The Bridge

Volume 29 | Number 2 Article 45

2006

Carl Theodor Dreyer' s Response to Anti-Semitism in His Unfilmed Jesus Film Scenario

Peter G. Christensen

Carl Theodor Dreyer's Response to Anti-Semitism in His Unfilmed *Jesus* Film Scenario

by Peter G. Christensen

The controversy in 2004 over possible anti-Semitism in Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ* had precedents in earlier Jesus-films.[1] Pier Paolo Pasolini's *The Gospel According to Matthew* and Franco Zeffirelli's *Jesus of Nazareth* have also been accused of anti-Semitism.[2] Carl Theodor Dreyer (1889-1968) wanted to combat anti-Semitism, as he directly stated in his own essays attached to his *Jesus* screenplay, which since his death has been published in English, Danish, and French versions.[3] Dreyer began the film project in 1949-1950 in Independence, Missouri, writing in English, and he worked on it until the end of his life. However, he was continually thwarted financially in his efforts to see it to the screen. The context of Dreyer's desire to make a film about Jesus that would not be anti-Semitic, however, has not, as far as I can tell, been discussed in detail in the dozen or so books on the depiction of Christ in the cinema[4] and in the even greater number of books published on Dreyer.[5]

After Robert Wiene's *I. N. R. I.* (1923), Cecil B. DeMille's *King of Kings* (1927), and Philip Van Loan's *Jesus of Nazareth* (1928) toward the end of the silent period, there were no new films about the life of Christ until Julian Duvivier made *Golgotha* in 1935. So if Dreyer's film had been produced immediately after its conception, it would have been only the second major sound film on the life of Christ. However, *Day of Triumph* (1954), *King of Kings* (1961), *The Gospel According to Matthew* (1964), and *The Greatest Story Ever Told* (1965) were all completed while Dreyer was still trying to get funding for his project. Since then there have been even more films in this genre: *Jesus of Nazareth* (1977), *The Messiah* (1978), *Jesus* (1979), *The Last Temptation of Christ* (1988), *Jesus* (1999), *The Gospel of John* (2003), and *The Passion of the Christ* (2004). None of these films takes Dreyer's line about Pilate's role as initial instigator of the Crucifixion, and only *Day of Triumph* and *King of Kings* (1961) are as concerned with depicting a

fierce anti-Roman armed resistance movement. Dreyer, who could sometimes indulge in ambiguity, was seeking clarity in the Jesus film, and, contrary to the Gospels, he took the unusual step of presenting Christ's trial and Crucifixion as a plot hatched by the colonizing Romans, not as an act to which they passively acquiesced.

Dreyer, in his *Jesus* screenplay, is admirable because of his attempt to divorce anti-Semitism from the Jesus film genre, but in doing so he unfortunately takes what is essentially a personal view of Pilate's instigation of Jesus' execution and passes it off as historically probable, when it is not. Furthermore, his deployment of the revolutionaries as a foil to Jesus' followers falls into the trap of the false dichotomy of the Jesus of peace and the Zealots of war, pointed out by the Biblical scholar Richard Horsley. Since Dreyer conceived of Judea as an occupied country like Denmark in World War II, one also wonders why Dreyer disapproved of the anti-Roman fighters, since, ultimately, Denmark and Europe were liberated by the Allied invasion—in other words, by war, not by peace.

First of all, Dreyer's screenplay needs to be understood in relation to the film *Golgotha.* Whereas it might at first seem that the assistance given Danish Jews to escape to Sweden might provide the backdrop for Dreyer's screenplay, I suggest instead that more likely he saw his project as a response to Duvivier's *Golgotha* (1935). This film starred as Christ Robert Le Vigan, an actor who was a member of the virulently anti-Semitic group of people around Louis-Ferdinand Céline. Although Dreyer did not comment on *Golgotha* in print, as a Dane he could hardly have been oblivious to the flight of Le Vigan, Céline, and Celine's wife Lucette from France to Berlin, to Sigmaringen, and then to Denmark. Furthermore, he would have known that the famous Jewish actor, Harry Bauer, who played Herod Antipas, in tour-de-force style in his one scene with Le Vigan, was tortured to death by the Gestapo, dying on April 8, 1943.

