

Maaret Koskinen

Stockholms universitet  
[maaret.koskinen@mail.film.su.se](mailto:maaret.koskinen@mail.film.su.se)

## Pictures in the Typewriter, Writings on the Screen Stieg Larsson, Ingmar Bergman, and the lure of media appropriations

Everyone involved in cinema culture, be it in production, distribution or academia, is aware of the ongoing debate on the imminent demise of cinema. Book titles such as *The Virtual Life of Film* and *Framed Time. Toward a Postfilmic Cinema* speak for themselves.<sup>1</sup>

The central question under debate is what happens to cinema, once its traditional 'medium' – that is, the celluloid emulsion on a filmstrip – has shifted into various digital forms. To be more specific, now that film and its moving images can be digitized on YouTube and absorbed into laptops and cell phones, does it not change in some fundamental way? As film changes material garb, is not its very nature threatened and turn into a mere 'phantom of its former self'?

This suggestive expression is lifted from the homepage of a recent film and media studies conference, significantly called 'Film in the postmedia age', the focus of which is similar queries: Do we find ourselves in a kind of cinematic post-medium condition, in which cinema will once and for all disappear into the archives and film museums? Or conversely, given that moving images have indeed long since entered the art galleries and now also moved into the streets and our everyday life, as a domesticated medium at everybody's reach – should we perhaps instead speak of a more all-pervasive 'cinematic experience' of everyday life?<sup>2</sup>

Here obviously two positions are pitted against each other – the disappearance of film versus the idea that *everything* is film, but whichever the case, the result is the same: exit cinema – as we have come to know it.

### *Cinephilic optimism and media wars*

So say the pessimists. But in this debate on film's absorption by other media one might just as well take the optimistic route, and in the

spirit of old-fashioned cinephilia point out the degree to which the film medium itself is, and has always been, a master of absorptions and appropriations. After all, film as a medium is deeply hybrid in nature, in which all kinds of other media – language, music, painting – can be inscribed, represented and even remediated.<sup>3</sup> Given this, could it be that this hybridity has given film a kind of inbuilt resilience, which will help it withstand the attack of the digital, allowing it to shift its shape and survive once more?

Well, there is no crystal ball providing simple answers. But let us note one fascinating detail – that in the wake of the ever evolving digitization of the moving image into other platforms, one can in recent popular film detect an increasing focus on various media and aesthetic technologies, be they new (computers, cell phones, CTV-cameras) or old (verbal language, the alphabet, print media), and in a way that seems to transcend mere narrative functions. Could it even be so that this interest is symptomatic of some kind of *Zeitgeist* regarding media issues?

Let us, for instance, look at *Zodiac* (2007) directed by David Fincher. On the surface this is a story about the serial killer who terrorized San Francisco in the 1960s and 70s, but was never caught. The killer is not apprehended in the film either – although it is almost three hours long. Still this slow-moving film does not bore you for a second, so obviously it is not your average whodunit. But, then, what is it? I would say that *Zodiac* is a kind of meditation on various media technologies – or more accurately, lack of them. Because what strikes one is the almost shocking absence of all the technological paraphernalia in this film – computers, cell phones, DNA – which by now has come to define the crime genre as such. There is even an ironic point made of the fact that a hot lead dies out simply because the local, small town cops still do not have a fax, while their colleagues in the city are shown to be proud owners of a (now comically antique) machine. My point here is that this absence of technology is not merely in the service of realism (since the film is set in the 70s), but rather a *retroactive making strange*, which makes visible our present-day absolute dependence on technology, not least how deeply it has changed our perception of time and space.

This becomes even more fascinating in the way the film highlights the one information technology that the bogged down police does have access to, namely good old-fashioned printmedia. Consider, for instance, how the officers in the film sometimes are reduced to jotting down leads on paper napkins, while the murderer triumphantly bombards them, as well as the press, with letters and ciphers to be decoded. But much more spectacular is the montage sequence in which one of the

main characters, the police investigator acted by Mark Ruffalo, enters the offices of the newspaper *The San Francisco Chronicle* together with a colleague. Because it is significantly precisely at this point that director Fincher decides to introduce the film's most stunning visual effect. For suddenly these two investigators, walking through the offices, seem as if surrounded by several layers of letters and numbers, an opaque virtual 3-D wall of writing, and even if they walk through it briskly, they seem as if captured and circumscribed by it. This is all very apt, of course, given that our heroes are lost in the murderer's scheme of things. But what this montage sequence in effect also does is to put into filmic audiovisual play a kind of war between various media technologies, at the same time as it elegantly marries them – firstly *text and writing*, which in turn are inscribed and remediated by *moving images*, which finally are enhanced by state-of-the-art *digitization CGI* (computer generated imagery).

