1977), what may appear to us as error, is re-interpreted as an action with conscious intention by the image-maker. Thus the narrator‘s misleading words are taken as a reflection of Buñuel‘s intentions, with a desired effect.

However, there is a moment wherein the narrator could be perceived to lose control of the narrative. The voice-over narrator tells us that the shortest of one of the ~~–i~~diots” is twenty-eight-years-old. The camera then pans to a young boy, proving that the narrator is lying. As this action takes place after the voice-over has stopped speaking it is the outer ~~–n~~arrator”, the image-maker, that reveals the voice-over‘s deception. The voice-over narrator appears to lose his apparent control over the image. Kozloff (1988) however, argues that a departure from the perceived narrator‘s point of view does not necessarily signal a departure from the narrator being perceived as the constructor of the text. She argues that as a film itself can oft move from one character‘s point of view, to an invisible observational view, to a secondary character‘s point of view, so can a narrator shift from a personal account to one that exists outside the realm of their knowledge. The former does not cause the audience to lose faith in the image-maker‘s consistency as one entity, and thus, Kozloff argues, the latter should not cause us to mistrust the structural integrity of the narrator. While the afore-mentioned moment may be perceived as a moment wherein the narrator loses control, it is not a moment from whence the narrator permanently loses control.

Therefore, despite this moment, we can still see the voice-over narrator as being in control and connected to the realm of the image-maker. If we seethem as connected, then we are likely to believe that these mistakes are intentional and that the narrator is intentionally misleading the viewer. We will then seek meaning from the deception as rationale for Buñuel‘s choices.

This meaning, as theorists such as Ruoff (1998) have suggested, is to call into doubt our faith in the traditional narrator, and the meaning-making of expository documentaries. No matter the original intentions of the film, it serves in some way as a fable to articulate the dangers of an uncontrolled narrator. This is also strongly suggested by the choice of co-author of the narration, Pierre Unik, who was a surrealist and communist

(Ruoff,1998). The selection of such an author hints at the intentions of the film. Surrealists are not typically in the business of creating dry, formal, expository documentaries. Instead, we normally find that their work is vivid, informal and lacking in clear explanations for the subconscious thoughts they sought to explore. Clifford notes that ethnography and surrealism developed "in close proximity" in France (1981: 540), so Buñuel would have been aware of ethnography's development and its subsequent criticism. Spurling (1998) argues that many theorists have attempted to define the film as surrealist, and failed. He cites Aranda's claims that the film is surrealist through its list of absurd, yet determinate facts. However, it is not within the goals of this dissertation to define the surrealism of *Las Hurdes*. While the film may or may not be a surrealist text, a standard ethnography it is not. Ruoff (1998) argues that the information we receive about the village is often dull and uninteresting, and that this in itself is a criticism of the expository ethnography. We learn as much as the children in the classroom do, that is not much at all.

Ibarz (2004) also notes that the later versions are against the original intentions of Buñuel. Rabal's more compassionate voice-over, done in 1995, does not reflect the original intentional "wearisome" tone of the narrator heard by Wright, and was likely created without Buñuel's direct influence. The original American version, he notes, has a "The March of Time" feel to it. Thus, this weariness *is* intentional. Its intended effect is to reflect the classic voice-of-God narrator, and in leading the audience astray, reveal the folly of trusting one.

However, while still seeing the narrator's words as intentional, Spurling (1998) views the voice-over as performing a different function. He suggests that the narrator functions in two different ways in the two parts of the film. In the first, the La Alberca and Las Batuecas sections, his words are consistent with the visuals. In the Las Hurdes section, he contradicts himself and the images. Intriguingly, Spurling points to moments in both sections where the narrator speaks words that appear in the image as key identifying instants. In La Alberca, he notes, the narrator speaks the inscription on what he incorrectly identifies as a church, but is actually a house. The narrator tells us the inscription is, "Ave Maria, conceived without sin," and the inscription is a variation of "Ave Maria purisima sin pecadoconcebida" - Hail purest Mary, conceived without sin. As Spurling notes, "The voice and image are in agreement". His second example is in the

classroom, where the narrator says words which are different to that which is written on the blackboard.

This only occurs in the MOMA print. In all other versions of the film that I have found, the narrator tells us that the student writes, "Respect the property of others" on the board. The student does write this in Spanish, and so there is no actual discrepancy between the two. Indeed, Spurling's suggestion that this moment is key in dividing the text is an incorrect interpretationbecause it does not occur in other versions of the film.

Spurling does note that the narrator's question of, "And what is this pretty lady doing here?" to a painting on a wall is the source of our removal and distrust of the narrator. He likens the statement to Magritte's "This is not a…" series, and suggests it provides a jolt for the viewer. However, none of the other versions include this statement. Instead, the voice-over merely tells us that they found an "unexpected and shocking image", and asks us what this "absurd drawing [could] be doing [t]here?" However, while these statements do not draw attention to the constructed nature of the film, they are certainly out of place with regard to the very ordinary drawing.

Fig 1. *Las Hurdes* (1933)

Kozloff (1988: 103), too, notes that the closest the image can be to the voice is in the case of words appearing on the screen. Kozloff suggests that we imagine a thread tracking the correspondence between the visual track and the soundtrack. At one end of the scale we have ~~–o~~verlapping" narration, which brings about the sort of redundancy spoken about in the introduction. The voice-over tells us no more information than what we could already deduce from the image (although it may tell us what is important about the image, which would reduce its polysemic quality). On the other end we have contradiction, wherein the image and voice-over are at odds with one another. *Las Hurdes* never quite reaches contradiction. Rather, the narration in *Las Hurdes* hovers in between the two extremes. Spurling's example of the inscription on the house is not even entirely congruous. If one listens to a French or English version of the film, for example, the actual words will be different, even if the meaning is the same. Even the Spanish version gives us some incongruity, as the written words on the house blend into each other, making it difficult to read as can be noted in the following image. There is also the discrepancy Kozloff (1988) mentions: that of the tone of the voice and the font of the printed words. However, she still argues that words represented through sound and picture are the closest one can get to correspondence, despite a few minor differences.

Fig 2. *Las Hurdes* (1933)

Therefore we have two theorists who suggest that it is when the text and voice correlate that is the most obvious departure from voice/image correspondence. In other words, it is when the words are not the same. This is a form of logocentrism, or a privilege of words

over other forms of communication[3]. While there is a great deal of visual imagery and spoken word discord in the film, Spurling considers the key moments as those between written and spoken words. These moments, are, according to Spurling, clearly instances of a deceitful narrator; while the previously mentioned confusion of a real woman with a painting merely serves to jar us, rather than actual evidence of image confusion.

But why should these be thought of as more clearly deceitful? If one considers the scenario in terms of signs, we have a phonic symbolic signifier paired with a visual symbolic signifier. They are both different ways of representing the same signifier. However, whether the signifier is spoken French, or written Spanish, the signifieds that they both point to are identical. Hail Mary, conceived without sin, could not be depicted in any way without words. Thus, while these moments are not the only indications to identify the narrator as misleading or corresponding, they do make the difference clear.

However, upon closer examination, the narrator does not merely repeat the words found in the image. Rather, the narrator tells us that these words appear on the houses of the Hurdanos. This is really no different in levels of correspondence than telling us that most homes have three stories, which occurs seconds prior, or that the children dunk their bread in water. It reveals information about the image by generalising it, and extending one example to serve as analogy for all. We only see one home with the inscription, and no other proof to suggest that this is the case. This serves as an example of Kozloff's mantra that voice-over is often the best way to provide generalisations, but it also shows how this aspect of the voice-over can be manipulated. Thus, his examples to cite the differences between the two sections of the film do suggest a form of logocentrism. However, despite this, we can still grant him the idea that the film has two different registers.

Spurling's (1998) suggestions lead him to the conclusion that the film denies a ~~"u~~nified reading", and that this implies that the earlier European section cannot and should not be encompassed within the same discourse as the Las Hurdes section. However, as I have shown, the misleading narrator calls into question the supposedly corresponding narrator of the earlier section. Furthermore, as Ruoff (1998) indicates, the rooster beheading is clearly reminiscent of surrealist visuals, and it seems irresponsible not to judge the earlier

[3] A more specific form of logocentrism, phonocentrism, will be further discussed in Chapter Four

section with as much scrutiny as the latter. If anything, the correspondence between visual and audio marks the narrator as capable of producing truth, as capable of guiding the image-track and standing in for our image-maker. Thus, when his narration becomes misleading, we see it as intentional, rather than merely incorrect or uninformed.

Most interesting about Spurling‘s notes, however, is that they do not appear on any of the versions of *Las Hurdes* that I managed to watch. There are at least five different versions of the voice-over of *Las Hurdes.* I have managed to watch part of the English voice-over (MOMA edition), two versions of the French voice-over, and one Spanish version. Ruoff (1998: 46) also notes that there ―are small but significant variations among these versions", but that he will limit his ―discussion to the version of *Land Without Bread* with the American voice-over".

All of these versions are fairly similar in tone and explanation, but these ―small" variations are certainly ―significant" and worthy of study. A complete data set is difficult to compile, as many authors do not specify which version of the film they watch, and many prints are difficult to obtain. Furthermore, as the film is no longer under copyright, many versions exist on sites such as www.youtube.com, and the authenticity of the voice-over and veracity of the translation is often suspicious. However, one can get a sense of the versions in surveying various authors‘ commentary, and the versions of the film that can be authenticated.

When *Las Hurdes* was originally released, it was a silent film. According to Gubern (2012), the film was often screened with Buñuel improvising a voice-over live at screenings. This meant that he would have licence to change the voice-over as he saw fit. This makes it hardly surprising that the film itself has many different versions. However, an official voice-over was written, and screened for the first time in 1936 (Gubern, 2012). The original script, which had to be cut for length, was far more radical than what exists today, and explored various psychoanalytical discussions of the culture (Gubern, 2012).

While this ―wearisome" commentary was written for the screen and added by Buñuel, various changes have been made in later versions. In the classroom scene, the early French and American version tells us that the documentary makers selected a page at random, and asked a child to write out a maxim from the page. The child then does so. In other versions of the film, the voice-over reports the scene as merely occurring. The films

report an observational mode of documentary making, while the early French and American versions demonstrates the interaction between subject and filmmaker. While a small difference, this clearly points to the difference a voice-over can make. In the first instance, the filmmakers are intervening; in the latter, it could be a daily occurrence. However, in the MOMA version the particular student writes it out from memory:

> We find a book of morality on a table and open it at random. One of the best pupils can write from memory on request one of its maxims.

This implies that the community highly values the notion. It is a maxim the student has learnt by heart.

However,Ruoff (1998) argues that this rote recitation also reflects Buñuel's own opinions on the education system. Buñuel complained that he was ~~"a~~ goldmine of useless facts" (Buñuel 1984: 3 in Ruoff 1988) by the time he had left school. Spurling also notes that ~~"th~~e future Hurdanos are being trained not in the irrational thought valued by the surrealists, but in the hierarchical, Cartesian social organization of modern Europe" (1998). In this scene it is thus the students' ability to recite passages from a book of moral instructions is ridiculed. While the changes in voice-over are subtle, the effects that they have on implied meaning is significant.

The maxim chosen is particularly important: ~~"r~~espect the property of others". If it is a daily occurrence, then this means that the school chooses this as a maxim to teach its pupils. They hold the principle dearly. The maxim is about property ownership, and this suggests that the Hurdanos see private property as a key moral concept. This suggests that key constraints of capitalism have found their way into the Hurdanos' lifestyles. However, a film crew instructing a child to write out the maxim means that the film crew finds it interesting. It says nothing about the community's value of such an idea, and the point is not as strong.

In the version Spurling writes about, the voice-over apparently intones that ~~"e~~ven these children learn the golden rule" (to respect the property of others). Here, the voice-over is speaking from a position of superiority to the children. The voice-over, which is typically thought of as being omnipotent (as discussed in previous chapters), claims this power in the use of the word ~~"e~~ven". Thus, power is associated in believing that ~~"th~~e golden rule" is to respect the property of others. Typically, we tend to believe that the golden rule is more generic, along the lines of ~~"d~~o onto others as you would them you". The voice-

over reduces this rule to one about property and a link forms between a position of authority and the importance of private property. The voice-over thus works against the "solution" offered by the title cards at the end, which suggest Hitler was trying to bring power to the rich and that by "mutual self-help", the villagers will be able to make their lives better and elect "a Popular Front government". The untrustworthy narrator is thus made part of the very system the filmmakers are fighting against.

One of the telling differences between the MOMA print and the early French and Spanish versions is the introductory sequence. The MOMA print begins with a sequence of maps. The film starts with a map of Europe, then a map of Spain, and finally a map locating Las Hurdes between Caceres and Salamanca. Mendelson (1996) argues that these maps suggest that what we see in Las Hurdes is common to other communities in Europe. He argues that the final map shows that Las Hurdes is a site of political charge, as Salamanca was "the last frontier of Republican Spain", as well as a cultured university town (Gubern, 2012) and Portugal was under the dictatorship of Salazar (Mendelson, 1996: 234).

In the other versions, we are instead given lengthy intertitles that explain the suffering of the Hurdanos people and contextualises their history. The intertitle deprived English speakers are told that the film can be seen as a study of "human geography". The non-English viewers are told no such thing. Therefore, the viewers of the American version are left to make some inferences themselves and are made to rely on external knowledge to contextualise the piece.

