

Edgar G. Ulmer in the Yiddish period:
The dissonance between the Yiddish culture and the filmic text
in *Green Fields* (1937)

Katsunao HIRAI

Kyoto University

要 旨

エドガー・G・ウルマーのイディッシュ期の映画『グリーン・フィールド』(1937)を論じる。これまでこの映画に関しては、文化的側面とフィルムテクスト的側面の差異がさして意識されることなく調和的に論じられてきた。本論では、これまで論じられてこなかった、イディッシュ文化とフィルムテクストとの軋みの部分に焦点をあて、この観点を軸に論じる。それは、ウルマーによるこの映画がマイノリティの文化的共同性を単に補強するものではなく、様々な映画的記憶により織り成されたテクスチャーであることを示すことになるであろう。最初に、この期の映画を検証するにあたりイディッシュ、ウルマー、イディッシュ期のウルマーについて見る(I)。次に、この期のウルマーの映画『グリーン・フィールド』の製作経緯を見る(II)。引き続き、この映画の最後のシーンに着目する(III)。最期に、この映画のフィルムテクストを分析する(IV)。

“Yiddish ... movement of nomadic de-territorialization” (Deleuze, Guattari 46).

Introduction

Edgar Ulmer's perspective is understood through S. Grissemann's first monograph, published in 2003.¹ Ulmer has long been known as “the king of the Bs,” but his various cinematographic journeys, which were known only fragmentarily, are now described in connection with his perspective. In other words, people other than cinéphiles now know that Ulmer produced minority films, including Yiddish films, as well as B movies.

Attention to the Yiddish film can be dated back to the past despite small drifts. In 1976, P. Ellens wrote an article about the Yiddish film in the United States in *Film Comment*. This article was stimulated partially by an interview with Ulmer conducted by P. Bogdanovich for *Film Culture*. Ulmer talked about his own Yiddish filmmaking in this interview. In addition, a few articles have focused on Yiddish films produced from 1936 to 1939 in the United

States. The laborious book, *Visions, images, and dreams: Yiddish film past and present*, was published in 1979. In this book, the Yiddish films produced from the 1910s through to the 1950s were presented chronologically, and mixed with interviews of people engaged in their production. However, there is no aesthetic and critical consideration of these works' style here. Also, a skillfully-organized book by J. Hoberman, *Bridge of light: Yiddish film between two worlds*, was published in 1991. This book was also constructed chronologically, but in more detail in response to Goldman and others. However, though there is some aesthetic and critical consideration of the works, interviews, comments on current films, and the filmmaking process receive greatest weight in this book. Certainly, both books are important, but they contain harmonious discussions without revealing the consciousness of differences between the cultural aspects of the film and the filmic text aspects.

In this article, we focus on these aspects, which have not yet been investigated. In particular, this article examines the film *Green Fields*, created by Ulmer in the Yiddish period, from the perspective of the dissonance between the Yiddish culture and the filmic text. This film is not just an attempt to reinforce the cultural community of ethnic minorities; it should be seen as a landmark film for Ulmer, with a whole array of cinematic memories behind it. First, we survey the Yiddish film, E. G. Ulmer, and his own Yiddish period to examine his films in the Yiddish period. Second, the filmmaking process for *Green Fields* in his Yiddish period is examined. Third, we take note of the last scene of this film. Finally, we analyze the cinematic text closely.

1. Yiddish, Ulmer, Ulmer in the Yiddish period

1. First, we want to examine the word, "Yiddish," and the person, Ulmer, in greater depth. Yiddish is the language of Eastern Europe and Russian Jews, in particular. Both Hebrew and local languages were the written languages of the Jews who lived there. However, Yiddish, a language that mixes old German with Hebrew, was used as the spoken language.²

Films began to be produced at the end of 19th century (about 1895) and films produced in Yiddish began to be produced after 1911. Because Yiddish was the language used among Jews who lived in Eastern Europe and Russia, Yiddish cinema was produced in Eastern Europe and Russia. However, Yiddish films were also produced in the United States, because Jews who lived in Eastern Europe and Russia went to the United States as emigrants. The main cause of immigration was pogroms, rampant anti-Semitism that occurred in Russia and Nazi Germany. Certainly, Ulmer was not an exile who had such reason directly, but he was a Jew from Eastern Europe who had come to the United States.³

2. Generally, Ulmer is known as "the king of the Bs." He was born in the former

Austrian-Hungarian Empire, in Olmouz in the current Czech Republic in 1904. He first went to Vienna and then moved to Berlin and became an assistant to the director, F. W. Murnau, in Berlin. When Murnau made movies at Fox Studios in Hollywood, Ulmer accompanied him, coming and going between Berlin and the United States. Later, Ulmer made films in a major production studio in Hollywood. However, he could not be engaged in filmmaking because of unforeseen circumstances (Krohn 61) and moved to the East Coast from the West Coast, transferring his base of activity in filmmaking to New York. From the middle of the 1930s, Ulmer was concerned with making the minority films that we take up here.