What also happens in this sequence is that the 'normal' power relations regarding text-image relations are turned upside down. Because if, in daily parlance and practice, the 'normal' course of events regarding text-image relations generally moves from book to film and from text to image, in *Zodiac* it is as if the moving image triumphantly has appropriated the realm of words, by literally splashing them all over the screen, and so turning normal chronology on its head. Thus, if what we see here is a kind of *lettrification of the filmic image* we also, and conversely, see a cinematic *spatialization of written language* – nothing less than an aggressive appropriation by film of words.

To be sure, the coming together of various media in this fashion – text, images – is nothing new, certainly not in film. Ever since the (so-called) silents, writings of various kind (from love letters to subtitles) have been used as nuts and bolts in propelling the narrative forward. But over and above such narrative functions many recent popular films seem to play out a kind of media wars or *media allegories* that re-enact, in new garb, the age-old rivalry between text and image – 'word culture' *versus* 'visual culture'.

More Anglo-american examples could be mentioned (for instance the *Jason Bourne*-trilogy, or the more recent *State of Play* from 2009) but interestingly similar media wars can be seen played out in Nordic film as well. Consider for instance Niels Arden Oplev's adaptation of the novel *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo*, the first part of Stieg Larsson's phenomenally successful *Millennium* book trilogy. Naturally much could be said in general of this book in relation to Swedish film and literature (for instance heroine Lisbeth Salander as a feminist Pippi Longstocking) and the adaptation process as such. But equally

interesting is to note the degree to which Oplev's film displays (a bit like *Zodiac*) an obsession with print media, which at times even colours the very style of the film.

This is emphasized already in the very beginning, where journalist Mikael Blomkvist is first seen walking past the evening tabloid posters, which in big print shout out that he has been sentenced to prison (for libel of the industry magnate whose shady business he has scrutinized), after which he is soon seen crouching under the huge, electronically rolling news screens on the walls of buildings in central Stockholm. From the very beginning the film, then, not only the print media but the visual remediation of words are given ample time and space.

This comes to a head in an extremely elegant montage sequence in which Blomkvist looks for a lead in the archives of a local publication from the 1960s, which may hold press photos of the murderer. All proves extremely time-consuming, since he has to seek through stacks of negatives of old pics, without a negative scanner and only aided by a magnifying glass. But then the tempo picks up as he finally finds a lead. He now first loads the negatives down on his computer, after which he feeds them through the Graphic Converter program, and then finally turns the stills into chronologically arranged moving images.

In other words, what occurs here is a kind of condensed media history or a media allegory, in this case one that literally dramatizes how new media overtake old media. Hence just like *Zodiac*, *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* makes use of old media, but note in hindsight, and seen through (the awareness of) new media – as if in a rear view mirror.

But please note too that if media wars indeed are played out as outlined above – these are still set in action in and through that old medium called 'film'. Therefore, let us once more return to our question in the beginning – when we see films like these, and their elegantly condensed media allegories, are we really witnessing the final convulsions of the dying art of film, about to be engulfed by digitized media? Or, quite the opposite, are we only watching the normal moves of an art form that will continue to live and thrive, according to the way it always has – by adapting to and appropriating any new technological enemy that happens to come along?

In case of the latter, what we are observing then is *business as usual*.

### **Conceptual wars**

In the wake of the ongoing debate on the imminent demise of cinema, it comes as no surprise that the ever evolving changes in the medialandscape create havoc in academia as well. For instance it can be

noted that film scholarship – or what was formerly referred to rather unproblematically as ‘Cinema Studies’ – is a highly negotiable entity these days, in favour of more encompassing *Media Studies*, which focus on present-day concepts as ‘media convergences’ or ‘database aesthetics’.<sup>4</sup> This is reflected in the fact that with regard to concepts, all is in flux. I have already touched on some of the terminology, for instance aesthetic technologies, remediation, media convergence and hybridity. But more could be added, for instance intermediality, transaesthetics, intertextuality, assimilation, appropriation, adaptation, rewriting, transformation, mixing, remixing across media... The list could go on, not to mention the fact that most terms travel differently, depending on which discipline sets the agenda.<sup>5</sup>

Let us briefly indicate the complexity of the problem by focussing on the various meanings of the term ‘medium’. To cite Claus Clüver:

*‘Physical media’* are the means by which any medium’s complex signs are produced, such as the body, flute, percussion instruments; the Moog synthesizer; oil on canvas, brush and ink on paper; marble, wood; the video camera; voice; typewriter, pen; paper, parchment, skin; etc. Corresponding *‘media’* employing these *physical media* are dance, music, electronic music, painting, sculpture, architecture, video, speech, typography, writing, tattooing. [...] Then there are the *‘public media’* including the traditional print media (the press) and those relying on more complex technological means of production (radio, television, video, etc.) (My italics.)