The MOMA print also lacks the long sequence of names. This takes away the authorship of the film and makes it harder to see the narrator and image-producers as part of the same world. In the French and Spanish versions, the film cuts straight from the credits, to an intertitle, to the film itself where the narrator has begun speaking. The viewer is left with the impression that the creators listed at the beginning, those who put in the intertitle, and the narrator are all part of the same intentional creation. The American version goes from intertitle to maps, when the narrator begins speaking.

The differences here seem minor, but clear when considering the language shift. The French and Spanish versions are more explanatory. In these versions, we are told the "cretins" are playing a game of hide and seek, and so the sudden appearance of another from behind a hill is explained. In the American version, however, the narration only

states that ―he is another type of idiot". The film is set in Spain, so the Spanish audience is the one that gets to hear the most about the community. The version is available on the Spanish version of *Los Olvidados* (1950/Buñuel), and has no English subtitles. The MOMA version, which is in English, is the least explanatory and the most manipulative. Here again we find an echo of Spurling's interpretation of the film. The multiple films discourage a unified reading in their audience. If we are not Spanish, we find out less about the community. The English version tells us that this maxim ―governs our civilised world". This inclusion hints at sarcasm and also hints at an exclusionary discourse. The Las Hurdeans are not part of the civilised world, but the English speakers watching the documentary are part of it. That this addition is absent from other versions of the film is further evidence that the film, in its various forms, echoes Spurling's interpretation. It is not so much that the film denies a ―unified reading", but rather that the film, as a collection of films denies a ―unified reading" through their language divide.

One sees this again in the description of the baby near the beginning of the film. The English version says, ―Though actually Christian, these trinkets are amazingly like the charms of African natives". The newer French version says, ―Although the images on the trinkets appear Christian," and then finally the older French version states, ―A baby adorned with silver medals: they are like amulets from Africa or Oceania". Here, the older French version removes the ―Christianity" from the medals. The child that we see is merely adorned with medals that are like the land of ―the other". The newer French version does not concede that the images are necessarily Christian, and the English version states that they are Christian, but that they are similar to those from the land of the ―other".

Essentially, speaking of the voice-over or even the film in general as one unit is complicated. Even Ibarz's (2004) detailed discussion of the film speaks of it as if it were one text. For example, his discussion of the classroom scene tells us that the version he watched says that the students ―are taught the same as children everywhere, that the sum of three angles of a triangle equals the sum of two right angles". This is absent from all of the versions surveyed in this chapter, where instead the narrator tells us that the students are learning algebra.

The various versions of the film lead us to different conclusions about Buñuel's intentions. As Ibarz (2004: 27-28) indicates, the versions of the film released after 1965

do not necessarily reflect the intentions of Buñuel at all as the ―fraudelent tone of compassion" is a new feature. While Buñuel's authorisation of the various films' voice-overs may not be suitably delineated, the fact remains that different voice-overs exist today. An English speaker will likely see the MOMA print, a French speaker will see eitherJacquin's voice-over, or the newer dub, and Spanish speakers may hear the Rabal version. Without a translator, English speakers will never get to hear the Spanish version, and so this means that there is an automatic language divide. Viewers of the film at the time of release (before 1965) would have seen an edited version. English speaking viewers would have been shown a version lacking in contextualisation.

Therefore it is our earliest viewers who see the film most effective at criticising the ethnographic film and narrator. Modern Spanish audiences will see a compassionate, informative documentary. The film still has a misleading narrator, but the deception is considerably reduced.These choices, while they may not be intentional, still echo the intentions of the narrator. The intention, perhaps, is that modern Spanish audiences will gain more from the film as a reasonably honest documentaryabout their community in the early 1930s, than they would from a subtle criticism of ethnographic film. Similarly, the absence of important contextualisation in the early French and American prints means that those audiences were more likely to be misled, and thus, Buñuel's intention to reveal the problems with the infallible voice-over narrators would have been at their most effective.

Las Hurdes offers us two interesting avenues in its discussion. In the former, the film offers a criticism of the ethnographic expository film. Its manipulation of the viewer through montage and voice-over causes the observant viewer to be aware of the potential for manipulation. The multiple discourses present in the individual film itself and in the various versions lendthemselves to discussion about exclusionary practices. This reflects the goal of the filmmakerbecause the film does not have a unified reading within itself as a single text. It also does not have a unified reading when viewed as an array of voices from multiple films. Therefore one's geographical and temporal location will affect one's reading of the film and so the film will have, and does have, multiple interpretations.

Chapter Four: The Mutinous Subject: Silent Characters and Authorial Voices in the Films of Werner Herzog

From the literal mute in *Land of Silence and Darkness* (1971/Herzog), to the inanimate object in *Plastic Bag* (2009/Bahrani), to the untranslated and unsubtitled foreigner in films like *Wheel of Time* (2003), Herzog has a history of speaking for the mute subject. I will show that he often informs us about the characters, rather than letting them speak for themselves. I will argue that such appropriations can often be complicated in the heading of ~~"d~~ocumentary", and proffer a suggestion of subtitling as a potential avenue to avoid such problems. I will argue that Herzog's earlier documentary films appear to reveal unconventional story-weavers, but that on closer inspection they reveal conventional flaws. *Land of Silence and Darkness* appears to give a blind and deaf woman, FiniStraubinger, the ability to tell her own story, and places her on the level of framing narrator. However, as the film progresses, Herzog's narration begins to dominate, and she is revealed to merely be an embedded, homodiegetic narrator, much as N!ai was. Herzog not only controls the film itself (as its creator), but also controls Straubinger's words and voice. *Fata Morgana* gives us an array of voices that speak in mythical tones, but the lack of intervention from the mute subjects themselves means that they are depicted as somewhat of a ~~"n~~oble savage". I will argue that while one might be tempted to categorise the film outside of the documentary mode, it can be read as documentary through Nichols' poetic mode.

I will then compare these films to later works, such as *Wheel of Time, White Diamond,*and *Little Dieter Needs to Fly.* It is in his later films in which he unabashedly takes control of the narrative, while at the same time revealing his fallibility and personality. I shall argue that this encourages his audiences to engage more critically with his films, and that it also explains the relative popularity of the films. I will argue against the use of subtitles as an alternative to the voice-over Herzog uses by suggesting that dubbing forces the audience to listen to the subjects, even if it is not in their own voice. However, I shall argue that the real concern is of the mute characters that exist in films like *Little Dieter,* and that despite Herzog's quality as a complete acousmêtre, their presence is considerably problematic. I shall consider Chion's conceptualisation of the mute in cinema as counterpart to the acousmêtre, which suggests that the mute characters in the film have power similar to that of an acousmêtre. However, I shall argue that the

theory does not translate to documentary film, as his theory only works in the case of hired actors. Herzog, thus, on his path to ―ecstatic truth", inadvertently makes many of the mistakes early ethnographic filmmakers made.

In *Land of Silence and Darkness*, the subject matter is a group of blind and deaf people. They cannot sign to each other, as they are blind, and mostly cannot talk to each other, as they are deaf. Instead, they communicate with a seemingly complicated system of pats on the hands. Sitting at a dinner altogether, translators tap on their hands as other guests speak. Their words are translated into spoken German, and spoken by their translators. These are subjects that are generally incapable of speaking and a group of people who are used to others speaking on behalf of them, and so to have Herzog speak on their behalf does not seem particularly unusual. However, unlike in his later films, the film is not dubbed into English (or even from English to German as in *Fitzcarraldo* 1982), but rather is subtitled. When they can, the subjects are thus allowed to speak in their own voice, with subtitles provided. However, despite the fact that Herzog does not literally speak for the subject, his tendency to speak on behalf of others is still present in the film.

The film begins in darkness. A woman's voice speaks over the black screen. This makes her voice acousmatic in that we do not see the source of her voice's origin. She tells us she sees clouds overhead, and then clouds appear on the screen. After the ―Ein Film von Werner Herzog" intertitle, there is a cut to darkness. The woman's voice tells us about watching ski-jumpers from her childhood. ―I wish you could see that" spurs on images of the jumpers. Then the film removes another sense. There is no sound. Straubinger's words appear on screen in intertitle: ―I always jump when touched". When we cut to this screen, the music is cut off as the image cuts to black; in other words, the cinematic style reflects the content of the film. The film jumps as she does. In this way, her voice is almost akin to image-maker, it appears.

Kozloff (1988: 50) argues that:

> We find it easier to accept voice-over narrators as primary, framing storytellers when the voice-over is simultaneous with the film's opening shots, when one has seen as little as possible of the story world, and certainly before one sees the narrating character.

Straubinger begins the film in this role. Her words are heard even before we see the first image or title screen. We are thus inclined to view her as a ―primary, framing

storyteller". Her words appear to construct the imagery. This suggests that her words can make internal images external, which is the role of an image-maker. Together with her domination of the voice-over for the first fifteen minutes, these attributes give her the powers attributed to an image-maker. Her words call up images that she herself cannot see, but we imagine exist inside her head.

One might argue that the initial intertitle suggests an an external-to-the-film narrating force, as was the case in *N!ai*. However, while not explicitly stated, the intertitle is assumed by the viewer to be Straubinger's own words. The intertitle is written in the first person, in a similar tone, and so the intertitle speaks with her, and so it reinforces her voice. Instead of working against her narration, confirming and revealing the presence of an image-maker, the intertitle adds credence to the idea that she is shaping presence behind the world that we see.

However, in order to further understand the role Straubinger has in the narrative, we need to revisit some key terms from Genette's (in Kozloff, 1988) taxonomy of narrators, as outlined in Chapter One. Straubinger appears to be a framing, homodiegetic narrator in *Land of Silence and Darkness*, as she exists in the framing narrative, but is still a character in the film. When she tells us about the animals two minutes after the start of the film, she is de-acousmatised and she is marked as homodiegetic. As we learn more about the film, and Herzog's narration begins to creep in, we realise that while she is a framing narrator she is certainly not the image-maker, and we do not grant her the interchangeable connection between framing narrator and image-maker that we so often do.

However, Straubinger also brings you into her world through direct address. She tells you that she wishes ~~"y~~ou" could see that. The statement may have originally come from an interview with Herzog (and therefore he is the ~~"y~~ou" to whom she speaks), but in the context in which it appears in the film it suggests a direct address to the audience. Its placement in the film is more important than its original location. The audience only sees the final form of the film and not the sequences from which it was made up. The audience will perceive the statement as a direct address. This has the effect of further placing her in a world outside of the diegesis as she appears to be able to acknowledge the existence of the audience. However, this address only happens before Herzog's first voice-over, which is when she loses her image-maker qualities.

Herzog‘s first voice-over occurs sixteen minutes into the film. He provides a factual summary of what we are about to see, with none of the philosophical and virtuosic flair one sees in his later films. He informs us about the dinner party Straubinger is hosting, and that each guest will have a translator to explain the events. Soon after this, Straubinger tells us that they need help - in a way, repeating Herzog‘s words - ―but they also need help…”.Straubinger repeats the content of Herzog‘s words as a diegetic character. This appears to the viewer that as a character she is granted knowledge of the image-maker‘s world. While one might argue that her voice grants knowledge to the image-maker, the important distinction here is that he speaks before she does. Her words echo his.

The end of her sentence is, ―So they don‘t find themselves unprepared in the world of silence and darkness”. After confirming Herzog‘s narration she then utters the title of the film. Again, this happens as a character. While it is likely that in actuality her words informed the creation of the title, the construction of the scenes makes it appear the other way around. In this moment, therefore, she no longer appears to inform the image, and creates what we see, but instead responds to its creation.

It is after Herzog appears as a framing narrator that Straubinger is delegated to an embedded narrator. From this point onwards, Herzog occasionally intervenes, giving us framing narration, such as ―Fini and her guests go to see the botanical garden”. Straubinger still guides us through the film, but now as a character. In this early work, the diction of Herzog‘s voice-over is devoid of his typical flair and provides much of the role provided by a more traditional narrator. However, he is clearly present in the diegesis despite his physical absence. Thirty-six minutes into the film, the camera slowly tracks out from a close-up of a woman‘s face to a group of blind and deaf women, sitting on hospital beds. The camera lingers on these women, and we note their loneliness as they sit on their own in a world without sound or sight. However poignant, the shot seems constructed, particularly when followed by the intertitle: ―When you let go of my hand it is as if we were a thousand miles apart.” The sequence, devoid of sound and movement, drives home the plight of these women, but also reveals the film as created, rather than merely existing, or willed into existence as the introductory intertitle suggested to us. Later, when Straubinger is present at a speech where music plays, the camera pans from the orchestra to Straubinger‘s companion moving her hand in time to the music. This camera movement answers our unspoken question, and reveals an author

of the text beyond Straubinger‘s narration. The moment where the presence of an image-maker is made most clear is towards the end of the film when a deaf and blind man wanders off from the central group. Prior to this moment, the auditory focus had been on the discussion between FiniStraubinger and the man‘s mother. As he wanders off he bumps into a tree and the sound is slowly lowered as the instrumental music becomes louder. The camera moves to focus on him by zooming in, and then pans back to the group of women, and then pans back to him. The choices in framing and soundtrack selection emphasise Herzog‘s involvement in the creation.