Ulmer made four Yiddish films: *Green Fields* (*Grine Felder*, 1937), *The Singing Blacksmith* (*Yankl der Schmid*, 1938), *Light Ahead* (*Fischke der Krumer*, 1939), and *American Matchmaker* (*Amerikaner Shadkhn*, 1940). However, he did not make these Yiddish films as a great master director who took as much time as needed, worked out a detailed design, and prepared and made the films. He carried out other activities in intervals to produce these Yiddish films. Ulmer made other minority films, such as Ukrainian films and African-American films, as his filmography suggests.⁴ Moreover, he was engaged in not only the production of such films, but also the production of a short instructional film for the prevention of tuberculosis for the National Tuberculosis Association.⁵

Ulmer made so-called B movies in the 1940s. Those movies were not produced in major studios in Hollywood but by Producers Releasing Corporation, one of innumerable small and weak production companies in Hollywood and the West Coast; these companies also included Monogram and Republic. In addition, he was not called “the king of the Bs” in this period. In the 1960s and 1970s, he was named “the king of the Bs” by people in the United States who were interested in B movies.⁶ Though he received little attention in the period, a few people paid him significant attention. These were the French Nouvelle Vague.⁷ Though it is beyond the scope of this article to review Ulmer’s film from the perspective of the French Nouvelle Vague’s activity, one aspect that has received particular attention is the improvised shooting. However, this improvised shooting did not suddenly appear in B movie production in the 1940s; it was prepared for earlier.⁸ Improvised shooting had been used in a series of minor films for minorities, including Yiddish films, since the mid-1930s.⁹

3. However, we wanted to examine Ulmer in his Yiddish period. Ulmer made these films in the fourth production period of Yiddish films. The production of Yiddish films can be divided into five periods. The fourth period ran from 1935 to 1939. In the fourth period, the film industry was restored in Poland and the first Yiddish talkie in Poland stimulated American production companies and a dialogue between Warsaw and New York.¹⁰ This dialogue continued until the relationship with the Yiddish market was lost in World War

II. This period was when the most substantial films in the Yiddish filmmaking period were produced. Three representative films are *Yid'l with the fiddle*, produced in Poland in 1937,¹¹ *Dybuk*, produced in Poland in 1937,¹² and *Green Fields*, produced in the United States in 1937. Ulmer's *Green Fields* was seen by many people in New York other than Jews and received acclaim.

What about this film, *Green Fields* by Ulmer, supports the most substantial Yiddish filmmaking period? As these are Yiddish films, we can see (a) the nature of Jews' living conditions in Eastern Europe and (b) the synagogue where religious events are carried out in the Jewish community. In addition, stories in the films are based on the religious precepts of Judaism; both the visual atmosphere and the atmosphere of the story strongly reflect Judaism. Here we want to mention two scenes from *Green Fields*. One is a description of nature in the Jewish farm village community of Eastern Europe (1:16 / 1:08:50, fig. 1). The other is a scene in which the student of the chief character opens a door and leaves the synagogue (6:25, fig. 2). Where were these scenes shot? They were not shot in Eastern Europe. The scene with the description of rich nature depends on a location in New Jersey or Manhattan in New York. The synagogue in the latter scene depends on the set of the Producers Service Studio in Ridge Field, New Jersey. These scenes were all of an Eastern Europe created in the United States by Ulmer and others. We say "created" because these scenes were not provided by merely turning a camera to the subject. We will touch on this again in chapter IV.



fig.1



fig.2

II. The production process for *Green Fields*

1. Ulmer made a Ukrainian film, *Natalka Poltavka*, in 1936, the year before *Green Fields* was produced. Triggered by the success of this film, Ulmer established a production company, Collective Film Producers, with distributors of 16-millimeter film (Ludwig Landy and Roman Rebusch in Am Kino) and set out to produce Yiddish films.¹³ He moved from New York to Hollywood in the mid-1930s. However, in fact, he knew nothing about Yiddish drama, not to mention Yiddish film. This is why Ulmer was surprised by the enthusiasm he received when he visited the Yiddish art theater in New York; the idea that he could adapt material from such rich Yiddish drama for film stimulated him.

On the other hand, R. Rebush, a producer for Collective Film Producers, described a dream similar to Ulmer's. His dream was to produce superior Jewish films which drew both Christian and Jewish believers to the theater. Therefore, Rebush thought that production would require a much bigger budget than Jewish-race films. He chose a drama, *Green Fields*, by Perez Hirschbein as the script because it had been dramatized successfully earlier and become a classic of Yiddish drama. Rebush thought that *Green Fields* would achieve the same place in Yiddish film as the play and become a classic of Yiddish film, as well.¹⁴

2. However, although *Green Fields* was thought to be produced smoothly through the cooperation of the producers, Rebush and Ulmer, problems arose. One was that P. Hirschbein, who would provide the script, proposed that Jacob Ben Ami, his friend, be given the film's leading role. Hirschbein remembered that Ben Ami had displayed good acting skills on the stage 15 years earlier; he and Maurice Schwartz were the people who represented the Jewish art theater in New York.

