

Authorship and the Director of Photography: A Case Study of Gregg Toland and *Citizen Kane*

PHILIP COWAN, *Manchester Metropolitan University*

ABSTRACT

The artistic contribution of Directors of Photography to the films that they shoot, in narrative mainstream cinema, have been historically ignored in favour of the director-centred *auteur* theory. In order to address this imbalance a new approach to attributing authorship in film needs to be implemented, which acknowledges co-authorship in collaborative film-making. By taking established *auteur* methodologies Philip Cowan, himself a practicing Director of Photography, analyses the work of Gregg Toland, who has long been recognised for his technical contribution to *Citizen Kane* (Welles, 1941), but only by analysing his previous work can one actually realise the depth of his influence on the visualisation of *Kane*.

KEYWORDS

Film, cinematography, authorship, Gregg Toland, *Citizen Kane*, Orson Welles

Gregg Toland and the cinematographer's plight

Gregg Wesley Toland, born in 1904, became one of the most respected Directors of Photography in Hollywood during the 1930s and 40s. He started his career as an assistant to cinematographer George Barnes, who would later shoot *Rebecca* (Hitchcock, 1940). By 1931 Toland had graduated to cinematographer at Goldwyn Studios. Throughout the 30s he developed his own style of shooting, on films including *Les Misérables* (Boleslawski, 1935), *Mad Love* (Freund, 1935), *The Road to Glory*, (Hawks, 1936), *Dead End* (Wyler, 1937), *Wuthering Heights* (Wyler, 1939), *The Grapes of Wrath* (Ford, 1940), and *The Long Voyage Home* (Ford, 1940). In 1941 he shot the film that many film critics and theorists consistently regard as the best American film ever made, *Citizen Kane* (Welles, 1941). The film has topped every *Sight and Sound* Critics' poll of Best Film since 1962.

Toland died in 1948, aged just forty-four. His influence on visual narrative has been almost completely over-looked. He is chiefly mentioned only in connection with the *auteur* directors of the 30s and 40s. His artistry is almost always credited to others, and his historical role seems to have been consigned to that of a technical innovator. This treatment of Toland at the hands of historians, critics and academics illustrates the wider misrepresentation of the great cinematographers of the past, and present. Often defined as technicians rather than artists, as artisans rather than authors.

The wide-spread acceptance of classic *auteur* theory, which credits the director with sole authorship of a film, championed and developed by Truffaut (1954), Bazin (1957), Cameron (1962), Sarris (1962) and Wollen (1969), is largely responsible for the neglect of many innovative and creative careers. Perkins was one of the first to challenge the single-author idea, and discuss the idea of collaboration: ‘Unless one has watched the planning and making of a picture, it is impossible to know precisely who contributed each idea or effect to the finished movie.’ (Perkins, 1972: 68). Petrie argued for a ‘radical rethink’ of the *auteur* theory with the ‘consideration of the cinema as a cooperative art...’ (Petrie, 1973: 111). He particularly points to the significance of the contribution of the cinematographer. Koszarski also criticised the over-simplification of ideas of authorship and attributing artistry: ‘It is simply preposterous that there is not a sentence on the art of Lee Garmes or Gregg Toland, not any proper critical evaluation.’ (Koszarski, 1972, p.136) This is still true forty years later. Despite these various reservations the director as single-author has remained the bedrock of mainstream film theory.

Citizen Toland and the myth of Orson Welles

Many of the creative innovations in *Citizen Kane* that have been written about and subsequently attributed to Welles, have their origins in the development of the work of Toland. Amid the praise heaped on Welles it cannot be overstated enough that *Kane* was his first film, and he relied heavily on his cameraman. Debates have been waged over the authorship of the script of *Kane*, initiated by Kael’s essay *Raising Kane* (1971), but few discussions have been had about the visual style of the film. The default position of most critics and theorist is summed up by Laura Mulvey in her 1992 discussion of the film in *BFI Film Classics: Citizen Kane*, in which she seems to think any debates about authorship with regard to the script are unimportant, as the film is the final article, and that is Welles’ product:

... the concept and camera strategy used in the opening shots is undoubtedly in keeping with Welles’s aesthetic interests and expressive of the style he was evolving for his first foray into cinema. (Mulvey, 1992: 11)

This, in itself, demonstrates a complete lack of awareness of the cinematographer’s contribution to the film. The aesthetic that the film adheres to is Toland’s, developed over eleven years of shooting films. This is what I will establish, not only in order to give Toland the artistic credit that he deserves, but highlight by example how cinematographers have been historically ignored, and authorship often mistakenly attributed. Toland is far too often referred to as a “technician” who enabled Welles to realise his own vision, whereas he should be recognised as a co-author of the film.

***Kane's* aesthetic**

Kane is often cited for its use of staging in depth, low camera angles, ceilinged sets, and long takes of continuous action. All of these techniques are evident in Toland's earlier work.

Staging in depth



Figure 1.



Figure 2.



Figure 3.



Figure 4.

The exploitation of depth in *Kane*, can be traced along a developmental course throughout Toland's work, through *Mad Love* (Freund, 1935) (fig. 1), and *These Three* (William Wyler, 1936), where the children discuss their tutors (fig. 2), to the opening shot from *The Long Voyage Home* (Ford, 1940) (fig. 3), and countless other examples. In this context the photography in *Citizen Kane* (fig. 4) is consistent with Toland's style. This simple selection also shows the consistency of Toland's work across his collaborations with a number of directors, including those that are generally credited with exploiting this technique in the late 30s and early 40s; Wyler, Ford and Welles. Certainly *Kane* develops the idea of staging in depth to an extreme. This is partly due to the technical advancement of greater depths of field, often called "deep-focus", which clearly Toland exploited to develop his own aesthetic interests, which included a desire to tell a story more effectively. Bazin gives a detailed

analysis of the shot (fig. 5) conveying Susan's (Dorothy Comingore) attempted suicide (1972: 77-80).



Figure 5.



Figure 6.



Figure 7.

The frame tells a story, by the significance of the foreground glass and medicine bottle, Susan on the bed in the mid-ground, and Kane trying to enter the room in the background. We can actually trace the genesis of this shot from *Mad Love* where the placement of the bottle in the foreground emphasises the fact that Gogol's Housekeeper, Françoise (May Beatty) is drunk (fig. 6). Also the glass in the foreground in *The Long Voyage Home* is a prelude to Olson (John Wayne) being drugged (fig. 7). Although in both these cases the foreground object is out of focus, the compositional, and storytelling ideas are the same. Three different directors, the same cinematographer. It is easy to assume that Toland initiated this classic shot.

Low Camera Angle

The use of low camera positions can create dynamic compositions. Again *Kane* is noted for its use of low angle shots, especially the use of raised floors to get the camera at floor level. We can also see many examples of the floor level camera in Toland's pre-*Kane* work, for example, *Les Misérables* (fig. 8), *Wuthering Heights* (fig. 9), and an example from *Citizen Kane* (fig. 10). Toland often uses a low angle, looking up at the characters, to give them more importance and power at particular moments in the narrative, for example when

Valjean (Fredric March) looks at the candlestick that the Bishop gave him in *Les Misérables*, it reminds him of his moral obligations (fig. 8).



Figure 8.



Figure 9.



Figure 10.

Ceilings

In some ways an incidental by-product of using wider angle lenses and shooting from a low angle, is the inclusion of ceilings on sets. Much has been commented on this, but Bazin makes the most significant point: ‘Initially, it was because of the exceptional openness of this angle of vision that the presence of ceilings became indispensable to hide the studio superstructures. (1972: 74) Otherwise walls would have to be thirty or forty feet high to reach the top of the frame, an example of this we can see in the shot from *Citizen Kane*, where the tall windows justify the high walls (fig. 4). Wallace outlines the debate around ceilinged sets in his unpublished PhD thesis:

The body of *Citizen Kane* lore quite simply contradicts itself over and again on the matter of ceilinged sets. The question is whether Welles wanted ceilings (for realism) which demanded wide angle lenses (for depth), or whether Welles wanted depth (wide angle lenses) which, in turn, demanded ceilings (for protection against overshooting the set)?... This point would not be nearly so

important if not for the fact that the critics, and even the director, insist upon the importance of ceilinged sets. (1976: 117-8)



Figure 11.