‘[T]o find a general definition of “medium” that will apply to all those listed above [...] has proven a difficult task’, adds Clüver laconically.<sup>6</sup>

This is clear already from the way the term ‘medium’ has been used above. Sometimes it is used in its material sense (for instance film emulsion), at other times it may refer to intermedial relations *between* various media or (as in ‘film’ or ‘the’ or remediated *within* one given medium. Since such issues have been noted by numerous scholars, most notably Clüver, Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, Hans Lund, Erik Hedling, and most recently Lars Elleström (see further below), I will not delve into them. Suffice it to say that the technological turn in recent humanities no doubt has resulted in areas of contestation between various hard-core perspectives on the one hand; and on the other more traditional aesthetic perspectives, in which the philosophy of aesthetics, the history of ideas, and literature used to occupy a privileged position in setting the agenda for studying the relations between various arts.<sup>7</sup>

Thus the notion of intermediality can be understood to encompass everything from traditional aesthetic and work-oriented perspectives,

with questions such as adaptation practices and authorships on the agenda, to more technological perspectives, mainly concerned with the medium as a physical and historically defined channel, in which for instance individual authorship is regarded as incompatible with the idea that it is mainly the medium that is the ultimate 'cause' and origin – the computer, the gramophone, the printing press, to borrow Friedrich Kittler's famous book title.<sup>8</sup>

Personally, though, I do not think that aesthetic and technological approaches have to be regarded as mutually exclusive, but can be seen rather as different foci along an interconnected continuum. If nothing else, it may serve us well to remind ourselves of art historian W.J.T. Mitchell's famous dictum that there are no pure arts or media, and that all media are always already hybrid or mixed. At least this is the case when regarding it from the point of view of the human sensory apparatus. As Mitchell puts it, a painting is not purely optic, because in seeing it we are at the same time able to perceive the hand or the brush that touched the cloth, quite simply because we bear with us the memory of how a touch feels, and therefore vision too is able to call forth the sense of touch: 'Seeing painting is seeing touching'. Obviously, from such a perspective there are no 'pure' arts or media, endowed with certain media-specific properties, which in turn supposedly address one predominant sense (as for instance in the term 'visual media'). Rather various arts and media, and in fact, the very notion of a medium entails some mixture of sensory, perceptual and semiotic elements which can be activated in different proportions and mixes. What we are dealing with then are different aesthetic objects that collaborate with different media technologies, which in turn activate our sensory apparatus in varying and synesthetic ways, according to different 'recipes' so to speak, to use Mitchell's cooking metaphor.<sup>9</sup>

In his recent book Lars Elleström too seeks to combine the various dimensions in the concept medium, and suggests the term 'modalities', which include certain categories that stretch from the material to the mental, in order to more precisely get at how various media are constituted by both physical realities and human cognitive functions. Various media thus include varying ratios of modalities, and thus a complex blend of physical and cognitive factors—various material manifestations or channels, various activated senses, and various origins and uses in specific historical, cultural and social contexts.<sup>10</sup>

### *Sounds of silence: Ingmar Bergman's film dialogue*

But regardless of what Mitchell and Elleström so wisely point out about the onesidedness of a term like 'visual'; and regardless of us

being quite aware of the fact that the apparently separate cultures of writing and image always have been integrated – it seems that most of us still harbour one or two media puritans in our hearts, and that we, at least in our everyday thinking willy nilly tend to think in a rather binary fashion around phenomena like ‘words’ and ‘images’, imagining boundaries where there are none.

The Swedish director Ingmar Bergman certainly belonged to those media puritans, at least during parts of his career. This becomes clear when reading his notebooks from the time he was writing the script for his film *The Silence* from 1963. I will not get into this film in detail here (which I have done elsewhere),<sup>11</sup> but at least one or two quotes may be of interest in this context, specifically with regard to word-image relations and not least the transformative process from one medium to the other.