However, Ben Ami was already 45 years old, and he was old too to play the leading role of a student in the film. In addition, he did not wish to play the leading role. Therefore, Ben Ami directed in cooperation with Ulmer and cast and instructed the performances. He chose actors who were thought to be consistent with Hirschbein's mind from the Yiddish theater in New York. Most of the chosen actors had worked with Ben Ami before and some had worked with him in the drama, *Green Fields*. On the other hand, Ulmer worked with engineers and chose shots and locations. However, as the actors had performed only in plays, they had little experience in front of a camera. Ulmer showed them how they should react and perform, but in fact Ulmer himself hardly knew Yiddish (we think this is a big factor, measuring the distance between Ulmer and the Jewish). Therefore, in a sense, Ben Ami's choice to participate as co-director was fortuitous. Furthermore, though judging in hindsight, a system of having two directors for one film was slightly strange. However, Ulmer had experienced such a system in the German film production company, UFA, where Ulmer had worked before. There were two directors in the UFA studio in the silent era; one watched actors and performances and the other determined the look of the film, that is, the camera angles and movements (Bogdanovich 563). Therefore, the co-director system wasn't difficult for Ulmer.

However, Ulmer didn't get along well with Ben Ami at this time. When he was introduced to him, it was apparent that the two would not work well together. They not only had strong wills, but also didn't feel like watching each other's work. Ulmer's first priority was to make sure that he put sound to the film and that the actors acted well enough to make a good film. On the other hand, Ben Ami's intention was to make a film consistent with the intention of Hirschbein. In other words, this meant that Hirschbein essentially produced the

film according to the original drama. Thus, we think it was by the strong request of Ben Ami rather than the intention of Ulmer that the last scene of *Green Fields*, which we will analyze in chapter III in detail, confirms the community of the Judean farm village.¹⁵

3. We have seen the film, *Green Fields*, and the drama, *Green Fields*, in this way in II-1, 2. Furthermore, we must think about the difference in the social situation between New York in the early 1900s when the drama, *Green Fields*, was staged, and New York in the mid-1930s when the film, *Green Fields*, was released.¹⁶ We have already mentioned the division into periods of the Yiddish film. In fact, there had been a struggle in attracting audiences between the film and the Yiddish drama (theater) in New York after the 1900s, the dawn before the first period.¹⁷ As stated above, the groundwork that the drama, *Green Fields*, that made people feel strongly the Judean community was well received, existed in the early 1900s. In other words, in the early 1900s, the Yiddish drama or the Yiddish film functioned as a device to let Jewish emigrants from Europe and Russia to the United States soak themselves in nostalgia for their mother countries in a foreign land (the United States).¹⁸ If an attempt to deviate from such a function was made, the Yiddish drama or film would not have been well received. In addition, most of the audiences of this film were people (city dwellers) who had once belonged to a Judean farm village community and moved to the big city of New York as emigrants. This is why the Yiddish drama or Yiddish film functioned to restore the Judean farm village community through imaginative nostalgia.

However, when times changed in the mid-1930s, the social situation also transformed. In II-2, we thought that Ulmer wasn't interested in producing the Yiddish film *per se* but in producing the film itself well. Ulmer's interest agreed with such transformations of the social situation. In other words, as the change of generations was taking place in the people who went to the United States as emigrants, the degree of the desire to contribute to pacification of the cultural nostalgia gradually thinned.¹⁹ Therefore, officially, Ulmer tried to produce a film faithfully from the drama, *Green Fields*, which was the intention of co-director Ben Ami. On the other hand, Ulmer tried to veer away from Ben Ami's intention.²⁰ We can see his attempt in the last scene of the film.

III. The last scene of *Green Fields*

As I referenced in I-3, Ulmer's *Green Fields* is similar to Yiddish films produced in the same period. Certainly, two other films (*Yid'l with the fiddle* (1937), *Dybuk* (1937)) are good; indeed, they have been called superior (Koch 13-34). However, we think of them as films which let the viewer confirm certain aspects of the Jewish community. Ulmer's film seems

to come under those films. For example, the last scene of *Green Fields* is the following. A young man, the chief character of this film, stays in the Jewish farm village in the middle of a trip.²¹ He intends to stay for a short time. However, while he is teaching the children of the village, he is welcomed by the people of the village and can't leave. He gradually becomes deeply impressed by the simple life of the villagers and he realizes that God demands both land and law (Torah). On the other hand, this young man becomes involved in a love relationship with a daughter of a man in the village and decides that he will stay. The last scene moves the viewer. This young man and the daughter walk hand in hand, and the agricultural machinery (plow) is set in the foreground before them. "The End" is presented at 1:37:44 (fig. 3).



fig.3

How should this scene be interpreted? The standard interpretation is that this scene confirms the Judean community which is supported by the law (Torah) of Judaism. Actually, S. Grissemann presents such an interpretation. This film conveys "the Zionism nostalgia for a sacred place praising the spirituality of Hasidism, the labor in the community and the family life" (Grissemann 115).²² However, as we discussed regarding the filmmaking process in chapter II the last scene of the film, *Green Fields* confirms the community of the Judean farm village, not because Ulmer intended it, but because co-director Ben Ami strongly requested it. Even so, this film doesn't always reflect the Judean community strongly. In the practice of the filmic text, this film is felt to form strong connections with other films rather than to confirm the Judean community. We see this in the practice of the filmic text in the following chapter.