Figure 12.

It is often implied that *Citizen Kane* began this technical “revolution”, however ceilings appear in Toland’s work prior to *Kane*. Examples include, *Mad Love* (fig. 11), *Wuthering Heights* (fig. 9), and *The Long Voyage Home* (fig. 12), which is a comparable frame to *Kane* (fig. 10). The addition of the ceiling to the composition does add a greater sense of reality to the scene. The set becomes less of a theatrical stage, and more of a three-dimensional location. The addition of a ceiling to the set also gives an added effect of claustrophobia, which can work dramatically. In *Wuthering Heights*, and *The Long Voyage Home*, this effect is very deliberate. Respectively the house, Wuthering Heights, and the ship, Glencairn, are claustrophobic environments for their inhabitants. The point being that the “technical” motivations for the use of ceilinged sets are of secondary importance to the narrative motivations. Toland was representing the narrative ideas, not just hiding the set, or striving for realism.

Long Takes and Camera Movement

Often the discussion of staging in depth is linked both to the greater depth of field of “deep focus”, and the long takes that allow continuous action. It is this mix of techniques that provide the “new style” of film language that impressed Bazin:

Talking about montage and cutting in relation to these dramatic blocks has little meaning other than a metaphoric one; what matters is less a succession of images and their relationship to each other than interior structure of the image, the attractions or currents that are created within the dramatic space, which is at last used in its three dimensions. (1948: 235)

Camera movement can come in many forms, pans, tilts, cranes, tracks, and they can be used subtly to reframe as characters move around a set, or in dynamic ways to follow action or explore space. There are a number of specific camera movements that are repeated by Toland in various films, with the same intended meaning, examples include the crane out, and the track back with characters.

The Crane Out



Figure 13.



Figure 14.

It seems that Toland begins using the crane out to add visual interest to a scene. In *Roman Scandals* (Tuttle, 1933) a crane shot starts on a sewing machine wheel and pulls out to reveal the residents evicted from their homes (fig. 13). In *Mad Love* a pullout begins on the significant detail of Orlac's bandaged hands, rather than the previous minor details of the sewing machine, which then reveals all those present in the room.

A much more effective pullout occurs towards the end of *The Dark Angel* (Franklin, 1935). Alan (Fredric March) has attempted to hide his blindness from Kitty (Merle Oberon) by rejecting her when she turns up at his house. When she leaves the camera slowly pulls back to increase the empty space around Alan, which visually represents his loneliness. In *The Westerner* (Wyler, 1940) this meaning is amplified (fig. 14). The crane out ends emphasising Judge Roy Bean's (Walter Brennan) isolation, both literally and metaphorically. He has been drawn into a trap, and is without the men that support him, but also his brand of "frontier justice" is becoming obsolete as the Homesteaders bring "civilisation" and Government control to the West.

The technique is used twice in the final sequence of *Kane*. The first crane out is used to highlight the vastness of Xanadu, and the enormity of the task of cataloguing everything. The second is much more impressive as it begins relatively close to the characters as they discuss 'Rosebud', and then cranes back a great distance to see the mass of objects, which perhaps represent the jigsaw puzzle that makes up Charles Foster Kane (fig. 15). The final frame of the crane out suggests to me the loneliness of the individuals, as it does in *The Dark*

Angel and *The Westerner*, and that all the possessions do not represent Kane, only that he is lost somewhere amongst them.



Figure 15.