Duvivier was commissioned by a Catholic cleric, Chanoine Joseph Raymond (about whom little is known), who was the head of the Catholic Society of Films in France. A production company, Icthys films, was set up for this project. According to Pierre Billard, when Julien Duvivier made *Golgotha* he was still a believing Christian, although he later became more of an atheist (28).

Golgotha received very mixed reviews and was not a commercial success (Le Boterf 1995: 119). Nevertheless, it was a major event of the film season in France, and it received much notice on its premiere in April 1935 (Desrichard 185). Although at its premiere some critics, such as the novelist Pierre MacOrlan (Bonnefille 180) found the film very impressive, others, such as Henri Jeanson (Bonnefille 183) criticized it as too derivative of popular Paramount epics, presumably Cecil B. De Mille's *King of Kings* and *The Sign of the Cross*. Somewhat surprisingly, both sides tended to fault the film for lacking a religious dimension or what they expected to be the religious dimension of such a Biblical film.

Golgotha's critical reception in more recent years has not been good. Since on DVD it is only sometimes available in a Japanese release in a Zone 2 Pal format, I have decided to use the more accessible Sinister Cinema videotape of the dubbed version of the film released for an American audience on February 9, 1937 at the Brooklyn Academy of Music (see Bonnefille 184), which is the same length of 95 minutes. The film was made in the wake of the Stavisky affair, which brought down France's leftist government and led to riots on February 6-7, 1934. It could well be that Duvivier was not trying to be anti-Semitic but rather superimposing on Biblical material his view of brutal French masses led by corrupt back-room officials in cahoots with swindlers like Serge Stavisky.

Duvivier's view of the Crucifixion, which, in the words of Claude Beylie and André Bernard, is played out like a lynching (60) by a blood-thirsty mob, can easily be interpreted as anti-Semitic, since it makes both the Sanhedrin and the Jewish pilgrims in Jerusalem for Passover the villains, rather than the Romans. The most detailed summary of the reviews of the film, that of Yves Bonnefille, does not make any suggestion that the film was seen as anti-Semitic on its initial reception. This response may reflect the extent of French anti-Semitism of the time, where even Louis-Ferdinand Céline's inflammatorily anti-Semitic *Bagatelles pour un massacre* was accepted on its publication in 1937 with moderate reviews. As Frédéric Vitoux, biographer of Céline (1894-1961), says, such acceptance of hate literature appears shocking to us today (321). He claims that then, "One could write against the Jews with impunity" (321). It set

the stage for the deportation and murder of French Jews in World War II.

Starring as Christ was Robert Le Vigan (1900-1972), a brilliantly intense actor but also a mentally ill drug addict and anti-Semite (see Le Boterf 1986 and Vandromme 1996, passim). Le Vigan, who later criticized Duvivier's direction (Le Boterf 1986: 164) threw himself into the role (Baylie and Bernard 61). He became close friends with Céline in 1935, after the filming of *Golgotha,* and Céline always associated him with the role of Christ (Vendromme 68-69). During World War II, Le Vigan denounced his friends to the Gestapo (Vitoux 374). With the Célines he fled to Denmark in March 1945, where they were captured. Céline spent fourteen months in the prison *Vestre Fængsel* in Copenhagen, part of the time on Death Row.