IV. The description of nature, the cheap set, and the long take

1. As mentioned in I-3, in *Green Fields*, we see, for example, (a) the description of nature where the Jewish farm village community in Eastern Europe is seen and (b) the student of the chief character opening a door and leaving the synagogue where religious events in the Jewish community are carried out. These scenes are thought to be not a thing provided by turning a camera to external nature or the set and merely filming, but a thing elaborately devised under limited conditions. The description of nature (fig. 1) in *Green Fields* and three other films in Ulmer's Yiddish period was provided by shooting on location in New Jersey and on Manhattan Island in New York, as mentioned in I-3. Shooting on location provides charm for the film and shows its documentary texture. However, it is not the charm of shooting on location, not the documentary touch, and not the thing that tames the film

into something story-like. The film recalls other descriptions of nature, such as the light and wind in *Propos de Nice* (1930) and *L'Atalante* (1934) by Jean Vigo.²³ For example, J. Hoberman said, “ Sunlit and airfilled ... the film recalls...Vigo” (Hoberman 252).²⁴

2. In addition, a cheap set, such as the scene that imitated a house, remarkably is seen in the third Yiddish film, *Light Ahead* by Ulmer, rather than in *Green Fields* (59:06, fig. 4). The man and woman as the chief characters performed in front of this set. The house in the Jewish community in Eastern Europe was not quite rich, so the angle of the roof declined and the frame of the window ran diagonally. Therefore, it may not make much difference whether a real house is imitated or not. The set which seemingly was made properly was not groundless. According to film history, we can clearly see stimulation from German expressionism here. Ulmer accepted the stimulation of German expressionism and formed such a style in his Yiddish film in his own way. This style is called “Chasidic gothic” (Hoberman 300)²⁵ or “poetic expressionism” (Grissemann 134).

3. Furthermore, the very long take on very few setups falls under the films in his Yiddish period. For example, the scene (a) in which the young man of the chief character talks with farm families and neighboring people in front of the farmhouse is seen in *Green Fields* (fig. 5). However, in other scenes, the accumulation of shot-countershoot is seen (e.g., the scene in which the young man of the chief character and the child talk over becoming a rabbi in a house (38:18-42:49)); scene (a) is intentionally composed of endless long-take shots with a fixed camera on very few setups (29:54-32:12). Though the waist shot of the man out of screen is inserted once in the middle of the scene, in fact, an accent is added to the earlier and later long takes through insertion of this short shot. This is heterogeneous with the frequent accumulation of shot-countershoots that was characteristic of films in Hollywood in the same period.

Furthermore, we see scene (b) in which the woman entreats the young man of the chief character to stay in the village (42:50-48:23, fig. 6). In this scene, the young man is in a room of the house and he moves about the room and looks out the window at the sky. The camera is fixed; it pans right and left without following him and describing the sky that he sees out the window. The woman who sends goodwill



fig.4



fig.5



fig.6

to him enters the room. However, the position of the camera changes without moving and following her; while fixed, the camera continues to describe her and the man. The composition includes a table in the center of the depth with the young man sitting at it in the right of the screen while the woman works by a kiln in the front of the screen. At this time, the conversation that he and she exchange is presented not by the accumulation of shot-countershots but by the long take with the fixed camera. Then, the camera in a fixed state begins to move slowly (45:02-; in fact, judging from cinematographic memory, viewers will be impressed by this scene, as shown in the following paragraphs). In other words, the camera follows the woman from the back as she slowly comes toward the table where the man sits; she is located opposite him diagonally and they are caught in the frame. In this scene, the woman who sends goodwill to the man entreats him to remain in the village. In this series of scenes, the upsurge in her emotions, which she experiences on approaching him, to whom she sends goodwill, agrees with the motion of approaching slowly of the camera in exquisite timing.

Generally speaking, the long take seen in these scenes may surely be monotonous. Though the long take may be portentous in these scenes, it can be seen in a similar and more refined way in the beginning scene in the fourth film, *American Matchmaker*, in Ulmer's Yiddish period (2:42-10:18, fig. 7).²⁶ Generally speaking, the long take may be monotonous. Hoberman has this difficulty, too, when he turns the long take toward the affirmation. In other words, he evaluates negatively and says that this camera is "sommolent" (Hoberman 317), though he watches the elaborate device by Ulmer in other scenes. Though Hoberman's review is generally good, it is necessary to think a little more. In other words, it is necessary to turn such a long take thought weak at first glance toward the affirmative. That is, the long take seen in this film, *Green Fields* agrees with the long take seen in some films by F. W. Murnau. Ulmer once worked with F. W. Murnau at Fox in Hollywood and at UFA in Germany. Indeed, the director, Murnau, is known for the "moving camera" in *Der Letzte Mann* (1924) in film history.²⁷ That is, Murnau's "moving camera"