Track Back with Characters

Another repeated camera move that Toland uses is the track backwards with the characters. This technique can be seen twice in *Tonight or Never* (LeRoy, 1931), a film that is full of camera movement. The first one occurs when we first see Nella (Gloria Swanson). She has just finished a performance of *Tosca* and is returning to her dressing room with an entourage of admirers. The camera tracks backwards in front of her as she makes her way down the corridor. This style of shot empathises with the character, it focuses on them, rather than their surroundings. Interestingly as the character moves forward, through their environment, they actually remain static in relation to their size and position in the frame. This enables the audience to concentrate on them, as a fixed point in the image, but it also gives the sense that the character is making no progress. They remain a fixed distance from the camera, static within the frame. In this first example it is the admirers that Nella can not escape from. Toland is again using a technique to visually represent the emotions of the characters.

A track back in *These Three* occurs when Karen (Merle Oberon), Martha (Miriam Hopkins) and Joe (Joel McCrea) lose their slander case against Mrs Tilford. As they leave courtroom, pursued by reporters and photographers, the camera tracks back with them. As with Nella and her admirers, the trio cannot escape their entourage, although this time the attention is much more unwanted. This is emphasised by the harsh use of lights from the photographer's flash bulbs, firing off as the procession makes its way out of court. The choice of shot visually represents the experience of the characters very tangibly, which is what makes it so successful. Many directors and cinematographers may use a technique, or technical device, for purely aesthetic reasons, but the great cinematographers tell us something about the characters, their relationships, their emotional states by the way they use composition, lighting and movement.

This type of shot occurs twice in *Kane*. The first instance is when Kane (Welles) returns to the Inquirer office after his trip to Europe, and announces his engagement to Emily Monroe

Norton (Ruth Warrick). Kane wishes to quickly return to his fiancée, but the staff wish to present him with a Cup, and Bernstein (Everett Sloane) insists on making a speech. This time the character, Kane, is trapped by his public duties, which also reminds us how public his private life will always be.

The second track back occurs as Kane's marriage to Emily is about to end. Kane emerges from the successful political rally, pursued by supporters and reporters. He is greeted by Emily and their son (Sonny Bupp). She is about to reveal to him her invitation to go to his lover's apartment. Again it is the public setting of such an intimate exchange that both represents the exposed nature of Kane's private life, and the fact that he can not escape that. The added value to the use of this type of shot in *Kane*, is the fact that the two instances in which it is used are at the start and end of his relationship to Emily. Its repeated use in Toland's earlier work again illustrates the extent of his influence on the visualisation of *Kane*.

This type of camera movement is not what Deleuze may describe as an 'empty aesthetic' (1983: 17), an unmotivated viewpoint, rather it is a visual representation of the drama. This kind of cinematography, one that reflects and illustrates the drama in its form and style, is the kind of visual storytelling that Toland strived for:

Such differences as exist between the cinematography in *Citizen Kane* and the camera work on the average Hollywood product are based on the rare opportunity provided me by Orson Welles, who was in complete sympathy with my theory that the photography should fit the story. I have been trying to follow that principle for some time in an effort to provide visual variety as well as a proper photographic vehicle for the plot. Fitting *Wuthering Heights* and *Grapes of Wrath* and *Long Voyage Home* to an identical photographic pattern would be unfair to director, writer, actors, and audience. (Toland, 1941: 76-7)

It is clear that Toland believed his photography could tell a story.

Lighting

It is just as much with his lighting, as with his camera work, that Toland developed a distinctive style. High contrast images, characters often in shadow or silhouette, the use of "practical" lights and motivated sources, are all part of Toland's visual signature, as typified by the classic projection room scene from *Kane* (fig. 16). The only diegetic light comes from the projection booth, and the characters move around in half-light and shadow, often silhouetted. Mulvey may describe this as in keeping with Welles' aesthetic, but this kind of lighting is almost classic Toland before *Kane*. Compare it to the frames from *Dead End*, made in 1937, where "Baby Face" Martin (Humphrey Bogart) is hiding out in a warehouse (fig. 17), and the scene, as pointed out by Wallace (1976: 95), in the cabin on board the ship in *The Long Voyage Home* (fig. 18). The lighting style in the three frames is the same, the only apparent source of light comes from outside the locations, through small windows. As the characters move around they are either silhouetted by the light, or partially illuminated by

its fall. The projection room scene was the first to be filmed for *Kane*, famously shot under the guise of “tests” before the official shooting dates of the film:



Figure 16.