For the most part, however, scenes are allowed to speak for themselves, with large periods of silence articulating the strength of the moment. Herzog has often stressed that he views *Land of Silence and Darkness* as the film he wishes his audience would see. It is also, quite tellingly, one of the few films lacking his presence, and one of the few films that is subtitled. It is also a film in which his subjects are subtitled, rather than translated through a voice-over. Unlike in most of his films, Herzog‘s voice seems to be an entirely heterodiegetic narrator. There is no ~~–e~~lassic lunge into frame” (Wong, 1997) or even a hint at Herzog‘s presence in the world of these deaf and mute subjects. Herzog does not seem to have the quality of the acousmêtre he has in his later films, as he does not have Chion‘s (1999:21) ~~–s~~take in the image”.Instead he is a more traditional framing narrator and image-maker. His absence from the film seems to suggest that Herzog does not seem to speak on behalf of the subjects of the film. They cannot speak, and so it seems that he is unwilling to take away their ability to represent themselves.

While this is a nice thought, Herzog does, however speak for them in other ways. Straubinger‘s opening lines about the ski-jumpers‘ faces is a poignant moment that marks her as image-maker (even though this is conceded later). However, Herzog (in Galiero, Habib& Renaud, 2004) has the following to say about the validity of this statement:

> That was made up. It was all made up. I gave her that sentence to speak for me. And she understood.

Herzog continues to explain that he believes it points to her deepest truth. While she has no memory of ski-jumpers, it paints a visual picture that shows what he believes to be her truth. As in his treatment of Dengler, he attempts to express an inner truth through a falsehood. He also claims that Straubinger immediately understood why (in Ambrose, 2010). She again loses power as image-maker, as these words are not hers, but Herzog‘s.

The film opens with Herzog‘s words, albeit be it through Straubinger‘s voice. He uses her voice to shape the film, but the words are still his words, and his construction of the film. Even though it seems as if he lets his subjects ―speak‖ for themselves, it is still very much Herzog‘s film.

Young (2001) critiques his methods, claiming that ―it's as if he either doesn't trust the strength of the subject, or that he just couldn't get what he wanted out of Fini herself.‖ Young dubs Herzog‘s film-making style as ―*cinema-mensonge*‖, or cinema-lie. Herzog, certainly would counter that he never calls his films documentaries, but the fact still remains that many people still index his films as documentary, and this mars these ―ecstatic truths‖ as problematic.

However, Bruzzi (2006), following on from Morris, criticises direct cinema and their claims of objectivity. Quoting Antonio, who argues that it ―is first of all a lie, and secondly a childish assumption about the nature of film‖ (in Rosenthal, 1978; 7), Bruzzi (2006: 73) argues that documentary film can never be objective and the documentary filmmakers claims to objectivity are unfounded. Bruzzi, discredits the idea of cinema vérité, arguing, in essence, that it too is *cinema-mensonge*. In attempting to show the truth of its subjects, it reveals a caricature of how they prefer to present themselves to the world, rather than the ―truth‖. Bruzzi argues that this can be seen as a positive feature of direct cinema, once one removes the original intentions of the filmmakers. The so-called observational style reveals certain truths about the human condition, even if they are not the truths the filmmakers set out to portray.

However, inherent to Bruzzi‘s argument is the idea that documentaries are incapable of producing an objective truth. All documentaries will involve a level of construction and selection. She cites Albert Maysles‘ discussion of *Salesman* (1969/Maysles and Maysles) (in Bruzzi, 2006: 77-78) as evidence to support the claim. He argues that there are two types of truth in observational documentary: that of the raw footage, and that of the assembled footage. This suggests that even Direct Cinema filmmakers themselves recognised (even if they did not admit it) that there is always construction in film creation.

In light of this, Young‘s criticism of Herzog‘s *mensonge* seems obscure. However, we can go back to Plantinga‘s defining feature of the documentary as possessing ―asserted veridical representation‖ (2005: 110). When Herzog‘s films are labelled as

documentaries, we assume that he asserts that what he has represented is truthful. *Salesman*‘s selection of material and extending of shots asserts their truth in a way that seems to contradict Herzog‘s assertions.

However, the differences here are important. Firstly, Herzog‘s films have a dedicated audience of viewers, who often maintain an above average interest in film-making and film criticism, and are likely to know about his manipulations, and his refusal to characterise his films as fiction or non-fiction. In this way, Herzog‘s films do not have ―asserted veridical representation”, but perhaps a negotiated veridical representation. Secondly, even for non-dedicated Herzog-ian scholars, his manipulations do not affect the truth-value of his subjects in a meaningful way. In his eyes, at least, they are even more truthful. Finally, Herzog‘s presence in the films brings into doubt his disambiguity as overarching meaning constructor. Bruzzi (2006: 63) argues that a subjective voice-over can allow the spectator to question the relationship between text and narration.

> What consequently occurs when a documentary narration falters, stops or acknowledges its inadequacy… is that the personal subjective potential of that voice-over is unexpectedly permitted to surface, a rupturing of convention that forces a reassessment of the text/narration relationship and how that relationship impinges on the effect a film has on the spectator. (Bruzzi 2006: 63)

What I would argue is that in cases like Herzog and Jurschick (as we will see later), this rupturing of convention is always present. It is Herzog‘s acousmatic quality, his lunge into frame, and Jurschick‘s complicated presence within the text that qualifies the two as unconventional story-weavers. There is no ―pact‘ that the voice-over will remain objective” (Bruzzi, 2006: 63). We are thus likely to reassess their ability to present us with truth, and thus their assertions.

However, it is not just this deceit that is problematic. The film posits Straubinger as image-maker. She begins the film with narration, she is revealed to have knowledge outside of the film‘s diegesis, and the intertitles, although not captioned appear to be her words. When watching the film, and in writing these words, I attributed all intertitles as Straubinger‘s words, even though there is no declaration by the film that it is so. Davidson‘s (1980) assessment of the film does not state that the final intertitle‘swords belong to Straubringer, but he strongly indicates it.

Darkness, however, is apparent from the final image on screen, a written text which follows a view of Straubinger standing alone and reads: "If a world-wide war would break out now, I wouldn't even notice it." The emphasis is not only on Straubinger‘s dread isolation, but on the sanctity of the individual consciousness in its purest, most awesome, most visionary state.

It is clear that Davidson reads these words as belonging to Straubinger, even though they are not attributed to her. This is a strong indication that Straubinger is perceived as at least the primary narrator. It could also indicate that she is perceived to be interchangeable with the narrator, as she is perceived to have access to the realm of the image-maker through intertitles. However, it is also clear that Straubinger is not speaking her own words, and is at times, a mouthpiece for Herzog‘s thoughts.

Fata Morgana is another one of Herzog‘s early works that denies its subjects a voice without an acousmatic narrator. The film begins with a series of mirages that occur as a plane is taking off. The rest of the film offers a bizarre travelogue of the Sahara desert and its people. The film is divided into three parts: ―Creation”, ―Paradise”, and ―The Golden Age”. The sections are narrated by three different narrators, namely Lotte Eisner, Werner Herzog, and then Manfred Eigendorf. The film was originally intended to portray an exploration of a landscape through the eyes of aliens, but this concept was abandoned. However, one can still see the surreal quality in the manner in which the film was produced. Confining it to a subcategory of film is difficult. Ames (2009) refers to the film as a travelogue. Popular mediums such as ―The Film Sufi” (2008) and the often user edited site www.imdb.com categorise it an Expressionist documentary film, and as a ―Sci-Fi” and ―Drama” respectively. The presence of Eisner, a leading scholar on German Expressionism, lends credence to the work, as it links the German film to a history of expressionist films.

Eisner reads a paraphrased Mayan creation myth (written by Herzog). The narration in the other two sections is not based on the myth, but only on the writings of Herzog. Our assimilation into the conventions of film viewing impels the viewer to connect the words we hear to the imagery we see. We are inclinedto draw parallels between what we hear and what we see, even if these connections make no sense. After the opening shots of the mirages forming below aeroplanes, the sequencecutstovarious shots of barren landscapes. Eisner tells us that once "the earth swayed in deep quiet", and the viewers are wont to

associate these images with the birth of a new world. However, this is problematic in that the landscape is already inhabited. We are not seeing the birth of a new civilisation, but the re-presentation of an already existing one.

As in many of Herzog‘s films, the native people are rarely granted their own voice. Their images are placed on the screen with nothing more than a Mayan creation myth to place them in the context of humanity. Occasionally, music seems to inform their existence, and occasionally, silence. For example, at 28:30, Eisner has told us that after the creatress and creator told the animals to speak in their own way, and that ―it came to pass that they spake not as human beings would”. This sequence is followed by an extreme long shot of a group of children. Music plays over the shot of the children, and then Eisner continues the myth, explaining that they have not even learnt to say their creators‘ names. The music continues for a short period, and then there is eventually silence. There is a suggestion here that the children are like the animals. The silence of the children and film mirrors the imperfect speech of the animals in the myth, and a causal link is created. While this may not be the preferred reading of the film, it is definitely a viable interpretation. Their presence in the oeuvre of Herzog‘s work marks this representation as problematic.

However, the silence does not continue for the entire film. Immediately after the ―Paradise” intertitle, one of the locals speaks; but he is not translated or subtitled. Then the film cuts to a young boy in the dunes who stares at the camera and then Herzog speaks as narrator for the first time. It is here that a familiar pattern emerges - Herzog directly takes a voice away (by not granting subtitles to the man), and then speaks as narrator for the first time.

One of the options on the *Fata Morgana* DVD is to play the film with an American English voice-over applied over the voice-over narrators‘ original German to form a sonic palimpsest of sorts. While we can hear the immediacy of the original voices speaking and also get the benefits of understandable simultaneous sound, the auditory qualities of the original are somewhat lost. There is also a delay between the original German and the English narration, which allows for a glimpse of the original narrators‘ voices. The subtitles translate the German as it is spoken, which is a few seconds before the English narrator speaks. This adds to the surrealism of the viewing experience, as one can read the English before hearing it. The option remains to play the film in German

with English subtitles, but for the film to exist in this unusual manner is strange indeed. However, what this form provides is an avenue to explore the importance Herzog puts on various voices in the film.

Eugen is the first character that speaks that we understand. He is subtitled but he is *not* dubbed in the dubbed version of the film. Even though many have remarked on Eisner's telling of the tale, Herzog decided that the voice-over should be dubbed into English, whereas the direct speech of Eugen is only subtitled. Eugen later reads from a letter, which is again not dubbed in the English version of the film. The young boy standing next to him, suddenly begins to ask for money. This is the first local to be granted speech (with subtitles) - and it is only one word, repeated over again. Furthermore, the fact that this moment is translated is problematic, as it either suggests that the locals are only interested in money, or that they are only interesting when asking for money. The next words any local is allowed to say (with translation) is in German - "the Blitzkrieg is insanity". This is a statement likely to exist without context to any of the speakers. Thus, throughout the entire film the locals are denied any voice, besides their supposedly original "compositions" in their body arrangements that Herzog explains in the DVD commentary that they formed for the camera.

However, one could argue, as so many do, that the film is not a documentary. It is science fiction, it is "ecstatic truth", it is drama. The DVD cover claims that Herzog calls it a "science-fiction elegy of demented colonialism". If these categorisations are true, then the film is not problematic in its depictions of the local people because the film is fictional in nature, and it is intentionally alienating. These attempts to classify the film as something other than documentary perhaps fall short when one considers what Nichols calls the poetic mode.

> The poetic mode has many facets, but they all emphasise the ways in which the filmmaker's voice gives fragments of the historical world a formal, aesthetic integrity peculiar to the film itself. (Nichols, 2001: 101)

The film is arranged in a poetic manner, with imagery often left to speak for itself; parallels drawn between the mystical voice-over and the landscapes depicted. There are no words for the first four minutes of the film. The opening sequence of the aeroplanes landing, followed by the empty landscapes gives the world "aesthetic integrity". The tracking shots of the sand dunes are reminiscent of the female body, and the film caresses

this body lovingly. As Ames (2009: 64) indicates about *Wheel of Time*, this sequence also emphasises the ―haptic and the kinetic", which in turn increases the affect induced by the film itself.

This poetic quality is discussed in Ames with regard to Herzog's use of landscape as an exploration of the human condition. He quotes Herzog as a foundational point for the argument: ―for me, a true landscape is not just a representation of a desert or a forest. It shows an inner state of mind, literally inner landscapes, and it is the human soul that is visible through the landscapes in my films" (Herzog, 2002 in Ames, 2009: 51). While Herzog may not technically classify the film as documentary, this quotation shows that the film is intended to explore the nature of humanity through its landscapes.

Ames (2009) uses Bruno's model of film analysis of emotional engagement with the text, and applies this to Herzog. It is the movement through spaces allowed by the cinema, Bruno argues, that allows us to experience subjective states. Ames argues that the subject of Herzog's ―travelogues" is the emotional affect of a place rather than rather the places themselves. While the same could be said for fictional work, particularly those of the German Expressionists, the film can still be seen as documentary. This is firstly because it is sometimes indexed as such and secondly, because of the expository component of the film.