The transformative process from screenplay to finished film is naturally part of the package for any film *auteur*. But in Bergman’s case this hardly made the process simpler, quite the opposite: it was precisely the fact that the writer was the same person as the director that was particularly troublesome, from his subjective point of view. In fact, Bergman’s notebooks are virtually littered with lamentations about complications along these lines.<sup>12</sup> For instance, in one note one can read the following:

This anxiety before the start [of writing]. [The] inability to translate the images, which are clear and direct, into understandable words. [My] dialogue disease. Words that I hate: since, because, and, to, suddenly, silence, violently. Unreliable words that take the opportunity to hide when you need them the most. And then my absolute disgust over this devastating, risky procedure. My inhibition over the act of writing itself. My unwillingness to lift the burden and carry it. To be an amateur.

Another notation reads: ‘How hard it is with all these transformations that every image has to go through, before I can work with them. How often the result is unsure and half-baked’. And: ‘I feel a bitter discomfort [...] Will this process of transformation always be circumscribed with the same damned discomfort?’

Clearly, the key word here is ‘transformation’, or rather a kind of double transformation: first the one from the author’s internal images to their material manifestation, in the form of written words, which then in turn have to be transformed into another material manifestation, in the shape of sounds and moving images. As for the latter, it may be of interest what Bergman had to say of what he calls his ‘dialogue disease’ while writing *The Silence*. Because in ‘this film the dialogue will be entirely subservient and only an accompaniment on the soundtrack’,

‘only a rattle on the soundtrack without any meaning. Ignoring all that talk will be delightful [... and] cinematographic’.

So there you have it: no talk is somehow more ‘cinematographic’.

But fortunately, practice seldom goes hand in hand with theory or intent, and Bergman soon returned to his old ways – without becoming at all less ‘cinematic’ I may add. One finds a striking and beautiful example of this in *Persona* from 1966. This film is generally considered to be Bergman’s most cinematic, especially because it is explicitly self-referential and self-reflexive. After all, this is a film in which at one critical point in the story, the very film strip seems to break off and burn, in that famous *trompe l’œil* illusion created by (then) state-of-the-art trick photography.

But in the midst of such cinematographic experiments there are in *Persona* long traditional scenes in which spoken language and dialogue predominate. One is the sequence where Alma (Bibi Andersson) in a lengthy monologue to another woman, Elisabet (Liv Ullmann), recounts a sexual encounter that she and a friend experienced with two teenage boys on a beach one hot summer day. It goes without saying that Alma’s story could be rendered in a number of ways, and had the film been made in the 1940s or 1950s, Bergman would most likely have taken recourse to a flashback of one kind or another, as he did so famously in *Wild Strawberries* (1957). But in *Persona* he ends up doing something much more radical, focusing on Bibi Andersson while rendering Alma’s monologue that lasts about five minutes, and is interrupted only by a few short cut-ins of the other woman, listening intently. In fact, this entire sequence is so wordy that it can best be described as a kind of *languification* of the moving image, or a kind of *mise-en-scène* or theatrical staging of language itself – even with a built-in audience, in the form of Elisabet’s intently listening to Alma.

Now a media puritan would most likely call a scene like this theatrical, meaning it in a negative way as being too wordy, and therefore non-cinematic. But this particular kind of theatricalized languification does not make this scene less ‘cinematic’ at all, as the focus here, in and through this staging of language, is on those inner, *unseen images created by language*, on several levels: firstly, on the woman telling her story; secondly, on the woman listening; and thirdly, and perhaps primarily, on the viewer, or more precisely, the audience proper – those who are listening.

What this scene from *Persona* exemplifies, then, is a curious, inverted kind of *cinematic* ekphrasis. For if an ekphrasis normally is an attempt by the medium of written language to capture an existing image (for instance, a painting), thus playing with the absence of the image as

the presence of the written text, then what we are offered in *Persona* is the absence of a moving image (in this case a flashback) and instead its presence as verbal language/sound. Thus here the 'other' medium, and those missing images, are not tangible – except by the medium of language.

Indeed, it seems here that Ingmar Bergman uses the moving image – sometimes referred to as the most visual and visible of media – in order to remind us to what extent that particular kind of visibility is intimately related to the realm of the invisible. We are especially reminded of how the senses collaborate in this process, that is, how one sense, in this case the ear listening to words, is able to call forth another sense, in this case, the eye, and thus synesthetically create those inner images in our internal projector, so to speak.