was taken in by S. Kracauer, succeeded in L. Eisner, and inherited by Jean-Luc Godard, who pays homage to her.²⁸ However, in fact, Murnau presented the long take with the fixed camera with as much strength as the "moving camera" has. For example, one can see this in the scene in which an old porter is ordered a reshuffle in *Der Letzte Mann* (18:49-



fig.7



fig.8

29:49). In the scene, the manager of the hotel and the old porter are presented by the shot with a fixed camera set up outside a window (fig. 8). On this occasion, their exchange is not shown by shot-countershoot but by the continuation of the long take for 1 minute and 13 seconds. After the long take, the camera starts to approach the old porter slowly from outside the window to inside the building as if the camera agrees with the emotion of the viewer. In this way, Murnau's long take acquires new implications as a component of the space opened by the "moving camera."²⁹ Ulmer discovers Murnau in this way, digests the stimulation from Murnau, and stylizes it in his own way.

Thus, the description of nature by Jean Vigo can be seen in the description of nature in the films from his Yiddish period (IV-1). Furthermore, the stimulation from German expressionism can be seen in the sets, which seem to be properly made at first glance (IV-2). In addition, Murnau's technique that maintains the intensity can be seen in Ulmer's scene, which is constructed by a few setups and long takes and makes the viewer feel bored at first glance (IV-3). In other words, it is possible to retranslate the cinematographic technique affirmatively, which is thought to be a weakness at first glance, and pull an alternative line.

Conclusion

Finally, we want to return to the last scene in *Green Fields* once again. Certainly the scene which moves the viewer may confirm the community of the Judean farm village, if we look only there. However, as we have seen, this film arouses the cinematographic memory transversely on the level of material expression, and shows movement that deviates from such a Judean community rather than confirming it. In addition, if the possibility exists of Yiddish in "the language of the popular drama" and in "movement of nomadic de-territorialization" rather than in "the language of the religious community," Yiddish doesn't reinforce the Judean cultural community but suggests the possibility of going beyond the culturally shut-off area alternatively.³⁰ Even if Ulmer's Jewishness is argued, the possibility of the argument is not to confirm the general Judean community but to go beyond it.³¹ In this article, we have tried to see the possibilities of Ulmer's films in his Yiddish period. We focused on his Yiddish film, *Green Fields*, one of a series of minor films for minorities which was produced in the mid-1930s. As for the minor in a minor film here, the minor means not only the minor Yiddish film that presents minorities but also the very scarce experiment of this film being created by minorities who are objects and groups of production, showing the dissonance between story content and filmic text in this film, as we have argued.

The original version of this article was published in Japanese by the scientific journal *Human and Environmental Studies* Vol. 20, 2011 (Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University). This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S) "A Japan-Based Global Study of Racial Representations" (Principal Investigator: Yasuko Takezawa) No. 22222003.

Notes

1. Grissemann 2003.
2. Yiddish is the dialect of Jews in central and Eastern Europe. Like English, it is a “fusion tongue and an amalgam of High Middle German, Hebrew, Aramic and various Slavic languages.” It is “one of two European Jewish languages that evolved during the Middle Ages” (Hoberman 11).
3. For example, the following people were Jews from the former Austria-Hungary empire who came to the United States: Siodmak brothers from Dresden, Germany (Robert Siodmak 1900-1973, Curt (Kurt) Siodmak 1902-2000), Billy Wilder from Sucha Beskidzka, Poland (Samuel Wilder 1906-2002), and Fred Zinnemann from Vienna, Austria (Friedrich Zimmerman 1907-1997). They were all engaged in producing *Menschen am Sonntag* (1929) in Berlin.
4. Belton 173-80, Grissemann 371-81. u.s.w.
5. Mrs. Roosevelt, who wanted to undertake a tuberculosis prevention campaign, pressured the government and a budget for allotment to the National Tuberculosis Association was passed. The result was production of short instructional films for the prevention of tuberculosis for the National Tuberculosis Association. One day, after producing *Green Fields*, Ulmer was approached with a proposal for the production of an instructional film by a person concerned with government. The relationships between these short instructional films and Ulmer’s Yiddish films in the same period as well as New Deal and other films that had very close links to the New Deal must be discussed in another article. In the relationship with the partisan documentary, *The Spanish Earth* (1937), produced by J. Ivens in the same period, *Green Fields* had a very strong connection with the culture of the popular front. *Green Fields* was released in a theater in the west of Times Square for eight weeks on October 12, 1937. Earlier, in the same theater, *The Spanish Earth* by J. Ivens had been released. Furthermore, *Green Fields* was released on a program with a documentary of the popular front, *China Strikes Back*, by Frontier Films. In addition, Jewish people in the United States supported the popular front in the civil war that broke out in the summer of 1936 in Spain. In addition, a political tendency of the production group of *Green Fields*, Collective Film Producers, emphasized the posture of anti-fascism. Furthermore, the transformation by the popular front that an argument of the Torah and the unification of labor was intended for inclusion in the script of this film was added (Hoberman 249-52).
6. For more about evaluating Ulmer as “the king of the Bs”, see Charles Flynn and Todd McCarthy 1975.
7. For example, Francois Truffaut, Edgar Ulmer, *The Naked Dawn*, in *The films in my life*, translated [from the French] by Leonard Mayhew. London: Allen Lane, 1980, p. 155. Here, it is said that *The Naked Dawn* (1954) by Ulmer stimulated the way in which Truffaut made *Jules et Jim* (1961). Jean-Luc Godard pays hommage to three cinéastes in the end credits of *Détective* (1985). One of the three cinéastes is Ulmer. For further information, see note 31 .
8. Minority films, including Yiddish films, shared bad conditions such as shortness of life and low budgets with independent production companies such as Poverty Row, which Ulmer later joined in Hollywood. In addition, in such minority filmmaking, minimum facilities and equipment, as well as outdated studios or private homes in the East Coast, were often utilized (Taves 342).