Eventually, both Céline and Le Vigan regained their freedom. Céline immortalized Le Vigan in the role of a Grünwald-inspired Christ in his novel about their flight through Germany, *Nord* (1960). Although Le Vigan, an unrepentant fascist, was condemned in 1947 to ten years hard labor, he was freed in 1949 and moved to Argentina (Vitoux 463). He resumed his film career in 1951-1952, but then retired from the screen. Céline was exonerated by a military tribunal and returned to France in 1951, where he lived, worked, and wrote until his death. Because Céline did not actively collaborate with the Germans, he was eventually allowed back to France

Despite the neglect of *Golgotha* it is actually an impressive film that would have interested a master like Dreyer, who had worked as a director in France. The shooting began on 16 September 1934 in Algiers and Fort-de l'Eau (Algeria) and was difficult because the desert was very cold at night. Duvivier had to overcome many difficulties, and he did. *Golgotha* remains notable for some great traveling shots; many impressively large sets; the stirring music by Jacques Ibert; the atmospheric filming in the Casbah of the way to the Cross; the special effects surrounding the Crucifixion, such as the earthquake and rending of the Temple Veil; the photographing of models as full-scale buildings; and the use of point-of-view shots to characterize Jesus' view until we see him for the first time—more than twenty minutes into the film.

Since *Golgotha* deals only with the last week of Jesus' life, almost all of the attention goes to the attempt of the Jewish religious leaders to capture him, Judas to betray him, and Pilate to avoid having to crucify him. Pilate is no match for Jewish machinations. Jesus, shown primarily as a healer and as the man who overturned the moneychangers in the Temple, is an enemy of powerful Jews and a scapegoat of the mob. We see the religious elders plotting against him, first to capture him, next to bully Pilate into giving Jesus a death sentence (by suggesting that Pilate will provoke the wrath of Tiberius if he lets Jesus free), and then by bribing men to call for the release of Barabbas and the death of Jesus. Pilate has no desire to kill Christ, and Herod Antipas, who tells him to call up Beelzebub, shows no designs on his life either.

However, the people of Jerusalem have no sympathy for Jesus, and in one memorable scene they stretch their hands out through a barred window when he is in Roman custody, as if they would like to tear him apart themselves. Caiaphas, a figure for whom Dreyer asked understanding in his own screenplay, is a particularly nasty character. There is no fleshing out of the Sanhedrin with sympathetic characters such as Gamaliel, Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea, as in Dreyer's screenplay, and no sense that the Sanhedrin tries to get an orderly, democratic vote, as Dreyer would present it. Although Duvivier does show Judea as part of the Roman Empire and surrounds Herod Antipas, the Tetrarch of Galilee, with Roman soldiers, the stress on Jesus as a danger to the religious establishment rather than to the Roman Empire is clear from the Temple leaders' response to his entry into Jerusalem. It is not surprising that Dreyer's version of Holy Week, to which he devotes the second half of his film treatment, should be so much different from Duvivier's: his Jewish leaders are far more humane than Duvivier's.

As we turn from *Golgotha* to Dreyer's screenplay, we see that the key element in Dreyer's philo-Semitic film treatment is the Crucifixion of Jesus as instigated by the Romans rather than by the Jewish religious authorities. Dreyer claimed that it made historical sense to do so. He fashions Jesus as a person who would not have antagonized Jewish leaders to seek his execution, and indeed he would not have provoked the Romans to such a point either if

revolutionaries had not mixed themselves with his followers at the beginning of Holy Week. However, as Preben Thomsen states, in his essay "Working with Dreyer," there are problems with such a conception:

> The question that remains is whether [. . .] he oversimplifies the problem of Jesus, making one person too absolutely the villain of the piece, namely, Pilate, representing the totalitarian state (299).

Thomsen states that he tried to show Dreyer the "intention of the New Testament authors to represent the whole gallery of people surrounding Jesus as guilty of His death" (299). In Dreyer's film, if Rome had been less totalitarian, Jesus would not have died. However, it can be misleading and anachronistic to call Rome a totalitarian state and then consider it a stand-in for the Nazi Reich.