The poetic mode is absent from Nichols' previous work in 1991. There, instead, the poetic mode finds itself mentioned in the expository mode, which is one that ―addresses the viewer directly, with titles or voices that advance an argument about the historical world." (1991: 34). Nichols explains the form of the film, *Naked Spaces* (1985/ Minh-ha).

> *Naked Spaces* shows us West African villages and some of their architectural details (but few of their people). It does not tell us about the history, function, economics, or cultural significance of these particular forms. Instead a trio of female voices composes the voice-over sound track, accompanied by indigenous music from the various regions. (Nichols, 1991: 36)

With a few changes, the quotation could very well be speaking about *Fata Morgana*. Three voices speak, although not in unison. We do not learn any function or cultural significance of the forms that we see. The subjects are even further removed from their

context, as, instead of ―indigenous music", the film gives us Leonard Cohen, psych-folk-prog and classical music.

The beginning of the third section makes this classification as poetic documentary clear. ―The Golden Age" obscurely begins with a static long shot of a man playing the drums, and a woman playing the piano. The man is wearing the bug-eye glasses present in so many other sections of the film - but this seems to be the only causal link between the sections. We are told that in the Golden Age, man and wife live in harmony. We assume the narrator, now Manfred Eigendorf, refers to the couple on screen and then this confirmed by the follow up: ―Now, for example, they appear before the lens of the camera, death in their eyes, a smile on their faces, a finger in the pie". However, we can barely see either person's eyes, neither is smiling, and they do not seem to have any fingers in any pies. The following lines make little sense too, and then the film cuts to the woman playing piano in medium shot. Herzog explains in the DVD commentary that this scene was shot at night during the shooting of *Even Dwarfs Started Small* (1970). The man is a pimp, the woman a brothel owner. However, this information is only given by the commentary. In the film itself, we are only given a poetic musing.

Furthermore, there is evidence in DVD commentary that suggests that Herzog had a level of intention to create a document with the film. In the second part of the film, men covered in limestone dust are accompanied by Leonard Cohen's ―Hey, That's No Way to Say Goodbye". Herzog tells us that he ―think[s] the music is quite adequate" to portray the difficulty that the men undergo in order to survive. These are real men, and it is their struggle. Therefore the film is not merely fictional, but intended to reveal something true about the human struggle. It is a poetic exploration of humanity, and it is expository in the way that it aims to teach us about this exploration. The film *needs* to have asserted veridical representation for this representation to reveal anything, and therefore, to some extent, it must be intended to be a documentary.

Bruzzi (2006: 3), however, criticises Nichols' taxonomy, stressing that the modes are not hierarchal, but instead far more interactive and blended. She criticises these modes for defining films according to the films' attempts at getting closer to representations of reality (clearly indicated by Nichols 1991 title). She argues that it will never be possible for the documentary film to represent reality objectively, and therefore delineating the films by a taxonomy that is founded on such a need is redundant. Nevertheless, onemust

admit, as Bruzzi does, that the taxonomy has been introduced, and scholars and film-viewers alike have at least been made an acquaintance of the ideas. In some university courses Nichols‘ hierarchy is taught as the conclusive manner in which to view documentary film (Bruzzi 2006). Classifying films according to this taxonomy is thus not irrelevant, as it is in our(to use a rather hackneyed turn of phrase) collective consciousness. At least some viewers may subconsciously or consciously apply these modes while watching documentary films.

Thus, while viewers of the film in 1971 may not have approached the film in the same way as one might today, educated modern day viewers may see it as a poetic documentary. As many viewers of Herzog‘s films are generally well acquainted with film scholarship or are at least visually literate, these viewers will see the film as a poetic documentary, and will form their own associations between the image and voices. *Fata Morgana*, thus, while exploring the human condition, and colonialism, ends up revealing a troubling situation as its removes voices from the local people. As one of Herzog‘s early films, it is telling that these similar situations repeat themselves. However, the very stylised nature of this film, coupled with the estrangement of narrator to the imagery itself means that the narrators have no connection to the world of the film. Eisner‘s first words as disembodied voice seem completely out of place and the viewer must force meaning from disparate image and sound tracks.

Therefore, in both of these early documentaries Herzog and the other narrators are not shown as part of the films‘ diegeses. This positions them as framing narrators and we see them as generally infallible and omniscient. We are forced to discount alternative readings in which we do not trust the narrator, as their vulnerability as human is not shown. This changes in his later films. Both of these films also demonstrate a problematic muting of their subjects. While the subjects in *Land of Silence and Darkness* are allowed to speak for themselves, and are even granted subtitles, Herzog still speaks on their behalf in subtle ways. The mostly mute native subjects in *Fata Morgana* are only subtitled when asking for money. They stand in as props for the epic tale Herzog seems to want to construct.

In his later films, his voice-over reveals humanity and imperfect knowledge. In *White Diamond* and *Grizzly Man* (2005), he chooses not to show us footage to which he had access. In the former, the film crew manages to shoot footage of a nearly impossible to

get to cave through the agility of one of their cameraman. However, Herzog proclaims that they decided not to show the footage to honour its secrets. Instead we are shown footage of the camera being lifted above the waterfall. In *Grizzly Man*, Herzog has access to the sound recording of the subject‘s last moments as bears eat him. He explains that he will not play the audio clip in order to honour the dead. Instead, we see Herzog listening to the audio. In both cases, Herzog reveals his humanity in order to preserve secrets he does not believe the world should see or hear. However, he also replaces this footage with sequences that prove that he could have, should he have so desired. Both of these moments seem intentionally designed to reveal that Herzog has humanity.

Yet this humanity is present even in his early works. In *The Great Ecstasy of the Woodsculpter Steiner* (1974), Herzog explains that he is unable to see the results, and so has to get the facts from a walkie-talkie. His inability to be omniscient, and his humanity is emphasised by moments like these, and this encourages the audience to see alternative readings in his work.

In *Wheel of Time* Herzog speaks for others, as well as letting them speak for themselves. The film starts in a fairly traditional manner. Herzog announces the film‘s location and general subject matter in voice-over – the enlightenment of Buddha at Bodh Gaya. As in *Land of Silence and Darkness,* the film‘s title appears in capital letters on the screen, followed by ~~–~~A Film by WERNER HERZOG”. The location is then repeated in text on the bottom of the screen. Herzog is set up as image-maker of the text. His voice announces a location, and it is confirmed by the text on screen. Finally, his authority is confirmed by the text claiming that it is a ~~–~~film by” him. He is not merely granted authority as a writer, director or producer (or all three), but credited as the creator of the work itself. It is as if he willed it into existence. This sets him up in a way to be the creator of anything, and sure enough, he very quickly begins to speak for other people.

Around seven minutes in, his first moment of speaking for another begins. Intriguingly enough, he (as image-maker) speaks for a character using music. Framed in close-up, a monk stares silently into the camera while the music intensifies dramatically. We know nothing of who this monk is, or his intention, but the timbre of the music impels us toview him as reverential and serene. A few minutes later, Lama LhundupWoeser ~~–~~explains that [this monk‘s] voyage lasted over three and a half years”. While Herzog indicates the monk speaks himself, we actually only see a translator translate another

translator‘s version of his story. His dialect is so unique that this is required. However, we do not even hear the English translator‘s version. Instead, Herzog speaks over all three speakers, summarising the speech of the final translator. In this way, Herzog speaks for the monk literally, as narrator, and figuratively, as image-maker, through manipulation of the musical soundtrack.

Herzog explains this, arguing that he –would rather audiences who do not understand German listen to [his] voice in English rather than hear [him] in German and read the subtitles. [He] think[s] the result is a stronger connection to what [he] originally intended for the film” (Herzog, 2002: 54). As there is simultaneous sound, we can concentrate on the visuals, without having to read the subtitles constantly.

Early ethnographic films, MacDougall (1998: 165) argues, had a voice-over which speaks for, or translates the words spoken by, the people in the film. Importantly, their words were often not translated, deemed unimportant by the documentary filmmaker, and potentially untranslatable by the translator. The introduction of subtitles to ethnographic film, he explains, granted the subjects the immediacy and importance that is given to foreign characters found in fiction films. We get to know what they are saying as they are speaking, as we hear their own words, albeit their translated words.

However, MacDougall is quick to show that subtitling as an alternative to voice-over comes with its own issues. He articulates some of the main problems in subtitling ethnographic films. In fiction films, dialogue is concise and generally scripted. The screenplay can even be written with the ease of subtitling in mind. This allows for the subtitles to be concise and scripted as well. In a documentary film, however, the subject is often allowed to speak freely, albeit with some direction. This makes it harder to subtitle efficiently, as one has to choose between paraphrasing and a direct translation. Paraphrasing could lose some of the original‘s subtlety and the alternative, a direct translation, could be difficult to follow.

For these and other reasons, MacDougall (1998) suggests that there is an art to efficient and effective subtitling, and choosing when and how to use it, is, like the use of voice-over, a specific choice. He also explains how, by using effective subtitling, the filmmakers can help to emphasise and articulate certain themes that were not clearly identified by other means in the film.

However, none of these problems are clear reasons to suggest that Herzog was correct in his use of his own voice, rather than using subtitles. If someone was translating on site, it is likely that they too were paraphrasing, and Herzog‘s voice-over is likely to have paraphrased this even more. Furthermore, we can see that *Fata Morgana* suffers from much the same fate as the early ethnographic films MacDougall mentions. The locals are neither subtitled nor deemed important enough to be translated by the voice-over.

However, MacDougall (1998) also argues that we are inclined to expect subtitles instead of voice-over because of the common usage of synchronous sound. As we are used to synchronous sound, we expect to hear the subjects speaking and not have their voices masked by the voice-over artist. While we may not be able to understand their native tongue, intonation and inflection may still be relevant, and the viewer expects to be able to hear this. In the dubbed version of *Fata Morgana*, we can still hear Eisner‘s tone because of the delay, and so this effect is largely diminished.

Herzog‘s tendency to prefer simultaneous sound over subtitles could also spring from his Germanic heritage. The German film industry has a (in)famous tendency to dub many English films into German. Blinn (2008) explains how Germany‘s model of both dubbing and subtitled films in the 1930s shifted to a majority of dubbed films due to a desire to promote German nationalism. In 1935, 90% of all German theatres were screening dubbed versions. This trend continues today. Blinn cites a 1987 survey wherein 78% of the German population preferred dubbing, and suggests that these figures are likely accurate today, as in 2008 ~~–th~~he subtitled or original versions of a film constitute at most 5% of the copies in circulation” (Blinn, 2008; 19). This German policy seems to have carried over into Herzog‘s own desires in his filmmaking.

However, Herzog‘s preference (and perhaps Germany as a whole) for voice-over subtitles could arise from a seemingly less innocent notion. Phonocentrism is the argument that sonic signifiers are more representative of their signifieds that written signifiers are, leading to a preference of sounds over written words. Derrida (1997) criticises theorists such as Saussure and Rosseau by arguing that their assertion that there is a natural link between the signified and the sonic signifier is no truer than the suggestion that there is a natural link between the signified and the written signifier. This perpetuated notion gives weight to the idea that sounds are more natural than their written counterparts are. However, Derrida goes on to argue that certain kinds of thought,

linguistics being one of them, would only be possible with the written word, and thus are actually naturally linked to certain kinds of signifiers. He argues against this phonocentrism, or the belief that sounds are more important than written words, which Herzog seems to espouse here.

However, there are distinct characteristics between sound and the written word. Chion (1999: 17) argues that while vision is directional and partial, sound is omnidirectional. Sound is naturally oppressive, forcing us to listen to it. If there are subtitles translating a voice-over appearing over a beautiful landscape, we can choose to engage with the imagery, rather than read the subtitles. We cannot avoid a voice-over as easily. Thus when Herzog claims he would rather we listen to him in English, he is essentially saying that he needs us to listen to him, rather than choose to engage with the film in our own way. We are forced to make connections between the sound and imagery, and the film's polysemic qualities are reduced. Therefore Herzog's preference for voice-over narration over subtitles can be seen as a desire to make the subjects heard, as the English speaking audience is forced to listen to him translate.

However, perhaps the most pertinent difference between the narrators in *Fata Morgana* and Herzog in *Wheel of Time* is his quality as acousmêtre. As discussed in Chapter One, Herzog's voice is tinged with self-reflexivity and a geographical location. We can easily recognise his voice as belonging to Werner Herzog, the character. This places in him a space and time and makes him relatable. In *Wheel of Time*, the Dalai Lama explains that he believes that each individual is the centre of the universe, and tells Herzog that this means he is also the centre of ~~t~~he whole universe". Herzog's wry response that the Dalai Lama should not tell this to Herzog's wife grounds Herzog and places him in a position where he can create irony. After this, Herzog asks him what his dream of an ideal world would be. The Dalai Lama pauses and then the film cuts from a medium close-up to a medium long shot. We do not know what happens between these two shots. However, we do know that if Herzog had wished to cut out his statement about his wife, this could have easily been achieved. Later, Herzog's thumb cleans the camera lens for a shot that continues for one-second after the cleaning. He easily could have cut before this moment, as no new information seems to have been added. However, our knowledge of his presence in the film has been affected, and this shot carefully and purposefully informs us of this. He enters into the documentary space, and has designed it so that he does, even

if we do not see his face. He therefore positions himself as an acousmêtre because he has purposefully inserted himself into the film.