9. A series of the minor films for minorities produced from the mid-1930s are the following, except for the four Yiddish films mentioned above: Ukrainian films *Natalka Poltavka* (1936) and *Cossacks in Exile* (1938) and African American film *Moon over Harlem* (1938). The previous two Ukrainian films were not produced in Ukraine but in Canada and the United States for Ukrainian minorities who crossed into North America. Also, the short instructional films for the prevention of tuberculosis for the National Tuberculosis Association were produced for minorities in the United States. For example, African Americans in Alabama were described in *Let My People Live* (1938), Hispanics in San Antonio were described in *Cloud in the Sky* (1939), and the Indian Navaho tribe in the north of the United States was described in *Another to Conquer* (1940).

10. The first period was from 1911 to 1917. The second period began “with the fall of the tsar in 1917” and extended “a dozen years.” The third period was “the early sound period” and was “almost entirely American.” The fifth period was “concentrated in the immediate post WW II(1945-50)” (Hoberman 5-8).

11. For more about this film, see Hoberman 238-43 and Guenter 67-70.

12. For more about this film, see Hoberman 279-84.

13. The form of the independent production company was adopted in this Yiddish filmmaking as well the previous Ukrainian film, *Natalka Poltavka* (1936). Of course, the Yiddish film production company was generally an independent production company which was financially unstable and corresponded to the few limited minority groups, unlike major film production companies in Hollywood in the same period (Erens 48).

14. Peretz Hirschbein (1880-1948) was a scriptwriter of Yiddish from Melnik of Grodno in the former Czarist Russia, today's Belarus. He established the Hirschbein theatrical company in Odessa, Ukraine in 1908 and performed a tour in Czarist Russia. He visited Vienna, Paris, London, and New York alone in 1911 and moved to New York in 1914. He strongly influenced the Yiddish art theater in New York and built the foundation of the Yiddish theater in the second period that began soon after World War I. The script of *Green Fields*, written in 1916, was performed publicly in 1918 by theatrical company Fraye Yidishe Folksbine (Free Yiddish People's Stage), which was composed of many Jewish emigrants. This premiere described the birth of the Yiddish art theater (Liptzin 82ff. Nahshon 611-17).

15. Jacob Ben Ami had a strong relationship with the scriptwriter, Hirschbein, as an actor because Hirschbein's theatrical company was organized in Odessa, Ukraine in 1908. The following demonstrates this strong relationship. Ben Ami persuaded M. Schwarz to stage *Farvorfn Vinkl* (*A Secluded Nook*) by Hirschbein in the Yiddish art theater in New York in the 1918-1919 season. Ben Ami prioritized the performance of *Green Fields* in the 1919-1920 season and left M. Schwarz. *Green Fields* by Hirschbein belonged to a series of lyrical pastorals which expressed the Jewish life under the sky. The lyrical pastoral did not remind the viewer of the sorrow in a factory or ghetto, but rather the country of Hirschbein, a memory of early childhood in Lithuania, was pictured. Furthermore, Ulmer talked about intending to wrestle filmmaking in his own style, unlike M. Schwarz, who not only instructed the Yiddish art theater but also made Yiddish films. In other words, Ulmer said that he was “going to have his own style” and that he was “going to do it” “dignified, not dirty.” This was “[t]he same decision which ... Chagall made” (Bogdanovich 578f.).

16. About 2 million Jews from East European immigrated to the United States searching for a better life between 1880 and 1914. By 1910, 12 million Jews of various backgrounds lived in New York and constituted approximately a quarter of the population of New York. Jews from Eastern Europe formed “a dynamic, Yiddish-speaking community supporting a wide range of amusement venues,” such as “saloons, dancing halls, nickelodeons, Yiddish variety houses and legitimate theatres” on the Lower East Side of Manhattan and “theater-going played a prominent role in the social and cultural life of many Jewish immigrants.” We know of “the popularity of the Yiddish stage and its famous actors from Jewish-American memoir literature.” However, “memoires of Jewish immigrant life in New York” have rarely mentioned nickelodeons. In other words, “moving pictures seem to have been exclusively associated with American culture and

hence ignored." On the other hand, "the legitimate Yiddish theatre became the quintessence of the Old World-flavoured immigrant culture of the turn of the century and object of nostalgic reminiscence" (Thissen (1999) 15-28, Merritt 80-84).