Dreyer's *Jesus* screenplay at about 250 pages (41-292 in the 1972 English edition) is a long treatment that includes explanatory commentary which cannot actually be filmed. Like *King of Kings*, Dreyer's project used oral narration, although it does not have anything like the long prologue to show Pompey's destruction of Jerusalem, which Nicholas Ray's film has. There are forty-six points at which the Narrator speaks, including the opening and closing lines of the film. If each section of the film treatment after a narration is considered a sequence, then there are 45 sequences, which vary a great deal in length. The first narration tells us that John the Baptist came to bear witness to the light (41), and the last narration tells us that Jesus' message of "good tidings of love and charity foretold by the Jewish prophets of old" extended after his death (298). The narration does not insist on the divinity of Christ, and if one takes the position that Resurrection is crucial to Christ's identity, then no judgment can easily be made, as the action stops before the burial.

Whereas some readers of the screenplay may feel that the noncommittal approach to Jesus' divinity is crucial to the film, I feel instead that it is less important than the presentation of Jesus' death as instigated by Pilate. Of course, the inclusion of the raising of Lazarus and the Transfiguration on the mountain may be taken by some viewers as an indication that the film shows Jesus' divinity. Yet we should not forget that even in films that share an emphasis on

Jesus' earthly message as compared to his divinity, there is a Resurrection. For example, in *King of Kings*, Ray shows Jesus reappearing to the fishermen of Galilee after the Crucifixion, and in *The Messiah*, Rossellini has Mary come to find an empty tomb at the end of the film.

Dreyer's film covers the ministry of Jesus from his seeing John the Baptist at the Jordan to the Crucifixion. There is no material about either the Virgin Birth or Slaughter of the Innocents. Omitted are such set-pieces of Jesus films as Jesus' Baptism, his Temptation in the Wilderness, Marriage at Cana, Sermon on the Mount, and Salome's Dance. In contrast, particularly striking is the attention given to the parables. Dreyer chose to dramatize fully three of Jesus' parables: the Prodigal Son, the Wise and Foolish Virgins, and the Good Samaritan. None of the other major films of the life of Jesus have used this approach, although Pasolini and Rossellini do stress Jesus as a teacher of parables. By no means is Dreyer's Jesus an apocalyptic preacher. Nor does he seem to have a political message. The politics in the film move not from Christ's message outward but rather from Roman power downward.

The content of Dreyer's film becomes more interesting as it proceeds, and the last half of the film, beginning with the raising of Lazarus sequence (166-84) is certainly more controversial than the first half. In the first part of the film, Jesus appears primarily as a caller of disciples and healer of the sick. Over a half dozen scenes of Christ's miracles in this capacity are presented. Meanwhile, the Pharisees are presented as more curious than self-serving, and the revolutionaries are introduced as a group trying to see if Jesus will fit into their plans for revolution.

It is not possible to understand Dreyer's hostile portrait of Pilate and positive picture of the Jewish authorities unless we posit that he was making up for his own past cinematic errors. Dreyer in *Leaves from Satan's Book* had presented Christ as betrayed by Satan in the form of a Pharisee, abetted by Judas and Caiaphas. The implicit assumption in this film from 1919 is that Christ has a divine nature, but more to the point is the anti-Semitic conception of Satan possessing a Pharisee and causing Christ's death. Although in his three essays on the *Jesus* film Dreyer does not mention *Leaves from*

Satan's Book, he could hardly have forgotten that his earlier film was at odds with his new one. In the *Jesus* screenplay, Jesus is a Jewish religious leader who is sacrificed by the Roman political machine, not by the Jews, and he never loses his self-identity as a Jew.

In *Who Crucified Jesus?* (1951), Dreyer explains his point of view:

> Some days after the Germans occupied Denmark, it struck me that such a situation as we Danes were in was similar to that of the Jews in Judea in the days of the Roman Empire. [...] It seemed to me that the capture, conviction, and death of Jesus was the result of a conflict between Jesus and the Romans. (Dreyer 1972: 41).

Dreyer adds,

> I consider it possible that it was the Romans who demanded the arrest of Jesus, for the Romans, who commanded a well-organized 'gestapo,' were informed of all that went on in Judea, especially in Jerusalem during the Passover (45).

Dreyer is reasoning by shaky analogy from the present to the past.