### *The intermedialities of text: Ingmar Bergman's writing*

So far we have focused the phenomenon of spoken discourse in Ingmar Bergman as represented by film dialogue. But what about written texts by the same author, in this case his autobiography *The Magic Lantern*.<sup>13</sup>

Let us start by noting that anyone who has read the book cannot help but note that it does not deal much with Bergman's films or filmmaking, contrary to the promise in the title. Rather, apart from delineating some aspects of Bergman's personal life, the book as a whole is saturated with anecdotes dealing with his doings mainly in the theater, down to detailed analyses of his own productions for the stage. This may seem odd, because Bergman is after all best known internationally as a film director. However, my assumption is that, by this point in time, when Bergman had finished his film career proper (after *Fanny and Alexander* in 1982, his work was made exclusively for Swedish public television, SVT), he was becoming more interested in writing *per se*, and especially in being accepted as a writer – that is, a writer not only of screenplays but a 'real' writer, something he had failed to achieve in the 1940s before turning to the medium of film. As he put it in an interview from the late 1960s: 'I never belonged to "40s-ism" [a Swedish literary movement in the 1940s]. I wasn't allowed to play in their yard, something I used to be very bitter about'.<sup>14</sup>

In trying to become such a writer proper in the latter part of his career, it seems that Bergman turned to the theater and the metaphors it offered.<sup>15</sup> One prominent example can be found in Bergman's descriptions of marriage. For instance, writing about his own 1986 theater production of Strindberg's *A Dream Play*, Bergman launched into the following description of the playwright's relationship with the actress Harriet Bosse:

In May 1901, Strindberg marries a young, rather exotic beauty at the Royal Dramatic Theatre. She is thirty years younger than he is and already successful. Strindberg rents a five-room apartment in a new building on Karlaplan, and chooses the furniture, wallpapers, pictures and bric-à-brac. His young bride enters a décor entirely created by her aging husband. The contracting partners [in the original: “the protagonists”] lovingly, loyally and cleverly take pains from the start to reproduce [in the original: “perform”] the rôles expected of them. However the masks soon begin to crack and an unforeseen drama breaks through the carefully planned pastoral. The wife flees the home in rage [...]. The writer is left alone with his handsome décor.<sup>16</sup>

This terminology – décor, protagonists, roles, masks, drama – clearly represents a stylistic choice, shaping itself into a virtual *theatricalization* of language itself. In this particular case, Bergman’s aim may very well have been to give shape to things lost in the distance of time, while at the same time hinting at the intentions behind his own theater production of *A Dream Play*, since he actually continued to write about it in the paragraphs immediately following the passage cited above. But the fact is that this imagery flows over into the descriptions that deal directly with Bergman’s own life:

I had wearied of my bohemian existence and married Käbi Laretei, an up and coming pianist. We moved into a handsome villa in Djursholm, where I intended to live a well-organized bourgeois life. It was all a new and heroic production which rapidly turned into a new and heroic disaster, two people chasing after identity and security and writing each other’s parts [...]. The masks quickly cracked and fell to the ground in the first storm and neither had the patience to look at the other’s face. [...] Outwardly, the picture was of a stable marriage between successful contracting parties [in the original: ‘the protagonists’]. The décor was tasteful and the lighting well arranged.<sup>17</sup>

What is worth emphasizing in this context is the degree to which this theatricalized language introduces a sense of distanciation, in that it tends to turn the book’s narrative voice into a kind of autobiographical witness, and thus a perspective of someone who is constantly on the outside – looking in, as if from the wings of a stage. And note, that in choosing this terminology what Bergman in effect does is to conjure forth precisely what contributed to his fame as a *filmmaker*, especially during his heyday from the 1950s to the mid 1970s: someone with (supposedly) privileged access and insight into the psychology and rituals of married life.

In this context it is interesting to note that *cinematic* metaphors

too enter the proceeding, as in the following passage describing childhood:

To be honest, I think back on my early years with delight and curiosity. My imagination and senses were given nourishment, and I remember nothing dull, in fact the days and hours kept exploding with wonders, unexpected sights [in the original: 'scenes' or 'stagings'] and magical moments. I can still roam through the landscape of my childhood and again experience lights, smells, people, rooms, moments, gestures, tones of voice and objects. These memories seldom have any particular meaning, but are like short or longer films with no point, shot at random.<sup>18</sup>

Again one can note how these earliest memories from childhood are verbalized with the reader's foreknowledge of what this particular narrator would be known for later in life – namely, filmmaking. What we see in these passages, then, is the extent to which Bergman seems to be conjuring forth his own biographical legend, as if to remind the reader who is really in charge throughout these pages. The narrator becomes the director of the text, so to speak, his sharp gaze falling over the proceedings, in lighting and setting the stage.