Figure 17.



Figure 18.

In its visual appearance, what was shot on these first few days [which also included Susan’s suicide attempt] departed radically from the conventions of studio filmmaking at the time. Much of it was openly, blatantly experimental; one member of the camera crew explained later that the whole purpose of this early shooting was to prove certain new techniques. (Carringer, 1985: pp. 71-72)

I believe this also signals Toland’s intentions to push his own ideas and style during the shooting of *Kane*.

The Passage of Time

There are many instances when the passing of time is represented by montage sequences in Toland’s films, the changing of the seasons in *The Dark Angel*, or the varying jigsaws in *Citizen Kane*. However it is perhaps the most famous montage sequence in a Toland film that I wish to explore in more detail here, the breakfast scene in *Kane*. Over a few short

vignettes we witness the changing relationship between Kane and his first wife Emily. Their brief exchanges get less friendly, then more antagonistic, until finally, in their last exchange, they are not talking at all, and Emily is reading Kane's rival newspaper *The Chronicle*. According to Kael and Carringer this scene had not been finalised by the time Toland came onto the project in "the first week in June" (Carringer, 1985: 40):

By July 2... [one] of the film's most important conceptions also appear for the first time in this draft. One resolves the problem posed by Kane's first marriage, which has been reduced to the celebrated breakfast table montage: "NOTE: The following scenes cover a period of nine years – and played in the same set with only changes in lighting, special effects outside the window, and wardrobe." (Ibid.: 31)

There is a month between Toland joining the pre-production planning, and the amendment to the script that Carringer highlights. Consider for a moment the repeated breakfast scene in *The Dark Angel*. The opening of the film shows Kitty (Cora Sue Collins) as a young girl. She wakes, goes to say good morning to her Grandmother (Henrietta Crosman), rushes downstairs to say good morning to the rest of her family, and leaves by way of the french windows in the breakfast room to visit Alan and Gerald. This scene is repeated exactly, shot for shot, when Kitty grows up to be Merle Oberon. The point being that Toland had used repeated shots to represent different time frames before *Kane*. The two sequences could have been shot differently, but the shots in each timeframe are compositionally identical.

The second example I want to consider is from *Les Misérables*. Cosette (Rochelle Hudson) and Marius' (John Beal) developing relationship, over three months, is shown in a series of three short shots. In the first they are taking a walk though the park, Marius addresses Cosette as "Mademoiselle", she addresses him as "Monsieur". In the second shot they are standing, and they address each other by name. In the final shot they are sat more intimately on a bench, and they address each other as "Darling". Over the course of fifteen seconds we see the relationship develop, via both the language they use, and the physicality of the pair, they are formally walking together, then standing more informally, and finally sitting in a more intimate way. Cosette even touches Marius' arm in the final shot. Again the point is that Toland is no stranger to the concept of compressing time, to show the development of a relationship.

The perhaps controversial conclusion of these two examples, is that Toland may well have had a significant influence on the concept of the breakfast scene in *Kane*. What is interesting to note is that the subtlety of the technique is greater in the two previous films, than it is in *Kane*, where blurred whip pans are inserted between each time-frame to represent the temporal shift. There is no further external evidence for the claim that Toland may have heavily influenced this sequence, other than the three items of interest presented here, the dates of various drafts of the script, the repeated breakfast scene from *The Dark Angel*, and the relationship montage from *Les Misérables*. However, as concepts of how to shoot *Kane*

were discussed between director, cinematographer, and production designer, I personally do not find it a great leap of the imagination to think that Toland would have referred to the two previous scenes in his earlier work. This is where issues and debates of authorship reside. A script provides a director with a detailed narrative, complete with themes and characterisation. A cinematographer has an influence on how those ideas are conveyed to the audience, as would a production designer, or an editor. A director does not work in isolation.