Unfortunately, Dreyer never says how he put together his original theories, only how they were substantiated for him by recent historical events and by the work of one distinguished scholar. Dreyer writes in the same essay that soon after he came to the United States, he was struck by the similarity of his own ideas to those of Dr. Solomon Zeitlin, Professor of Rabbinical Studies at Dropsie College, Philadelphia, who had published in 1941 *Who Crucified Jesus?* Zeitlin claimed, "Jesus was crucified by the Romans for a political offense as the King of the Jews" (211).

Dreyer stresses the fact that the Jews had a facade of self-government similar to the Danes under the Nazi occupation. Zeitlin, Dreyer notes, calls attention to the fact that the political councils were only called after the arrest of a political criminal and did not meet regularly: "Dr. Zeitlin concludes that it is to this political council that Jesus was taken on the night of his capture. If so, then Jesus was considered a political criminal" (Dreyer 44). Because Jesus had allowed himself to be hailed as King of Israel (John 12: 13), he made the Romans suspicious that he was an accomplice of the revolutionary groups and thus a "direct challenge" to Roman authority (44). By casting out the money changers from the Temple

courtyard (Mark 11: 15), "the high priest was obligated to have Jesus arrested, interrogated in the presence of the political council, and then–when Jesus confessed that he regarded himself as Messiah–delivered to Pontius Pilate" (Dreyer 45).

Dreyer spoke to Zeitlin after completing his screenplay and they seemed to agree on all but one issue: "Dr. Zeitlin is harsh on Caiaphas whom he describes as a 'quisling'" (45). Dreyer calls Caiaphas a collaborationist rather than a 'quisling," because he was a "conscientious man, who had the people's welfare at heart" (45-46). Dreyer minimizes a greater difference between his view and Zeitlin's. Behind the issue of collaboration and 'quislings' lies the question of the relationship of Caiaphas and Pilate. Zeitlin does not go so far as Dreyer, who has Pilate take the initiative to arrest Jesus. By acknowledging Caiaphas as a quisling, Zeitlin does not give Pilate so much agency (Zeitlin 157). Dreyer's Pilate has been having Jesus watched for months. Pilate has a paper stating, "*nothing is hidden for me and I am fully informed.*" Jesus "*must be put away before the feast; it is high time. I can run no more risks. Understood ?*" (240) When Nicodemus, Caiaphas, and the First Chief Priest, argue with Pilate, they are not able to dissuade him (340-41). Zeitlin (like Thomsen) is more generous to the Procurator, stating that "even upon Pilate alone the entire blame for the crucifixion of Jesus cannot be set, since '. . . [m]en are oftentimes the victims of their own systems,' such as imperialism" (211).

Zeitlin remains a reputable scholar, but Dreyer's own variation on Zeitlin's view runs counter to the views of the large majority of Biblical scholars. As E. Mary Smallwood states in *The Jews under Roman Rule*, "Despite the very wide discrepancies between the four accounts of the trial of Jesus, a general picture of the proceedings emerges" (169). Smallwood made this point even before Raymond A. Brown showed a means of reconciling some of the seeming contradictions in the Gospels. She claims that

> ... Pilate showed his weakness, and an understandable desire to protect himself against possible Jewish delation, by yielding to the pressure thus brought to bear upon him and condemning to death a person whom he believed to be harmless (169).

Brown, perhaps the greatest expert on the Passion Narratives, notes in *The Death of The Messiah* (1994) that he does not feel that the Gospels are exculpating the Romans. He writes:

> ... I judge it lucidly clear that all the evangelists would identify those who plainly wanted Jesus dead as the chief priests and the Jewish populace who stood with them. But there is no exculpation of the Romans. All Gospels use *paradidonai* of Pilate, and so he joins the chain of those described by this verb: Judas gave Jesus over to Jewish authorities; the Jewish authorities gave Jesus over to Pilate; now Pilate gives Jesus over to be crucified. (854)

Brown, whose citations show that he has read Zeitlin, admits that this Jewish initiative presented in the Gospels, and which he believes to be historically true, does have disturbing implications (653-55). Thus it is no surprise that Dreyer, who apparently felt that the Gospels did exculpate the Romans, wanted to avoid these implications, and so he strongly connected the theme of purported revolutionary activity rather than religious blasphemy with the political sentencing of Jesus.