17. Thissen (2003) 29.
18. It is reasonable for Hoberman to say that "Yiddish was not just a language and a folk culture but an entire Jewish world, a *Yiddishland*" (Hoberman 5).
19. The audience of the Yiddish drama and film was the first generation that passed into the United States until the talkie was introduced (Desser 41).
20. According to Lipsitz, Ulmer believed that film as a medium had responsibility for education and communication and that film belonged to the people who made national identity clear the same as to the people who pursued profit from a film (Lipsitz 198). Whereas we recognize the importance of this opinion, it is necessary to cast a diagonal eye here.
21. The wandering preacher who travels around Jewish communities in Russia and Poland existed in the Jewish cultural sphere of Eastern Europe and Russia. These preachers depended on the generosity of various attendees who heard their teaching (Spalding 84). In addition, for more about the story of this movie, see Hoberman 245-53, Goldman 112-16, and Kiichiro Yanashita "Kogyoshitachi no Eigashi" (Seidosha, 2003) Chapter 7.
22. Both the young man of the chief character being a student and his trip to research the truth and the researching of the truth to stir up a tangle with the religious faith remaining in the farm village are important motifs of this film.
23. This needs further inspection in the filmic text. On this occasion, the following aren't unnecessary. It was Boris Kaufman who became the eyes of Jean Vigo in this film mentioned above. Boris Kaufman cooperated with Ziga Vertov as a director and elder brother, and Michael Kaufman as a camera man and elder brother, and made *Tschelowek s kinoapparatom* (1929). The early film, *Menschen am Sonntag* by Ulmer and others was produced under the stimulation of *Tschelowek s kinoapparatom*.
24. Hoberman describes briefly but doesn't make a concrete reference to the film by J. Vigo. However, we can remember the following scene of *L'Atalante* that takes the constitution of the film drama as well as *Green Fields*, as the scene where wind blows. The scene begins with an impressive long shot which presents Dita Parlo, the bride who will begin her newly married life on the ship, walking slowly on board, wearing a snow-white bridal costume (9:10-). In this scene, we can see the wind of nature through the smoke which a steamship blows up, snow-white clothes to hang over, and her hair.
25. Chasidism is the movement in Judaism proposed by Israel Baal Shem-Tov in Poland in the 18th century. It is full of mysterious tendencies. Chasidic gothic is stylized in the Yiddish film, *Dybuk* (1937, Poland) by the scripter, M. Schwarz. However, according to Hoberman, it "has misleadingly come to seem the main stream of modern Yiddish literature." "For all the emphasis on Jewish mysticism," *Dybuk* "is ultimately less spiritual than tribal" (Hoberman 280).
26. This scene lasts for 7 minutes and 36 seconds after the first establishing shot and comprises only 9 shots.
27. In addition, Ulmer created the dolly with R. Gliese and others to produce this film (Bogdanovich 569).
28. Kracauer 136-38, Eisner 210-12, *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (Jean-Luc Godard, 1988-1998): 3B (Une Vague nouvelle)
29. For example, the transformation from something dramatic. The long take in Murnau's film acquires new meaning as an element of the composition of space opened by introducing the "moving camera." It is necessary to debate F. W. Murnau on this viewpoint.
30. Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari 46.
31. In addition, this leads to the possibility of Ulmer's films in other periods. For example, J. Rivette said that "there no doubt are two Hollywoods, the Hollywood of sums and the Hollywood of individuals" (Jacques Rivette 17). And Jean-Luc Godard quoted a series of scenes from Ulmer's early film, *Menschen am Sonntag* (1929) where unknown people were cast, with the narration

that “I want to return the history to the people who don’t have the history” (*Histoire(s) du cinéma* (1988-1998), *Allemagne 90 neuf zero* (1991)). In addition, French Nouvelle Vagues such as Rivette and Godard will correspond to and feel something from Ulmer and they continue to inscribe on the margin of existing film history.

References

Belton, John, *Howard Hawks ; Frank Borzage ; Edgar G. Ulmer*, London : Tantivy PressNew York : Barnes, 1974.

Bogdanovich, Peter , Edgar G. Ulmer: An Interview, *Film Culture*, No. 58-60, 1974; deutsch : *Filmhefte*, Nr. 1, Sommer 1975 (u. a. über Murnau). in *Who the devil made it* : [interviewed by] Peter Bogdanovich. Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.

Deleuze, Gilles, Felix Guattari, *Kafka : pour une litterature mineure*, Paris : Editions de Minuit, 1975.