Collaboration on *Citizen Kane*

Citizen Kane is an object lesson in collaborative filmmaking, a combination of Mankiewicz's writing, Ferguson's designs, Toland's photography, Wise's editing, and, of course, Welles' direction. Two main issues that consistently cloud this conclusion however, are the oversimplification of the film-making process inherent in the *auteur* theory, and, surprisingly, Welles' own attitude:

Welles was recently quoted as saying, "Theatre is a collective experience; cinema is the work of one single person." This is an extraordinary remark from the man who brought his own Mercury Theatre players to Hollywood (fifteen of them appeared in *Citizen Kane*), and also the Mercury co-producer John Houseman, the Mercury composer Bernard Herrmann, and various assistants, such as Richard Wilson, William Alland, and Richard Barr. (Kael, 1971: 5a/b)

Toland's untimely death in 1948 perhaps contributed to his current lack of recognition. Welles however survived into the era of film studies, and was on hand to fuel the notion of the single-author *auteur* theory:

Welles has always tended to think of himself as an individual author. "Any production in any medium is a one-man production," he said to me. On the question of sharing creative responsibility for the works that bear his name, he is deeply ambivalent. His insistence on multiple billings for himself is legendary. As I can well testify, the very mention of the term collaboration at the wrong moment can be enough to send him into a rage. (Carringer, 1982: 651)

Debates do surround the writing of the screenplay for *Kane*, but whereas Welles already had some collaborative writing experience before *Kane*, and had worked with scripts as a director in both theatre and radio, he had no prior experience in, or knowledge of, cinematography. *Kane* provided Toland with an opportunity to indulge his own particular stylistic and artistic concerns, so stands, in many ways, as the purest form of Toland's work, which was often filtered by an experienced director's preconceived notions of how a film is made. If Welles brought something to *Kane* it was his ability to work with actors. The experience that he and his cast had of working in the theatre allowed for long takes of continuous action.

Conventional theory has it the Welles' aesthetic was conceived fully formed for *Kane*. This is obviously hugely improbable. Barry Salt in his book *Film Style and Technology* is much more straightforward on this point: 'Like many features of the photography of *Citizen Kane*, the extensive use of low-angles was adopted by Orson Welles as a feature of his own style when he went on to make films with other cameramen.' (Salt, 2009: 259). Toland was much more generous in his summation of his working relationship with Welles, than the director ever was with him:

Orson Welles was insistent that the story be told most effectively, letting the Hollywood conventions of movie-making go hang if need be. With such whole-hearted backing I was able to test and prove several ideas generally accepted as being radical in Hollywood circles. Welles's use of the cinematographer as a real aid to him telling the story, and his appreciation of the camera's story-telling potentialities helped me immeasurably. (1941: 73)

Here Toland gets closest to spelling out that he had a major influence on the visual style of *Kane*. I am not proposing that Toland deserves writing credits alongside Mankiewicz and Welles. I am not proposing that Toland deserves a directing credit. It is, as I have acknowledged, Welles' innovative work with the actors that allows scenes to be filmed in continuous shots. The pacing of the scenes in terms of performance is remarkable in itself, as there are very few scenes that involve cross cutting, or coverage. The pacing of scenes relies solely on the actors performance on set, and it is a testament to those performances, and the directing of them, that the dynamic of *Kane* still remains fresh and vital. In my view, Wallace balances the contributions of the creative talents fairly:

This is not to say that Toland's contributions to *Kane* were necessarily more significant than those of Welles (producer-director-contributing screenwriter) or of any other filmmaker who worked on this masterpiece; rather, it is submitted that Toland's contributions to *Kane* were no less significant than those of the other contributors – Orson Welles included. (1976: 32)

The argument of this article aims simply to demonstrate the justice in giving Toland due credit for his contribution: he photographed the film, he designed the shots, he created the lighting, and he probably positioned most of the performers. His motivation at all times comes from the script that Mankiewicz wrote, and Welles polished. His aim was visually to represent the narrative, and find suitable ways to symbolise the story in his images. It has been said that Toland's creative contribution to this film was so great that Welles felt the need to share his title card with Toland. Flattering, but also not the first time that that had happened. John Ford shares his title card with Toland on *The Long Voyage Home*. More broadly, the argument of this article is that Toland was doing what many great Directors of Photography do anyway, namely interpret the narrative visually. Perhaps it seems fair to leave the last word on *Kane* to Mankiewicz, who felt his authorship contribution had been overlooked:

The only religious remark that has ever been attributed to Mankiewicz was recorded on the set of *Citizen Kane*: Welles walked by, and Mankiewicz muttered, “there, but for the grace of God, goes God.” (Kael, 1971: 27)

I am trying to assert artistic recognition for Toland, as in some ways his fate has reassembled that of Mankiewicz’s, in the hands of the theorists. In (re)claiming artistic recognition for Toland, the aim is to secure a platform for gaining broader recognition for the Director of Photography. The argument needs to be made because the critics and academics brought up on Bazin and his ilk, are not easily persuaded that Welles and the *auteurs* are not divine by mere evidence and common logic.

There are many creative individuals who contribute to a film. The historical neglect of Toland poses a question, in the rush to credit directors with sole authorship of their films, how many other significant artists have also been buried under arguments to establish individual *auteurs*?

References

- Bazin, A. (1948) *Bazin at Work: Major Essays & Reviews from the Forties & Fifties*. Translated by Alain Piette and Bert Cardullo, 1997. USA: Routledge
- Bazin, A. (1957) ‘De la Politique des Auteurs’ In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008
- Bazin, A. (1972) *Orson Welles: A Critical View*. Translated from the French, 1991. USA: Acrobat Books
- Cameron, I. (1962) ‘Films, Directors and Critics’ In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008
- Carringer, R.L. (1982) ‘Orson Welles and Gregg Toland: Their Collaboration on “Citizen Kane”’. *Critical Inquiry*.8(4). USA: University of Chicago Press
- Carringer, R.L. (1985) *The Making of Citizen Kane*. UK: John Murray (Publishers) Ltd
- Deleuze, G. (1983) *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Translation by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, 1985. UK: The Athlone Press
- Kael, P. (1971) *The Citizen Kane Book*. UK: Bantam Books
- Koszarski, R. (1972) ‘The Men with the Movie Cameras’ In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008
- Mulvey, L. (1992) *BFI Film Classics: Citizen Kane*. UK: BFI
- Perkins, V. F. (1972) ‘Direction and Authorship’ In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008

Petrie, G. (1973) 'Alternatives to Auteurs' In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008

Salt, B. (2009), *Film Style and Technology*. Third Edition, UK: Starword

Sarris, A (1962) *Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962* In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Toland, G. (1941) 'How I Broke the Rules in CITIZEN KANE' In: Ronald Gottesman (ed) *Focus on Citizen Kane*, UK: Prentice-Hall, 1971

Truffaut, F. (1954) 'A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema' In: Keith Grant (ed) *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*, UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2008

Wallace, R.D. (1976) *Gregg Toland - His Contributions to Cinema*. Unpublished PhD: University of Michigan

Wollen, P. (1969), *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. UK: Secker & Warburg

List of Film Stills

All frames are photographed by Gregg Toland.

- 1, 6, 11. *Mad Love*, 1935, (35mm) Directed by Karl Freund. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer: USA.
2. *These Three*, 1936, (35mm) Directed by William Wyler. Goldwyn Studios: USA.
- 3, 7, 12. *The Long Voyage Home*, 1940, (35mm) Directed by John Ford. United Artists: USA.
- 4, 5, 10, 15, 16. *Citizen Kane*, 1941, (35mm) Directed by Orson Welles. RKO: USA.
8. *Les Misérables*, 1935, (35mm) Directed by Richard Boleslawski. United Artists: USA.
9. *Wuthering Heights*, 1939, (35mm) Directed by William Wyler. Goldwyn Studios: USA.
13. *Roman Scandals*, 1933, (35mm) Directed by Frank Tuttle. Goldwyn Studios: USA.
14. *The Westerner*, 1940, (35mm) Directed by William Wyler. Goldwyn Studios: USA
17. *Dead End*, 1937, (35mm) Directed by William Wyler. Goldwyn Studios: USA