As a major element in the scenario, Dreyer included a group of Jewish revolutionaries. They attempt to co-opt Jesus' peaceful movement and turn it to their own advantages. This motif runs into a different problem with Biblical scholarship because it is quite possible that there was no such organized Jewish revolutionary resistance as we find in Dreyer's film and Nicholas Ray's *King of Kings*. According to Richard A. Horsley in *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine* (1987), this kind of resistance did not develop until thirty years later. Horsley strongly holds that the earlier mistaken scholarly belief in such a Resistance at the time of Jesus' death has confused thinking about Jesus' message. It sets up a false dichotomy between violent revolution and the peaceful Jesus. Not everyone agrees with Horsley and, in addition, it would be unfair to judge Dreyer too harshly on the basis of research that has appeared long after his death. Nevertheless, since Dreyer clearly wanted his film to be true to the colonial situation in Palestine, it is not irrelevant to examine Dreyer's

beliefs with respect to Horsley's arguments about the reality of that time.

It is unlikely that Dreyer, if alive today, would agree with Horsley. Instead he would probably be drawn to the theories of S. G. F. Brandon in *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (1967). Brandon maintained that Jesus was executed because of his association with Zealots in his inner circle. Although I believe that Brandon is wrong and Horsley is right, Brandon's picture of a Judea filled with revolutionary resistors has such relevance to Dreyer's project that it makes a consideration of his ideas essential. Dreyer's Narrator states:

> Narrator: *At the same hour revolutionaries from all over Palestine met secretly in the quarries of King Solomon. Tidings had spread that Jesus was about to make his entry into Jerusalem as the Messiah. The revolutionaries, who were constantly seeking a way to get rid of the Romans, were not disposed to let this opportunity slip out of their hands.*
>
> *A hundred or more young men, fanatic revolutionaries, have gathered to learn the news that has just come from Bethany.* (208)

For Horsley, these revolutionaries never existed: "[T]here is simply no evidence for an organized movement of violent resistance that agitated for armed revolt from 6 to 66 C.E." In short, "Jewish reaction to Roman rule was far more complex that the old 'Zealot' concept allowed, and social unrest took a variety of social forms" (1987: x-xi).

Dreyer's Jesus, with his healings and parables, is not like Horsley's Jesus, who had a deep political commitment. Horsley claims that Jesus saw no place for society's ruling institutions. His prophecies, omitted by Dreyer, are crucial to this view. In short, Horsley says of Jesus that he rejected the institutions of the priestly class: "The kingdom of God apparently had no need of either a mediating hierocracy of a temple system" (1987: 325). Dreyer, in contrast, defends the temple system as the worthy site or true resistance to Roman imperialism. His philo-Semitic position makes him sympathetic to the Sanhedrin and the Pharisees. Although Horsley and Dreyer would certainly agree that Jesus was not a violent social revolutionary, Horsley sees him as a catalyst for a social revolution (1987: 326) to a much greater degree.

In conclusion, Dreyer created a screenplay that reflected his search for a historical Jesus. He thought about the historical issues of the trial and tried to make sense out of them by using the material in all the Gospels. Like *King of Kings, The Greatest Story Ever Told,* and *Jesus of Nazareth,* for example, *Jesus* combines material from the four gospels. In so doing, choices have to be made, and the writer is open to all sorts of criticism. When Pasolini chose to film the gospel of Matthew and Philip Saville to film the gospel of John, they probably made a wiser choice. They made adaptations of a single Gospel and put across the point of view of that book. Saville is now going on to film *The Gospel of Mark.* When Dreyer was working on his screenplay, there was no such precedent, but he was overtaken four years before his death by Pasolini's new approach. As more Jesus films are made, the need to film Dreyer's scenario becomes less and less urgent. Instead, because of the amount of commentary that Dreyer includes in his script, *Jesus* can best be read for its provocative treatment of Pilate, Caiaphas, and the trial of Jesus, where it will serve to promote interesting debate on issues of responsibility as well as history and anti-Semitism.