Furthermore Herzog can speak for the characters in *Wheel of Time* because we also have characters within the film confirm his statements. Even though Herzog is the first to tell of the significance of the mandala, the Dalai Lama repeats it. In *Las Hurdes*, conversely, we cannot hear the people speak for themselves as live sound recording would not have been possible at the time. This still means that we have only the narrator to influence our perspective of the situation.

The Dalai Lama thus backs up Herzog‘s words. Furthermore, after his interview, he enters into the documentary space as voice-over narrator. As he describes his vision of his ideal world, the camera creep zooms into his face.The film then cuts to a monk handing out money to beggars, while the Dalai Lama suggests that we need love, compassion and self-discipline. The image clearly links up to his words, and suggests that those around him live up to his expectations. Furthermore, the zoom ends with a medium close-up, similar in framing to the medium close-up that preceded the zoom. Therefore it is quite likely that the statements we see occurred in reverse. Ending with the zoom shot, however, suggests an exploration of a character‘s internal thoughts, as this is often filmic device used to indicate the start of a flashback. The use of the zoom therefore suggests that the images we see are the Dalai Lama‘s vision made external, and thus performs the role of a framing narrator.

However, later in the film (00:57:30) the Dalai Lama addresses a crowd who has gathered to see him, and as he does not speak in English, Herzog translates for him in voice-over. We can barely hear his voice under Herzog‘s translation. However, the disappointed looks on the pilgrims‘ faces, coupled with the fact that Herzog and the Dalai Lama‘s voices had before this moment coalesced, we believe that Herzog interprets him correctly.

Therefore, it is not the importance of the characters that seems to determine whether Herzog will provide voice-over, but rather if the language they speak in is the same as the language of the film. His phonocentrism, or Germanic heritage, however, still leads us to the same result. If you do not speak German or English, your voice will not be heard.

Wheel of Time features very little speaking. Much of the film consists of evocative music over landscapes and people-scapes. This creates a calming sense, echoing the film's themes and content. Ames (2009: 65) argues that:

> In this context, however, even the staged scenes work to engage the viewer on an emotional level, instead of creating an interpretive impasse. It appears that the sacred nature of the landscape is the crucial characteristic in explaining the shift of emphasis

However, we see that in *Land of Silence and Darkness* Herzog's scripted moments function in a similar manner. It is not the sacred nature of the landscape that differentiates either of these films, but rather the sacred nature of the subject matters themselves.

However, there is still an abundance of people in his films that are never given a chance to say anything. In *Little Dieter Needs to Fly*, Herzog occasionally intervenes for Dengler as discussed in Chapter One. For the most part, however, Dengler tells his own story, and it appears as though Herzog allows this story to be unravelled fairly naturally. However, more disturbing subjects are the unnamed Thai extras who hover ominously around Dieter Dengler as he tells us his story, much as the native subjects in *Fata Morgana*. They stand around, sometimes in a line, sometimes in the background, and they rarely say anything. Their fictional counterparts are also present in *Rescue Dawn*. In the fiction film they speak. However, they are declined subtitles and so their words are also not understood.

It is really only the sound film that is capable of ~~"r~~eproducing silence", explains O'Rawe, following Balázs (2006: 398). In a silent film, everything is silent. We do not have the qualities of sound to contrast with the qualities of silence. However, in a sound film, we are able to do this. A moment of silence in a sound film can change things drastically as it forces us to refocus and pay more attention to the next sound, when it does appear. Chion (1999) also argues that characters in silent films are not mutes. While watching a silent film, we create sounds in our minds and put a voice to the characters. This is why, he continues, silent actors found the transition to sound films so difficult. Audiences had imagined what the actors sounded like, and the imagery no longer matched the pictures, as fictionalised by *Singin' in the Rain* (1952/Donen). It is only the sound film, he continues, that allows a character to be a mute. The subjects of *Las Hurdes* or *The*

Hunters cannot be named mute, as there are no speaking subjects with which to compare them.

Herzog‘s films, however, do have mute characters thatare characters who possess a body and take up space, but that do not get to speak for themselves. In *Little Dieter*, the presence of these unspeaking characters becomes disturbing. As they are not literal mutes, but merely rendered mute by the choices made by the filmmakers, we are aware that they are capable of speech.

In *Dieter*, Dengler tells us the story of how his ring was taken by one of his captors. He complained to one of the guards, who then proceeded to chop the thief‘s hand off, and returned Dengler‘s wedding ring to him. Dengler enacts this story with one of the unnamed extras, the two of them framed in a two-shot. He grabs the man‘s hand, makes a chopping motion, and then the camera pans back to Dengler, framing only him. The camera pans back to the two of them, and Dengler puts his arm around the slightly perturbed un-named man, telling him not to worry; that ―it‘s just a movie.” It is not clear that the man has any idea what has happened, and yet is complicit in a sequence wherein he is painted as a thief, albeit in a re-enactment. The camera then tracks past him, to yet another silent local cooking food in the background. He briefly glances at the camera, but quickly returns to his meal. We have the sense that we are intruding on their world, yet we are never given the chance to know anything about them.

Chion (1999), however, gives us an avenue to explore these background characters in a different manner. Herzog critics do not tend to criticise the presence of these mute background characters, and while one might be inclined to suggest that this is because of ―Herzog-philia”, there may be another reason. O‘Rawe (2006) and Chion indicate that mute characters are counterparts to the acousmêtre. Their voices are linked to the diegesis, but are never heard. The acousmêtre‘s body is linked to the diegesis, but is never seen. Thus, like the acousmêtre, they have the power in the ability to reveal their voice. Once their voice is heard, however, the mystery is removed.

As the characters never speak, they hold onto this mystery. According to this line of argument, the mute characters in the film are not disempowered because they never speak, but are instead granted power because they never speak. We never get to hear their thoughts, and thus do not know the extent to which they are knowledgeable. Moreover,

as Chion argues, we are "accustomed" to the mute character serving as "the guardian of the secret" (1999: 96). Chion (1999: 97) argues that the mute characters appear to possess the ability to "penetrate deeper" with a "profound gaze". The silent presence certainly adds to the mysterious quality of *Fata Morgana*, and seems to amplify Dengler's struggles in Dieter.

However, Chion's argument exists within a discussion of fiction films. In fiction film, the mute character can serve to promote themes and the style of a film because they are hired actors. In the documentary, however, we are likely to assume that the people depicted on screen are themselves. While many of the people were paid to appear in the various films, the audience still expects that they are representing themselves. Their personhood is reduced to an "instrument" that affects the style or theme of the film. Utilising human beings in this way seems deeply problematic, even if they simultaneously appear to have potentially unlimited knowledge.

While he does not have Chion's (1999: 21) stake in the image in the earlier films discussed here, Herzog takes an active role in the world that his subjects occupy in his later ones. He reveals his humanity through conversations he has on screen, and in this way becomes an acousmêtre. While his stake in the image gives him limited power and omniscience, it also allows us to engage with him as human, and thus see him as fallible. While this break from a traditional narrator allows us to engage critically with his work, the silent characters in *Little Dieter* reveal a concerning tendency to mute subjects who cannot speak the language in which the film is produced. Chion argues that mute characters can often hold as much power as acousmêtres because we do not know what they know. This means that they often can be used to emphasise themes within a film. However, I have argued that his theory can only apply to fiction films, as the mute characters in documentary films are not actors, but represent themselves. Therefore, while the acousmêtre may allow us some leeway in interpretation, in many of Herzog's films the non-English speaking subjects are not given a voice.

Additional Notes:

Near the end of the film is a voice that is experienced as acousmatic even to the people in the film. The pilgrims are led in meditation by the Dalai Lama who whispers into a microphone. Many pilgrims have headphones, and the Dalai Lama has his hands in front of his mouth. We do not see him speak, and it is not entirely clear that he is speaking. The sound does not seem to be diegetic, but rather a recording directly from the microphone added in post-production. Therefore we experience the voice as ~~–o~~ther", as it possesses a clear auditory quality like a voice-over narration. While it visually seems to originate from the image, it does not sound like it originates from the image. We thus experience something quite strange, perhaps reflecting the meditation the pilgrims undergo.

Chapter Five: Detaching the Third Person Narrator from Convention

Karin Jurschick‘s film *It Should Have Been Nice After That* (2001) blends voice-over narration in the third person with personal narration in the first person. I shall argue that Jurschick appears at first to function as a voice-of-God narrator, breaking away from traditional gender norms. However, as the documentary progresses, one realises that she in fact offers another take on the personal documentary by making the viewer experience the detachment that she herself feels to her father. I shall argue that in using the third person and wide-angle lenses she creates a sense of detachment in both a visual and auditory manner. I shall use MacDougall (1998) to argue that the use of subtitles emphasises the verbal content of the film, and that in response, the silent sequences take on gravity and add to the detachment that the viewer experiences. The film therefore stands as an example of how a seemingly typical disembodied, detached narrator can serve as more than storyteller, but can elicit an emotional response in the viewer.

The film uses two voice-over artists (one male, and one female), archival footage, Karin Jurschick‘s voice, and her father‘s voice, to tell the story of her mother‘s suicide and her family‘s life. Estranged from her father, a German Engineer who worked for the Nazi Party, she meets up with him after years of separation. While originally not intending to make a film, she brought along her camera, and a film naturally evolved from the process.

> The camera helped to create a different kind of plane, a space outside of the existing father-daughter structure where we could „talk about her‘ - in both senses of the word. Perhaps that is why, when faced with the decision to either making a film from the material we had shot, or to put it into the box with the rest of the „family photos”, he agreed to the film. (Jurschick, 2010)

On the surface, the film appears to be a standard documentary. Our documentary filmmaker, Karin Jurschick, interviews her father, and this is coupled with a voice-over explaining archival photographs and supplementary footage. This voice-over is broken down into three parts. We have two voice-over artists, Eva Matthes and Reinhardt Firchow, who provide voices for the chracters. They read the letters, journal entries and police reports upon which the documentary is based. The anchoring, context-providing voice-over is provided by Jurschick herself.

Jurschick's voice is delineated as context providing. Her voice begins the film, explaining the details of the film we are about to watch. She gives us the date: 1963, and then introduces the male voice-over. She tells us that "the man writes letters to his child", and then Firchow reads said letter. Firchow merely represents "the man", while Jurschick does not seem to represent anyone. Her voice is detached from any body and is not anchored in the physical realm. We have no geographical markers to place her character (other than the fact that she speaks German). She offers us no glimpse into her world, as Kozloff (1988) argues a voice-over is completely capable of doing. She then, sometimes operates as a female voice-of-God narrator that Silverman (1988) argues is rare.

In Silverman's (1988) essay, *Disembodying the Female Voice*, she indicates that the male voice is typically the only one that assumes "disembodied and extradiegetic forms". While her discussion is primarily centred on psychoanalytic analysis (the value of which is currently debatable), she raises some interesting arguments that are still relevant outside of psychoanalysis. Silverman notes that it is frequently the crime-related drama (often B movies) that appears to have the male voice-over. She speculates that the male voice-over is so prevalent because these movies require an authoritative voice to promise inevitable justice to the viewers (1988: 163). Writing in 1988, she also states that the voice-over is "almost an institution" in the documentary form. The documentary film is also a mode of film that seems to require a voice of authority. Many of the films made under the description of "documentary" have a didactic quality to them, and this desire to teach often requires a leading presence to provide a coherent argument to the viewer. This argument is typically provided by a voice-over.

Silverman argues that it is when the male voice appears without a body it is the "ideal realisation" (1988: 165) of male subjectivity. Ging (2004), following Mayne, also hints at this when she evaluates Kuleshov's early experiments. Kuleshov designed a range of experiments to determine the nature of the viewing experience. The most famous of these resulted in the discovery of what is called "The Kuleshov Effect". Subjects were shown a series of photographs of a man, juxtaposed with a series of context providing imagery: a plate of soup, a girl in a coffin, and a woman on a divan. The audience believed the man's face to change depending on the context, even though it was *exactly the same image of the man.* Mayne (in Ging, 2004), however, reviewed another of his experiments in photo-montage. An idea of a woman was created through different shots of different women. Mayne argues that it seemed to be in order to create an idea of a non-threatening

woman. However, it also shows that the female form, from the early beginnings of film, is strongly linked to the body. Female subjectivity, then, is viewed as when the woman is most corporeal.

The female voice, Silverman argues, almost always appears with a visual counterpart. A voice on the phone will quickly have its deacousmatic moment by the linking reverse shot of the visual of the woman on the phone. The female narrator is thus often someone who is firmly located in the diegesis (Ging, 2004 and Silverman, 1988). This would be someone like Dieter in *Little Dieter Needs to Fly,* or Celie in *The Color Purple* (1985/Spielberg), who is both the central character and narrator. We have seen their body (or at least an earlier version of themselves), and we thus know that they have personally experienced the story to which they are adding information, and we doubt them more so than we doubt the so-called voice-of-God or even the acousmêtre.

One might argue that Silverman was writing in 1988, and mainly about fiction films, and that things have changed in 2014. However, a quick reviewof modern documentary films does not turn up new data. Female narrators seem delegated to the realm of the nature documentary (such as Oprah Winfrey in *Life* (2009-/Holmes et al.), Sigourney Weaver in *Planet Earth* (2006/Fothergill) or as anonymous voices in lifestyle reality television, (such as *Supersize vs. Superskinny* (2008-/Channel 4 UK)).This study does not allow the space to investigate these claims further, but the lack of any immediately obvious counter claims seems sufficient to suggest that Silverman‘s observations are relevant to the current discussion.