What Bergman does throughout these passages is in fact performing a kind of cinematic and theatrical staging of *memory*, which in this case results not only in a theatricalized and cinematically spatialized language, but a language that at times comes close to being an *appropriation by the text of pre-existing images and stagings*, to the extent that Bergman is playing on the reader's foreknowledge, and perhaps even lingering memory images, of his work in the cinema and the theatre.

What this ultimately reminds us of is that writing always establishes a complex relationship to images, something that naturally comes into play even more in the case of writing autobiography. For what is biography if not literally *writing* the *images* of (life's) memories?

Put differently, if in writing *The Magic Lantern* Ingmar Bergman wanted to prove that he was a 'real' writer, and not 'only' a scriptwriter for the cinema, it seems that he did his utmost to avoid writing directly about his own films. But miraculously *he conjures them forth anyway* – through language.

Author triumphant, in other words – author doubly triumphant.

#### Noter

<sup>1</sup> D. N. Rodowick, *The Virtual Life of Film*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007; and Garrett Stewart, *Framed time. Toward a*

*postfilmic cinema*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> On the homepage of the recent film and media studies conference 'Film in the postmedia age' (<http://film.sapientia.ro/en/conferences/xiiiinternational-film-and-media-studies-conference-in-transylvania>)

Last checked 2010-09-21. For a similar idea, see Trond Lundemo, 'In the Kingdom of Shadows. Cinematic Movement and the Digital Ghost', in Pelle Snickars and Patrick Vonderau (eds.), *The YouTube Reader*, Stockholm: Kungliga Biblioteket, Mediehistoriskt Arkiv 12, 2009.

<sup>3</sup> David Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press, 2002.

<sup>4</sup> Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide*, New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.

<sup>5</sup> Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

<sup>6</sup> Claus Clüver, 'Intermediality and Interart Studies', in Jens Arvidson/Mikael Askander/Jörgen Bruhn/Heidrun Führer (eds.), *Changing Borders. Contemporary Positions in Intermediality*, Lund: Intermedia Studies Press, 2007, p. 30.

<sup>7</sup> Ulla-Britta Lagerroth, Hans Lund and Erik Hedling (eds.), *Interart Poetics. Essays on the Interrelations of the Arts and Media*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1997; Hans Lund, 'Förord', in Hans Lund (ed.), *Intermedialitet. Ord, bild och ton i samspel*, Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2002; and Erik Hedling and Ulla-Britta Lagerroth (eds.), *Cultural Functions of Intermedial Exploration*, Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2002.

<sup>8</sup> Friedrich Kittler, *Gramophone, Film, Typewriter*, trans. Geoffrey Winthrop-Young and Michael Wutz, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

<sup>9</sup> W.J.T. Mitchell, *What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2005, p. 336–356; and 'There are No Visual Media', in Oliver Grau (ed.), *MediaArtHistories*, Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT Press, p. 399–400.

<sup>10</sup> Lars Elleström, 'The Modalities of Media: A Model for Understanding Intermedial Relations', in Lars Elleström (ed.), *Media Borders: Multimodality and Intermediality*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

<sup>11</sup> Maaret Koskinen, *Ingmar Bergman's THE SILENCE. Pictures in the Typewriter, Writings on the Screen* (Nordic Cinema Series), Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010.

<sup>12</sup> For all cited quotations from the notebooks, see Koskinen 2010,

p. 68–71. All quotations translated by me.

<sup>13</sup> Ingmar Bergman, *The Magic Lantern: An Autobiography*, transl. Joan Tate, New York: Viking, 1988.

<sup>14</sup> Henrik Sjögren, *Ingmar Bergman på teatern* [Ingmar Bergman at the Theater], Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell/Gebers, 1968, p. 307. My translation.

<sup>15</sup> This is not surprising for, as many scholars have noted, Bergman's world view as such is intensely ruled by the idea of *theatrum mundi*. But more interesting is the extent to which language itself in *The Magic Lantern* is saturated with the same idea. This is worth stressing, especially because of some quite lacklustre translations of the book. For instance, English-speaking readers will have to make do with a sometimes imprecise albeit competent translation, which does not pay heed to the rich, theatrical metaphors of the book.

<sup>16</sup> Bergman, 1988, p. 37.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 188–189.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13.