---

[1] Jonathan Burnham, ed., *Perspectives of* The Passion of the Christ*: Religious Thinkers and Writers Explore the Issues Raised* (London: Hyperion, 2004); Kathleen E. Corley and Robert L. Webb, eds. *Jesus and Mel Gibson's* The Passion of the Christ *: The Film, the Gospels and the Claims of History* (New York: Continuum, 2004); S. Brent Plate, ed. *Re-viewing* The Passion *: Mel Gibson's Film and Its Critics* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Jean-Gabriel Rueg, Philippe Raguis, Pascal Ide, eds. *Regards sur* La Passion du Christ *: Lectures du film de Mel Gbson* (Toulouse : Carmel, 2004); Daniel Burston, Rebecca I. Denova, and Richard C Miller, eds., *Passionate Dialogues : Critical Perspectives on Mel Gibson's* The Passion of the Christ (Pittsburgh, PA; Mise, 2005); Timothy K. Beal and Tod Linafelt, eds, *Mel Gibson's Bible : Religion, Popular Culture, and* The Passion of the Christ. (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006); Paula Fredriksen, *On* The Passion of the Christ *: Exploring the Issues Raised by the Controversial Movie* (Berekeley: U of California P, 2006); Zev Garber, ed. *Mel Gibson's* Passion *: The Film, the Controversy, and Its Implications* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue UP, 2006).

[2] See Adele Reinhartz, "Jesus in Film: Hollywood Perspectives on the Jewishness of Jesus," *Journal of Religion and Film* 2.2 (Oct. 1998.) 22 Dec. 2005. http://www.unomaha.edu/jrf/JesusinFilmRein.htm.

[3] The three versions of the screenplay are as follows: Carl Th. Dreyer, *Jesus* (New York: Dial P, 1972); Dreyer, *Jésus de Nazareth; Médée*, ed. Maurice Drouzy (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1986) ; and Dreyer, *Jesus frå Nazaret*, eds. Merete Ries and Preben Thomsen (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1968).

[4] Michel Estève, *La Passion du Christ comme thème cinématographique* (Paris : Minard, 1961) ; Henri Agel, *Le visage du Christ à l'écran* (Paris : Desclée, 1985) ; Peter Malone, *Movie Christs and Antichrists* (New York: Crossroad, 1990); Roy Kinnard and Tim Davis, *Divine Images: A History of Jesus on the Screen* (New York: Carol, 1992); Bruce Babington and Peter William Evans, *Biblical Epics: Sacred Narrative in the Hollywood Cinema* (Manchester: Manchester U P, 1993); Guy Hennebelle, *Christianisme et cinéma* (Condé-sur-Noireau : Editions Corlet, 1996) ; Lloyd Baugh, *Imagining the Divine: Jesus and Christ-Figures on Film* (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1997); W. Barnes Tatum, *Jesus at the Movies: A Guide to the First Hundred Years* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge P, 1997); William R. Telford, "Jesus Christ Movie Star: The Depiction of Jesus in the Cinema," *Explorations in Theology and Film*, eds. Clive Marsh and Gayle Ortiz (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1997), 115-39; Reinhold Zwick, *Evangelienrezeption im Jesusfilm: Ein Beitrag zur intermedialen Wirkungsgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Würzburg: Seelsorge / Echter, 1997); Georg Langenhorst, *Jesus ging nach Hollywood: Die Wiederentdeckung Jesu in Literatur und Film der Gegenwart* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1998); Richard C. Stern, Clayton N. Jefford, and Guerric DeBona, eds., *Savior on the Silver Screen* (New York: Paulist P, 1999); Bryan P. Stone, *Faith and Film: Theological Themes at the Cinema* (St. Louis: Chalice P. 2000); Douglas K. Mikkelsen and Amy C. Gregg. *"King of Kings": A Silver Screen Gospel* (Lanham, MA: U P of America, 2001); Richard G. Walsh, *Reading the Gospels in the Dark: Portrayals of Jesus in Film* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity P International, 2003).