Ging's essay (2004: 70) on sound and Eisensteinian montage in feminist films, argues that mainstream feminist films do not challenge ―the (patriarchal) grammar of the cinematic apparatus itself”. While films like *The Color Purple* deal with feminist issues, they still function as mainstream cinema. One of those features she discusses is the lack of authorial female narrator in fictional film. She states that the authorial voice is almost never female, unless it belongs to a character in the film. The female voice is never given the omniscience and power of the male narrator. Ging (2004) argues that while we engage with feminist films thematically, we do not engage with them structurally. Doane (1980: 42) also comments that the authoritative disembodied voice in the documentary film has, ―been for the most part that of the male”, although does not comment further on this gendered distinction.

Chion (1999: 109-118), on the other hand, gives several examples from the fiction film wherein the female voice is given wings, and ―rises and takes on limitless proportions" (117). Some of these voices, such as Jo Conway in *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (1956/Hitchcock), seem to hold power, even though they are ―yoked" to bodies. However, while these female voices are able to transgress typical constraints of space, they are ultimately confined to a diegetic body. Furthermore, they are not examples of voice-over narration. What Chion's examples show, however, is that the female voice is capable of existing in a non-localised manner andthat it is capable of having power. It suggests that the dominance of the male voice as disembodied narrator may be no more than a convention or societal construct, rather than a biological, necessary constraint.

The starting voice-over in *It Should Have Been Nice After That* places us in a highly unusual scenario wherein we have a female detached voice leading us through the story. However, Jurschick is also a character in the film. She appears on screen, thus appearing to fit into what Kozloff (1988), following Genette, might call a homodiegetic-framing narrator. This kind of narrator is not particularly unusual for female voices, as I have argued. However, great lengths are taken by Jurschick to distance herself (in voice-over form) from herself as character within the film. There is a clear distinction, as I shall argue, between Karin Jurshcick, the subject of the film, and Karin Jurschick, the framing, heterodiegetic narrator. In light of this, for this chapter ―Jurschick" will refer to the voice-over and documentary filmmaker, and ―Karin" will refer to the character, or visible presence within the film.

Like many of Herzog's films, this film also begins with an intertitle: ―ein Film von/ Karin Jurschick". The intertitle does not suggest the process under which the film was created (directed, written, edited), but merely that Jurschick is the creator of the film we are about to see, and has willed it into existence. However, unlike Herzog, Jurschick is not (yet) well known, and her voice is not easily recognisable. Thus, when we hear her voice for the first time we do not necessarily know that it is her voice, or even that the film is about her. This means that we are unlikely to grant her the special power that we grant to Herzog, as we do not know (yet) that she is the creator of the film. Instead, at least for the first several minutes of the film, we assume that a heterodiegetic, framing narrator is leading us through the film.

Jurschick herself has, in a way, referred to herself as a voice-of-God narrator, as these types of heterodiegetic, framing narrators tend to be called. In an interview, Jurschick explained that in making *It Should Have Been Nice After That*, she was fulfilling her childhood dream of ―God" making a film of her childhood that told the truth (2010). In the absence of a divine director, Jurschick stepped in. Although she adds that she realises that the truth ―can't be shown", through her intriguing camera angles and use of voice-over, she presents us with information in a unique way, that might just capture some of this truth.

Jurschick's detachment is emphasised by the diction of the voice-over. These introductory words offer no suggestion that the voice introducing us is ―the child" of which she speaks, unless the viewer possesses prior knowledge. At the time, we only recognise the voice as a disembodied narrator. In fact, it is only eight minutes and thirty seconds into the film that the voice-over explains (or at least confirms) that ―the man is my father", and we are thus able to infer that she is the child in the story. Jurschick says these words after appearing on screen in her contemporary form for the first time. The voice-over also uses the personal pronoun ―my" for the first time. One might argue that this is the stage in which her body is linked to the voice, in line with Silverman's (1988) argument. As Silverman (1988) and Ging (2004) argue, the female voice rarely appears without its body, and when it does, Silverman continues, it is quickly grounded in the diegesis by the synchronisation of voice to its body. Thus, seemingly in line with their arguments, Jurschick grounds her voice relatively quickly into a body.

However, Karin has filmed herself in a rather unusual way, making this convergence uncertain. She holds the camera above her head, perhaps attached to some sort of rig, thus framing herself in the centre of the screen. It is a wide-angle lens, which means that while it is able to capture more of the setting, it also distorts the perspective of the room and Karin's face. This distances the viewer from her as it contradicts our learnt conventions of introductions to central character, such as a more typical establishing shot, followed by a close-up. The father, in comparison, is introduced through a brief close-up of putting on his gloves, then a close-up of his face in profile, and then a medium shot, locating him in his surroundings. On this shot, the voice over begins, ―The man is 91….", giving the character a ―name" and a temporal space when he is framed in a medium shot. While the film is not conventional in its introduction to her father, there is no distortion, and he is located in space and time. Karin's introduction, on the other

hand, is not referenced by the voice-over, nor does she acknowledge or link up to the voice-over in any way. Staring slightly off centre, in complete silence, Karin comes across as almost alien in a strange new world. Eventually, she joins her father in frame, and interviews him while they both stare at the camera. The same lens is used, which still warps their surroundings around them.

This visual detachment links up to the auditory detachment. The content of this sequence, too, tells us that Karin feels that the very space in which her mother had suffered seems strange to her, wrought with memories she would rather forget. She is in the house in which her mother committed suicide, and her father has not changed any of the furniture, believing it to be unnecessary.

It is only now, nine minutes and twenty-five seconds into the film, that Karin as character speaks and her voice is located within her body for the first time. Unlike in the generally third person voice-over, she uses the first person. However, we find that her voice in this sequence lacks the clear acoustic quality ascribed to her voice-over. She lacks the "radical otherness" that Doane (1980: 168) argues that the voice-off possesses, through its different auditory quality. After this sequence, we break into Jurschick's voice-over again, with no connection to Karin's words. Her voice as narrator is thus markedly different from her voice as character, and there seems to be no interaction between the two.

When one knows about the production history of this sequence, it is clear why she does not link her words to the voice-over in anyway, and why the sound quality is poor. When visiting her father, she had no idea that she would later be making a documentary of it. This came after. At the same time, the voice-over, which was clearly recorded intentionally and with purpose, does not introduce this sequence or make any link to it. Thus, no matter the original intention of this sequence, the effect is the same: Jurschick the voice-over does not interact with Karin the character.

The voices sound so discernibly different, that like Yahnke (2009) from Chapter One I found it difficult to differentiate between the female voices appropriately. When I first began to analyse the film (knowing that Matthes was a voice-over artist) I assigned all instances of female voice-over to Matthes. Placing Karin (the character) next to the audibly alienating voice-oversounded to me as though they were different characters.

However, once I listened to Matthes in other sources, I realised that she was used merely as a character voice, just as Firchow is used.

This confusion is important because it suggests two things, besides from suggesting I might need to get my ears checked out. Firstly, my inability to determine that Karin‘s voice is the same as Jurschick‘s voice is likely linked to my inability to speak German. When watching the film for the first or second time, one must concentrate on the subtitling of the words, rather than the quality of the noise. In order to make sense of the film, one needs to read, which limits the time one can spend on the visual and auditory components of film. The effect of this will be discussed later on in the chapter.

Secondly, it suggests that the auditory quality of the voice-over is markedly different from that of the diegetic voice. As Chion notes, ―a voice has to have strongly marked personal characteristics… to be identified with certainty” (1999: 33). When one recordsa voice-over in an environment designed for clarity of sound, this marks it as such and personal characteristics do not trump this in its recognisability. This confirms Doane‘s (1980) thesis as the voice-over‘s auditory quality places it in the realm of ―the other”. The voice-over in the documentary does fulfil Doane‘s suggestion of a voice that ―cannot be yoked to a body”, making it ―capable of interpreting the image, producing its truth” (1980: 42) as the voice-over is not designated as belonging to the diegesis. Jurschick‘s voice-over narration is also italicised in the subtitles, marking it as substantially different from her non-italicised voice in the film itself. Thus in both written and spoken words, her voice is marked as different, and it provides a different role in the film.

Bill Nichols (2001: 13) describes several ways in which the voice-over can handle the relationship between the subject and the filmmaker or voice-over. The primary method that is used is, as he puts it, ―I speak about them to you”. The voice-over artists, typically representative of the filmmaker or the filmmaker himself (I), address the audience (you) directly about a subject matter (them). This formulation, Nichols argues, is the typical voice-of-God narrator. It establishes a personal relationship between the speaker and audience, and presents a seemingly detached picture of the subject.

Nichols‘ second formulation is ―It speaks about them or it to us”. Nichols views this as an authoritative, disengaged and impersonal voice offering information. Importantly, he

identifies the lack of authorship often associated with films such as these. Absent of personal opinion or emotion, the voice does not represent an individual or even a union of collective ideas, but is abstracted. A typical documentary of this genre would be the informative nature documentary or the lifestyle reality television shows mentioned previously.

This is rarely found in the personal documentary. Typically, the filmmaker will identify with the subject matter and thus it will be more in the formulation of ‚I or we speak about us to you" (Nicols, 2001: 18). Kuenne's 2008 film, *Dear Zachary*, fits the vein of this method. *Dear Zachary* tells the story of Andrew Bagby, murdered by the pregnant mother of his child. His childhood friend, Kurt, set out to make a film to tell Zachary, the child, about his father. The film is told through a series of interviews and archival footage, taken of Andrew and Kurt when the two were children. Themes are constructed through careful editing and manipulation of the interviews. Whole sentences are sometimes created by piece-meal editing of several character's individual sentences. Key phrases that are repeated by several people in Andrew's life are tied together in flowing rhythmic sequences. Unlike Karin, Kurt is deeply involved in the story. His role as filmmaker and friend is symbiotic, and there is never a distinction made. He tells the story, but so too do the people in the film.Little distinction is made between his ability to tell the story and the people interviewed's ability to tell the story. His voice as filmmaker is not separate from his voice as a member of the documentary.

‚By speaking about an ‚us' that includes the filmmaker these films achieve a degree of intimacy that can be quite compelling." (Nichols, 2001: 18). Kuenne achieves this through the conglomeration of voices that include his own. While *It Should Have Been Nice After Tha*t features a multitude of voices telling the story, Jurschick is clearly our framing narrator, while Firchow and Matthes only function as character voices. Jurschick shapes our perception of the film. Firchow, for example, is strongly linked to Karin's father. Both read the same letter at different stages of the film. Firchow's first words (this letter) are repeated by Karin's father, thirty-six minutes into the film. As we have already heard this letter, the only real purpose can be to link the voices together. Hearing this again, however, after we have learnt more about her father and his role in her mother's death, changes our understanding of the letter. Jurschick even introduces the reading, albeit now with a little bit more information.

Jurschick also avoids the intimacy that the use of ―us" grants. As narrator, she does not function as an individual. However, her film does not offer the sense of spontaneous creation that Nichols' ―it speaks about them" films would suggest. She cannot be clearly differentiated between an ―it" and an ―I". There is such a strong inclination in the audience to ―yoke" the voice to its body that despite all the effort made to separate the two we are likely to connect them.

Jurschick thus hovers somewhere between an ―it" and an ―I". The same can be said for her subject matter. As Karin's father is an engineer, there are many shots of cogs, blueprints and machines. However, the film does not just stop at representing his trade. In a montage sequence, imagery of German men and women doing state required exercise is intercut with imagery of cogs and machines. Wheels turning cut to men doing cartwheels in pairs (01:20:26). It is almost as if Vertov himself leapt in and created the sequence.

> The new man, free of unwieldiness and clumsiness, will have light, precise movements of machines, and he will be the gratifying subject of our films (Vertov,1919: 8)

The people in the film are turned into objects and made abstract. Later in the film, we are shown repetitive imagery of a woman turning a man almost as a cog in a machine. There is an overlapping edit, the sequence is tripled, and we see the same action multiple times. This enhances the idea of mechanism, as the jerkiness seems more machine-like than human. Karin's father also mentions that a woman must also ―work hard and persevere" which emphasises her function as well as her rhythm.

This detachment is highlighted by the indifferent third person narration. Instead of ―My mother" or ―me", we have ―the mother" and ―the child". These terms are used constantly. When referring to Hannelore's (her mother's) body it is ―the body in room 128". In talking about her mother's suicide, Jurschick detaches herself from the personal. The voice is clearly emotionally detached through the use of third-person in the film.

Matthes, as I have mentioned, is used as a character artist. She reads the letters of the mother, the aunt, then neighbour - and ―the child". Jurschick detaches herself so far from her childhood character, that a voice-over artist must tell her story in the first person.

While an anonymous hand scrubs at a mirror, Matthes reads to the audience Karin‘s observation of one of her mother‘s breakdowns. The next shot is of Karin as a child standing in front of that same mirror. The child stares off beyond the gaze of the camera. The previous shot therefore seems to represent a desire to scrub away this memory, to remove the child from the room, but the next shot grants her permanency. Karin ―wanted to run away, but she couldn’t”, just as the voice-over proclaims. However, the film still successfully grants a detachment between Karin of today, and Karin in the picture, through the detached impersonal nouns - ―the child” - and the use of Matthes as voice-over.