Desser, David, Review of *Bridge of Light: Yiddish Film between Two Worlds*, by J. Hoberman, *Film Quarterly* 47, no.1, Autumn 1993.

Eisner, Lotte H., *Die dämonische Leinwand* : überarb., erw. und autoris. Neuaufl., 3. Tsd. Frankfurt am Main : Kommunales Kino, 1976.

Erens, Patricia, Mentschekhkayt Conquers All, *Film Comment*, Vol. 12, No. 1, January/February 1976.

Flynn, Charles and Todd McCarthy, *Kings of the Bs : working within the Hollywood system : an anthology of film history and criticism*, 1st ed. New York : E. P. Dutton, 1975.

Goldman, Eric A., *Visions, images, and dreams : Yiddish film past and present*, Ann Arbor, Mich. : UMI Research Press, 1983.

Grissemann, Stefan, *Mann im Schatten. Der Filmemacher Edgar E. Ulmer*, Zsolnay-Verlag, 2003.

Guenter, Winfried, Misrach un marew. Zu den jiddischen Filmen Edgar G. Ulmers und Joseph Greens, *Das jiddische Kino*, Ronny Loewy (Red.), Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum, 1982.

Herzogenrath, Bernd, Introduction: The Return of Edgar G. Ulmer, in: *Edgar G. Ulmer : Essays on the King of the B's*, ed. Bernd Herzogenrath, McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2009.

Hoberman, J, *Bridge of light : Yiddish film between two worlds*, Philadelphia : Temple University Press, 1995.

Koch, Gertrud, Auf halbem Weg zum Engel des Vergessens, *Das jiddische Kino*, Ronny Loewy (Red.), Frankfurt: Deutsches Filmmuseum, 1982.

Kracauer, Siegfried, *From Caligari to Hitler. A Psychological History of the German Film*, Princeton: University Press, 1947; dt.: *Von Caligari zu Hitler. Eine psychologische Geschichte des deutschen Films(Schriften. Band 2)*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979.

Krohn, Bill, King of the B's, *Film Comment*, July/August 1983.

Lipsitz, Georges, *Time Passages: Collective Memory and American Popular Culture*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

Liptzin, Sol, *A history of Yiddish literature*, Middle Village, N.Y. : Jonathan David, c1985.

Merritt, Greg, *Celluloid Marvericks: A History of American Independent Film*, New York: Thunder's Mouth Press, 2000.

Moeller, Olaf, Borderline: Arkham, Arkadien, *Filmdienst*, Nr. 12, 7.6.1994.

Mouillet, Luc et Bertrand Tavernier, Entretien avec Edgar G. Ulmer, *Cahiers du Cinema*, No. 122, Aout 1961.

Nahshon, Edna, “Theater, Yiddish” in *Jewish-American history and culture : an encyclopedia*, edited by Jack Fischel and Sanford Pinsker, New York, Garland, 1992.

Spalding, Henry D., *Encyclopedia of Jewish humor: from Biblical times to the modern age*, compiled and edited by Henry D. Spalding; with a glossary by Dorothy H. Rochmis, Middle Village,

NY: J. David, 2001.

Taves, Brian, The B Film: Hollywood's Other Half, in *Grand Design: Hollywood as A Modern Business Enterprise 1930-1939*, ed. Tino Balio, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Thissen, Judith, Jewish Immigrant Audiences in New York City, 1905-14, in: M.Stokes / R.Maltby (Eds.): *American Movie Audiences*, London, 1999.

---, Charlie Steiner's Houston Hippodrome: Moviegoing on New York's Lower East Side, 1909-1913, in Gregg Bachman and Tom Slater (eds.), *American Silent Film: Discovering Marginalized Voices*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002.

---, Movies vs. Yiddish theater: 'the grand scandal' , in: J. Hoberman and Jeffrey Shandler, with contributions by Maurice Berge [et. Al], *Entertaining America: Jews, Movies, and Broadcasting*, Jewish Museum, New York, 2003.

Green Fields (Grine Felder), USA, 1937, 97 minutes B&W, Yiddish with new English subtitles, Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer, Jacob Ben-Ami, The National Center for Jewish Film (NCJF), 1989.

The Singing Blacksmith (Yankl Der Schmid), USA, 1938, 105 minutes B&W, Yiddish with new English subtitles, Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer, NCJF, 1989.

The Light Ahead (Fishke der Krumer), USA, 1939, 94 minutes B&W , Yiddish with English subtitles, Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer, NCJF, 1989.

American Matchmaker (Amerikaner Shadkhn), USA, 1940, 87 minutes B&W , Yiddish with English subtitles, Directed by Edgar G. Ulmer, NCJF, 1989.

Yid'l with the fiddle, Poland, 1936, 86 minutes B&W, Yiddish with English subtitles, Directed by Joseph Green, Sphinx Films Corp., N.Y. : Yiddish Film Collection, 1994.

Le Dibbouk, Poland, 1937, 100 minutes B&W, Yiddish with English subtitles, Directed by Michel Waszynski, Brooklyn Video, 1999.