[5] For studies of Dreyer since the making of his last film, see the following works: Philippe Parrain, Barthélemy Amengual, and Vincent Pinel, *Dreyer, cadres et mouvements* (Paris: Minard, 1967); Claude Perrin, *Carl Th. Dreyer* (Paris: Seghers, 1969); Tom Milne, *The Cinema of Carl Dreyer* (New York: A. S. Barnes, 1971); Paul Schrader *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1972); David Bordwell, "Passion, Death, and Testament: Carl Dreyer's *Jesus* Film." *Film Comment* 8.2 (Summer 1972): 59-63; Mark Nash, *Dreyer* (London: British Film Institute, 1977); Pier Giorgio Tone, *Carl Theodor Dreyer* (Florence: La Nuova Italia / Il Castoro Cinema, 1978); David Bordwell, *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981); Maurice Drouzy, *Carl Th. Dreyer, né Nilsson* (Paris: Cerf, 1982); Andrea Martini, ed. *Il cinema di Dreyer: l'eccentrico e il classico* (Venice: Marsilio, 1984); Jytte Jensen, ed. *Carl Th. Dreyer* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1988); Raymond Carney, *Speaking the Language of Desire: The*

Films of Carl Dreyer (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989); Paul Houe, *Carl Theodor Dreyer's Cinematic Humanism* (Minneapolis: Center for Nordic Studies, University of Minnesota, 1992); Jean Drum and Dale D. Drum, *The Life and Films of Carl Th. Dreyer* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow P, 2000); Manuel Vidal Estévez, *Carl Theodor Dreyer* (Madrid : Cátedra, 1997); José Andrés Dulce, *Dreyer* (Madrid : Nickel Odeón Dos, 2000); and Aldo Bernardi, *Carl Theodor Dreyer : il verbo, la legge, la libertà* (Genova: Le Mani, 2003).

Works Cited

Beylie, Claude, and André Bernard. *Robert le Vigan: Désosrdre et Génie*. Paris: Pygmalion, 1996.

Billard, Pierre. "Gli Anni trienta di Julien Duvivier." *Julien Duvivier*. Ed. Aldo Tassone. Milan: Il Castoro, 1996. 13-54.

Bonnefille, Eric. *Julien Duvivier : Le mal aimant du cinéma français*. 2 vols. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002.

Brandon, S. G. F. *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. New York: Scribner, 1967.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentaryon the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

Desrichard, Yves. *Julien Duvivier: Cinquante ans de noirs destins*. Paris Durante / BiFi, 2001.

Dreyer, Carl Theodor. *Jesus*. New York: Dial P, 1972.

Duvivier, Julien, dir. *Golgotha*. English language version. English dialogue: I.E. Lopert, Forrest Izard. Actors: Robert Le Vigan, Harry Bauer, Jean Gabin. Videotape. 95 min. Medford, OR : Sinister Cinema, 1990?.

Horsely, Richard. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

Le Boterf, Hervé. *Harry Baur*. Paris: Pygmalion, 1995.

Robert Le Vigan: Le Mal-aimé du cinéma, suivi des Confessions du comédien. [par Robert Le Vigan]. Paris: Ed. France-Empire, 1986.

Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Stanton, Graham N. *The Gospels and Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

Thomsen, Preben. "Working with Dreyer." *Jesus*. By Carl Theodor Dreyer. New York: Dial, 1972. 295-302.

Vandrome, Pol. *Céline & Cie: Robert Le Vigan du côté de Céline, Lili Marcel, Roger et Ferdinand La France Vacharde*. Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme, 1996.

Vitoux, Frederic. *Céline: A Biography*. Trans Jesse Browner. New York: Paragon House, 1992.