Additionally, the information that she provides is ratherminimal. If one knows nothing of the film on first viewing, all we know is that ―a man” is writing to his wife and daughter. As Jurschick‘s voice-over begins:

> 1963. The man writes letters to his wife and child.

She may provide us with a time, but she does not provide a location. The accompanying imagery, too, is distancing. It is a ship in the middle of the ocean. No geographical markers place us anywhere and no historical context provides us a hint as to why the man is writing letters. We know he is an engineer on a ship, but we do not know why. In this way, she introduces the male voice-over, but she does not anchor it in any traditional sense of the word.

However, while Jurschick may seem to provide us with the qualities of a female voice-of-God narrator, her purpose in the film seems to serve a different purpose. Rather than being an exception to the personal documentary, this very alienation brings us closer to understanding Karin Jurschick. Her alienation from her mother‘s story, her estrangement from her father, her discomfort in her family home; these are all expressed through the very nature of her voice-over. The abstraction of the voice follows the abstraction of the human form into machine. The voice becomes removed from its human counterpart. Like many personal documentaries, the documentary seems more interested in creating a certain emotional response from the viewer, rather than revealing content. The use of voice-over, particularly, lends itself to eliciting this emotional response.

While Jurschick‘s formulation as an ―it” or a voice-of-God may incidentally reflect her own true feelings (thus actually representing an ―I”), the voice-over is clearly used to

make sense of the visuals in the way that one would expect a contextualising voice-over to do. For much of the film, the images seen on camera would make little sense without the voice-over. Early on in the film, random images of a hotel room are shown. The voice-over gives this a place a meaning by simultaneously informing us of Karin‘s mother‘s suicide in a hotel room. The empty hotel room now invokes imagery of a dead woman.

Linking back to MacDougall (1998), one can see how subtitles in this case can drastically change the way in which one might interpret a film. If one did view the voice from the voice-over as belonging to someone other than Karin Jurschick, then the effect derived from the alienating discourse will change. Instead of realising that Karin herself is removed from the story, it appears that the voice-over is detached, giving us a female third person narrator, an ~~-it~~ speaking about it”. Particularly given that a great effort has been made to distance the character from the voice-over itself, this confusion is easy to make. At the moments when the contextualising voice-over uses the personal pronouns and links itself to Karin, it would seem more like an instance in which the voice-over is standing in for Karin herself, much like Letta Mbulu is used in *N!ai*, to stand in for N!ai.

However, *It Should Have Been Nice After That* avoids some of the pitfalls described by MacDougall by making a large percentage of the documentary scripted. As it is not an ethnographic film, and does not rely largely on observational footage, the film is able to say (and write) what it wants, through a use of careful selection through letters and contextualising voice-over. This means that the screenplay could be written in order to control the subtitles, as the direct translation is similar to the original intent. There is little need to eliminate fillers like ~~-u~~m”, as the voice-over is precise and scripted.

MacDougall (1998: 175) argues that using subtitles can often lead the viewer to focus on what is said, rather than what is shown. He argues that when the filmmaker is attempting to stress a non-verbal theme, this can be lost on the viewer. One could argue Jurschick gets around this problem in the film by having many sections in which there is no language whatsoever, and thus no need for subtitles. For example, after being told by Jurschick that her father meets his future wife, a montage sequence of dancing couples and carnivals plays. As the camera cranes above the carnival (31 minutes), the music fades and we watch in silence for fourteen seconds. This would then serve to break the

viewer out of his or her verbal orientation, and make him or her more open to other themes.

However, these scenes without words are harrowing and strange, for example Jurschick‘s description of her father‘s transition to engineer around the twenty-minute mark is peppered with archival footage unaccompanied by words. Watching these sequences unfold without language to explain them is disorientating. MacDougall (1998: 175) potentially explains this phenomenon, as he argues that in a film with subtitles:

> We become both word-dependent and word-oriented, so that if a scene appears in which there are no subtitles, we feel at a loss.

If we agree with MacDougall, the continual use of subtitles forces the viewer into a mode where verbal communication becomes important. This is even true for the German viewers of the film as the presence of subtitles increases the redundancy of the content. MacDougall argues that subtitles draw special attention to the words, doubling the content and emphasising their meaning. The redundancy of the content recalls Kozloff‘s (1988) argument about the redundancy of the voice-over, wherein she argues that while a voice-over may sometimes seem redundant, it often serves to highlight what is important. As mentioned in the introduction, ―Three planes circle the sky” emphasises the number while, ―Red planes…” would emphasise the colour. The repetition of one kind of information serves to heighten its importance. When watching foreign films in a language that I do understand, or even in watching English films that have been subtitled for some reason, I find myself drawn to the text, emphasising my reading over pure listening. By subtitling the film, the German speaker is made hyperconscious of the verbal content of the film, through the repetition of words. In the same way, the persistence of voice-over throughout the film also alerts the viewer to the relevancy of the voice to interpret the images. Thus, through both the presence of subtitles and voice-over, the German viewer has too, like their non-German subtitle-reading counterpart, become ―word-oriented and word-dependent”.

The silence over these particular shots, also serve to emphasise a repetition. The carnival shots echo the ones we saw when we learnt about Hannelore‘s suicide. A motif is formed, which is strengthened and emphasised by the silence. The importance of the

carnival is never mentioned by anyone in the documentary, but one feels that it has some importance because of sequences like these.

Other visuals displayed in the non-verbal sequences are of little informative import. The hand scrubbing the glass, petals falling onto the ground, writing and typing: these are all fragmented, seemingly inconsequential images. Many of the film‘s visuals would be incomprehensible without the voice-over to explain their meaning. An overhead shot of a highway seems inconsequential, until the voice-over informs us that suicide victims used to be buried under highways like it. Thus, when the imagery pops up again, we are reminded of this moment and the shot brings up the connotations of suicide victims. As Kozloff (1988) argues, the redundancy of the voice-over highlights the importance of the shot.

These scenes are made stranger because they remove us from this language-oriented mind-set and replace it with an almost entirely visual one. The film has taught us to need words, so what is spoken after the silence is interesting. After the thirty-one-minute montage of couples dancing, followed by the silent shot of the carnival, we have shots of men cartwheeling in pairs, intercut with a woman spinning a hoop. Jurschick‘s father tells us about how met her mother, beginning with the words, ―It‘s that first impression when you dance with a woman, in step to the same rhythm”. The previous sequence brought in the concepts of dancing, Hannelore‘s suicide, and being in the same rhythm. The silence forces us to have these ideas in mind, and therefore his words have sinister overtones. We know that although they may be in the same rhythm, they will still end back at the carnival, at death.

While on the surface the film appears to be a documentary about Hannelore‘s suicide, the format of the film reveals that it is actually a personal exploration of Karin Jurschick‘s emotional landscape, and her relationship with her father. The film uses voice-over and subtitles to highlight the verbal content of the film and in doing so it enhances the periods of silence that punctuate it. These silences are strange and disorientating, just like Jurschick‘s voice-over. Through the diction used, and the othering quality of the medium of voice-over, Jurschick creates two distinct characters, which reflect her own personal reflection on the situation. She also reveals her detachment in using Matthes‘s voice to stand in for her as a child. In using a voice that hovers between an ―it” and an ―I”, which

would typically be used in an expository film, Jurschick makes a personal documentary. These choices are also echoed through the mechanised depictions of humanity, which echoes her father‘s words.

As we see, in the case of *It Should Have Been Nice After That*, the detached voice-over can reflect the tone and emotional journey of its subjects. While the voice-over is merely one of the devices that the film uses to portray the emotional landscape, first person narration would have changed the tone of the film. This backs up Kozloff‘s (1988) assertion that the detached voice-over is not merely a tool for the lazy or unskilled filmmaker. In the hands of the skilled filmmaker, the detached and disembodied voice-over narrator can produce an emotional response in the viewer.

CONCLUSION

Throughout this study I have answered my research question by demonstrating a variety of choices in voice-over that filmmakers have made in their films. I have shown how these choices affected the representation of their subjects and affected the truth-values of the films themselvesThis alone stands to support the original claim that voice-over narration in documentary film is worthy of study. I have also aimed to argue that many of the seemingly unconventional story-weavers chosen for this study reveal rather conventional traits after scrutinisation.

In Chapter One, I demonstrated that both *Rescue Dawn* and *Little Dieter* feature dual narratives with both Dengler and Herzog providing narration. I argued that *Little Dieter* has diegetic narration in the form of voice-over narration, while this narration is present in *Rescue Dawn* as mimetic narration. Herzog‘s quality as a complete acousmêtre shows that MacCabe‘s narrative theory is flawed, as narration from Herzog and Dengler can be confused, and can be used interchangeably. I argued that Herzog is present in both the narrative film and the documentary, albeit in very different ways. Similarly, I argued that Dengler also creates the narrative in both films, with voice-over narration in *Little Dieter*, and through identification with his character in *Rescue Dawn.* While there are many reasons why the films‘ narratives are constructed as they are, this suggests that despite Herzog‘s attempts to create ecstatic truth through blending fiction and reality, he is still limitedby the idea as expressed by Silverman (1988) that the voice-over in documentary film is ―institutional”.

In Chapter Two, I argued that *The Hunters* enforces linearity in its narrative through Marshall‘s voice-over. As he is the only narrator, and the only source of sound in the film, the audience only knows his perspective. *N!ai*seems to avoid this, as we hear her voice in the film, as well as many others. N!ai is given precedence from the film‘s title and in telling her ―story” in voice-over. At the same time, N!ai is only an embedded narrator in the film, whereas Marshall is a framing narrator and is also the image-maker. This means that Marshall‘s narration is suggested to be the final word. Her story can always be contradicted by Marshall‘s voice, but the reverse is not true. The title of the film suggests that it will take N!ai away from what Mohanty (1986 in Geiger, 1990) calls

–generality" by granting her story special status as the subject of a film. However, Marshall replaces her voice with that of another African woman, Letta Mbulu, and this results in her story becoming more generic. Mbulu, on the other hand, is granted a certain omniscience as she is presented as a bodiless voice. While the film links her voice to N!ai's voice, her body is not present. Her voice has the clear acoustical presence of a voice recorded in studio, which grants her the radical otherness needed to translate the image. However, she has less power because the film carefully links her voice to N!ai, and so she is only able to interpret for N!ai. The problem in this situation, as I have argued, is that the infallibility suggested by Mbulu's unyoked voice means that Marshall could assign *any* words to N!ai, have Mbulu speak them, and the audience would likely believe that they were N!ai's. Therefore the type of voice-over utilised in *N!ai*shows a fundamental flaw, as an unethical filmmaker could assign any content to their subjects by using this method.

Chapter Three illustrated the strength of the untethered voice. Referring back to Plantinga's (2005) definition, the indexing of *Las Hurdes*as documentary is key in understanding the film's intentions. In *Las Hurdes,* Buñuel grants the voice-over artists free range over the imagery. Great efforts are made to link the voice-over artist with the image-maker, and so the voice-over artist is deemed to have authority. I have argued that because the film is indexed as documentary, it demonstrates the folly of trusting in such a narrator as the voice-over narrator becomes less trustworthy as the film progresses. I have also argued that the multiple versions of the film extend this demonstration. The meaning of the film subtly changes depending on which version of the film you watch. The version of the film that you watch, in turn, is affected by the language that you speak, and the time period in which you live. This, I have argued, seems to be an intentional decision, as those Buñuel deemed to need more education watched a more obscure text. Viewers of the earlier versions receive a critical text, whereas modern Spanish audiences would see a more compassionate, historical document. *Las Hurdes*, thus, has an unconventional story-weaver masquerading as a conventional one. The films' uses of multiple discourses (within the film itself, and within the versions) help the viewers of the film recognise the persuasion that can be present within a voice-over narrator.

As I have argued in Chapter Four, this persuasion is present in Herzog's earlier works. Even though the earlier films discussed feature Herzog far less diegetically than the later

films, he is actually *more* present as image-maker. I have argued that his presence as a fallible complete acousmêtre in his later films makes these films more open to interpretation. However, I have also argued that his films often feature subjects who are rendered mute due to Herzog's preference for dubbing. I have argued that this preference can heighten a character's words by forcing the viewer to listen to the character, as sound is omni-present. However, this is often not the case in Herzog's films as many characters remain silent, or speak and are therefore neither subtitled nor dubbed in voice-over. I argued that when Herzog is acting as a traditional narrator might, his voice is often present through characters like Straubinger. In *Land of Silence and Darkness*, Herzog functions as a traditional voice-of-God narrator, which gives us little reason to doubt his words. This is somewhat problematic as he often speaks on the behalf of his subjects, and often manipulates the truth. This effect is lessened when he functions as a complete acousmêtre, but mute characters still seem to serve as props, rather than as human beings. While Herzog may not be concerned with the ~~"t~~ruth of accountants", an effect of his ecstatic truth is the marginalisation of oppressed voices.

Finally, Jurschick's *It Should Have Been Nice After That* has been used to demonstrate that a third-person voice-over narrator can stimulate an emotional effect in the viewer. Jurshick's voice, like N!ai, is present in the film as both character and voice-over artist. Unlike in *N!ai,* both her voice-over and direct dialogue are subtitled for the English-speaking viewer. Like Mbulu, her voice has an auditory quality that suggests it was recorded in a studio. However, unlike Mbulu, this voice is used to tell her own story. Jurschick is also the producer of the film, and as such is granted creative control that N!ai or Mbulu could not have. I have argued that her use of third-person narration serves to distance the viewer from the subject matter, much like Jurschick herself is distanced from her father. While the film appears to be what Nichols (2001) might call an ~~"I~~t speaks about it to us" formulation, Jurschick actually operates somewhere between an ~~"i~~t" and an ~~"I~~", and the same can be said for her subject matter. I have also argued that the use of subtitles in the film place a weight on the verbal content of the film. Non-verbal sequences are thus heightened and made strange, which adds to the emotional condition of the film. I have therefore argued that her film indicates that a voice-of-God style narrator can be used as a stylistic device, and not merely as a default choice for filmmakers.

Chapters Two, Four and Five have demonstrated the effects the choice of language can make. In *N!ai*, we saw how choosing to dub a voice-over into English takes a level of power away from the original speaker, and instead grants it to the disembodied voice that replaces the original speaker. Herzog‘s films also feature this scenario, except that in his case, the speakers‘ voices are often replaced by his own voice. As concluded in Chapter Two, this allows for scenarios where the voice-over can say anything, and we are no longer able to access the original voice in order to determine the veracity of the voice-over. Jurschick chooses to use subtitles to translate into English in her film, which thus allows us access to the original words. However, this emphasises the verbal content in the film, and can often be distracting to viewers who speak both languages. In Jurschick‘s film, the effect is appropriate. There are many films, however, in which subtitling would hamper the desired effect. Furthermore, as Herzog‘s films demonstrate, a preference for the final film to be in one language can render many potential subjects mute. Therefore the initial choice to create a film needs to be accompanied by careful consideration of the final language of the film, and whether anomalous language will be dubbed, subtitles or simply ignored.

The story-weavers discussed in this thesis often seem to have made considered choices. However, on closer inspection some of their choices err on the side of the default, and thus affecting the final films in possibly undesired manners. While Herzog aims to reveal an ~~–e~~cstatic truth” through blending fictional elements to traditional documentary elements, his films still reflect a conventional tendency towards voice-over narration in documentary film, and mimetic narration in narrative cinema. In Chapter Two, we saw a possible unconventional story-weaver in *N!ai,* but it was argued that with Marshall‘s occasional narration, and with N!ai‘s voice substitution, the film has a linear approach to storytelling through a supposed omniscient narrator. Chapter Three, and *Las Hurdes* demonstrates the power that such a conventional narrator can have, and suggests that one needs a somewhat different approach should one want to encourage critical thinking in one‘s viewership. What then do we have? We have our complete acousmêtres, our unreliable narrators and our truly unconventional story-weavers. In locating their voices in the real world, in offering glimpses of personality and moments of inadequacy, they reveal themselves to be fallible. We have the immediacy that sound grants us, and yet we are simultaneously granted the ability to doubt their words. Herzog demonstrates this

quality in his later films, even though he denies many of his subjects a chance to speak. Jurschick provides us with voice-over narration that appears to be conventional at first glance. It defies gender norms, but still functions in a traditional nature. However, it eventually reveals itself to be unconventional as the detached voice-over narration portrays the emotional landscape of the film. Therefore this dissertation has shown that the choices documentary filmmakers make in the production of their films can have effects on the representation of their subjects and themselves. Furthermore, the choices can affect the level to which the audience is persuaded and manipulated by the voice-over. Therefore the choices made are important and worthy of study.

List of Illustrations

List of References

Altman, R., (ed) 1992.*Sound theory, sound practice* New York: Routledge

Ambrose, D., 2010.*Herzog: Ecstatic truth*[online]http://dcambrose.com/film/herzog-ecstatic-truth/[Accessed] Aug 2012

Ames, E., 2009.Herzog, landscape, and documentary.*Cinema Journal* 48(2): 49-69

Anderson, C. and Benson, T.W.,1993. Put Down the Camera and Pick up the Shovel: An Interview with John Marshall. In J. Ruby, ed.*The Cinema of John Marshall* Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publisher. 135-167

Barsam, R. M., 1988. *The vision of Robert Flaherty: the artist as myth and filmmaker.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Barthes, R., 1977.The Rhetoric of the Image.*Image-Music-Text*. Translated by S. Heath.New York: Hill & Wang

Blinn, M., 2008.*The dubbing standard: Its history and efficiency implications for film distributors in the German film market.* Berlin, Germany: FreieUniversität Berlin.

Bordwell, D., 1985.*Narration in the fiction film*.USA: Univ of Wisconsin Press.

Brown, E., 2012 Simon Amstell overshares.*Interview Magazine*

Bruzzi, S., 2006. *New documentary*. New York: Routledge.

Chion, M., 1994.*Audio-vision: sound on screen.* Translated byC. Gorbman.New York: Columbia University Press

Chion, M., 1999.*The voice in cinema*. Translated byC. Gorbman. New York: Columbia University Press

Clifford, J., 1981. On ethnographic surrealism.*Comparative studies in society and history*, *23*(4): 539-564.

Davidson, D., 1980. Borne out of darkness: the documentaries of Werner Herzog. *Film Criticism,* 5(1):10-25

Derrida, J., 1997. *Of grammatology*. Baltimore: JHU Press.

Dickens, C., 1861.*Great Expectations*. 1965. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin

Doane, M. A., 1980. The voice in the cinema: The articulation of body and space. *Yale French Studies*. (60): 33-50.

Documentary Educational Resources.n.d.*Film guide for N!ai, The story of a !Kung woman* [online] http://www.der.org/resources/study-guides/nai-study-guide.pdf [Accessed 20 April 2011]

Eisenstein, S., 1987.*Nonindifferent nature: film and the structure of things.* Trans. Marshall, H. Cambridge: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge

Elsaesser, T., 1989.*New German cinema: A history* New Brunswick, NJ:Rutgers University Press

Galiero, S., Habib, A. & Renaud, N.,2004 *Thetrail of Werner Herzog: An interview* Available: http://www.horschamp.qc.ca/new_offscreen/werner_herzog.html [2012, September 30]

Geiger, S.,1990.What's so feminist about women's oral history?.*Journal of Women's History*, *2*(1), 169-182.

Ging, D., 2004 Thepolitics of sound and image: Eisenstein, artifice and acoustic montage in contemporary feminist cinema.In Jean Antoine-Dunne with Paula Quigley (eds.) *The Montage Principle: Eisenstein in New Cultural and critical Contexts*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, pp. 67-95

Godmilow, J. and Shapiro, A., 1997. How real is the reality in documentary film?*History and Theory*. 36(4): 80-101.

Grierson, J.,1932. First principles of documentary (1998).*Imagining reality: The Faber book of documentary*. London: Faber & Faber: 97-102.

Gubern, R., & Hammond, P., 2012. *Luis Buñuel: The red years, 1929-1939*. USA: University of Wisconsin Press

Herzog, W., 2002.*Herzog on Herzog* London: Faber and Faber

Herzog, W., 2010.*On the absolute, the sublime and ecstatic truth.* Translated by M. Weigel Available: http://www.wernerherzog.com/52.html [2011, January 31]

Ibarz, M., 2004. A serious experiment: _Land Without Bread‘, 1933. *Luis Buñuel: New Readings*. 27-42.

Jurschick, K., 2010 *God doesn't make movies, so Karin Jurschick does it herself.* Available at:*http://www.realeyz.tv/en/blog/documentary-films/god-doesn%E2%80%99t-make-movies-so-karin-jurschick-does-it-herself.html*[2013, March 13]

Kozloff, S., 1986.Review: Narration in the fiction film.*Film Quarterly* 40(1): 43-45

Kozloff, S., 1988.*Invisible storytellers: voice-over narration in American fiction film*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press

Kozloff, S., 2000.*Overhearing film dialogue.*Berkeley: University of California Press

Loizos, P., 1993.*Innovation in ethnographic film: From innocence to self-consciousness, 1955-1985*. University of Chicago Press.

MacDougall, D., 1998.*Transcultural cinema.*Taylor, L. (ed.) Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press

MacDougall, D., 2006.*The corporeal image: film, ethnography and the senses.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press

Marshall, J., 1993. Film and learning.In J. Ruby, ed.*The cinema of John Marshall* Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publisher.

Mendelson, J., 1996. *Contested territory: the politics of geography in Luis Buñuel's: Las Hurdes: Tierra Sin Pan*. UniversitatAutònoma de Barcelona, Servei de Publicacions.

Metz, C., 1974.*Film language* University of Chicago Press

Nichols, B., 1991.*Representing reality: Issues and concepts indocumentary*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nichols, B., 2001.*Introduction to documentary* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

O'Rawe, D., 2006. The great secret: silence, cinema and modernism. *Screen*. 47(4): 395-405.

Plantinga, C., 2005. What a documentary is, after all.*The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 63: 105–117

Pudovkin, V. I., 1933. *Film technique.* Translated by I. Montagu. London: George Newnes

Roman, J. 2007 *Christian Bale pushes the limit in 'Rescue Dawn.*Available at: http://www.movieweb.com/news/christian-bale-pushes-the-limits-in-rescue-dawn [2013, Sept 12]

Ruoff, J., 1998. An ethnographic surrealist film: Luis Buñuel's _Land Without Bread'. *Visual Anthropology Review*, 14(1): 45-57

Shostak, M.,1981.*Nisa: The Life and Words of a !Kung Woman*New York: Vintage Books

Silverman, K., 1988.*The acoustic mirror.*Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press

Spurling, D., 1998.*Comments on Las Hurdes: Tierra Sin Pan* Available: http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MRC/bunuel2.html[2012, 3 February]

Sterrit, D., 2005. The ecstacy of truth: Werner Herzog seeks new horizons. *MovieMaker Magazine* 59(12). Available: http://www.moviemaker.com/magazine/issues/59/herzog.html [2012, 20 April]

Walters, B., 2007.*The top of his voice: Werner Herzog interview*Available:http://www.timeout.com/london/film/the-top-of-his-voice-werner-herzog-interview [2012, 4 April]

Winter, J., 2007.*Re-orchestrated, scripted and rehearsed.*Available: http://www.slate.com/articles/arts/culturebox/2007/07/reorchestrated_scripted_and_rehearsed.html [2012, 8 April]

Wong, T., 1997.*Appreciations: 'Little Dieter Needs to Fly'.* Available: http://lumiere.net.nz/index.php/little-dieter-needs-to-fly-1997/[2012, 5 April]

Vertov, D., 1896-1954.*Kino-eye: the writings of DzigaVertov*. Berkeley, CA: University of California

Yahnke, R., 2009._*Little Dieter Needs to Fly': Summary*Available: http://www.tc.umn.edu/~ryahnke/filmteach/Circle/2-Little-Dieter-VIEW.htm [2012, 20 April]

Young, N., 2001.*Land of silence and darkness* Available: http://www.jigsawlounge.co.uk/film/reviews/neil-youngs-film-lounge-land-of-silence-and-darkness/ [Accessed 2012, 30 September]

Zaleweski, D., 2006.*The ecstatic truth* Available: http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/04/24/060424fa_fact_zalewski?currentPage=all [Accessed 2012, 20 April]

FILMS

Apocalypse Now(1979/Coppola)
Breathless (1960/Godard)
Chronicle of a Summer (1961/Rouch)
Community (2009-/NBC)
Dear Zachary (2008/Kuenne)
Even Dwarfs Started Small (1970/Herzog)
Fantasia(1940/Ferguson)
Fata Morgana(1971/Herzog)
Grizzly Man (2005/Herzog)
In *The Great Ecstasy of the Woodsculpter Steiner*(1974/Herzog)
It Should Have Been Nice After That(2000/Jurschick)
Land of Silence and Darkness(1972/Herzog)
Land Without Bread/Las Hurdes(1933/Buñuel)
Lessons of Darkness (1992/Herzog)
Life (2009-/Holmes et al.)
Little Dieter Needs to Fly(1997/Herzog)
Los Olvidados (1950/Buñuel)
Man Bites Dog (1992/Belvauxet al.)
N!ai: The Story of a !Kung Woman (1980/Marshall)
Naked Spaces (1985/ Minh-ha)
Nanook of the North (1922/Flaherty)
No Country for Old Men(2007/The Coen Brothers)
Planet Earth (2006/Fothergill)
Plastic Bag (2009/Bahrani)
Rescue Dawn(2006/Herzog)
Roots (1977/Wolper)
Salesman (1969/Maysles)
Shookting Bookie (2003/De Mezieres and Riz)
Singin' in the Rain (1952/Donen)
Supersize vs. Superskinny (2008-/Channel 4 UK)
The Colour Purple(1985/Spielberg)
The Hunters(1957/Marshall)
The Lord of the Rings Trilogy (2001-3/Jackson)
The March of Time(1931-45/Larsen & Smith)
The Nine Lives of Tomas Katz (2000/Hopkins)
The Rocky Horror Picture Show(1975/Sharman)
The Wizard of Oz(1939/Fleming)
Titicut Follies (1967/Wiseman)
Wheel of Time (2003/Herzog)
White Diamond (2004/Herzog)