

## Cutting and framing in Bauer's and Kuleshov's Films

This article deals with what looks like the most intriguing aspect of silent cinema in Russia as it passed from its pre-revolutionary period to the period known as the classical Soviet montage school. In terms of style filmmakers seemed to have run from one extreme to another. Almost overnight, long shots and long takes, typical for Russian films of the 1910s, gave way to close framing and fast cutting. In this article I am going to address the issue of cutting rate as related to the emerging notion of 'efficient narrative' and that of closer framing as conflicting with previously established ways of representing the filmic space. Yevgeni Bauer and Lev Kuleshov have been picked out as contrasting figures; besides, in the last years of Bauer's lifetime Kuleshov had been his devoted pupil, so the change in style is set off by the continuity of generations.

### 1. *Face versus Space*

What was the chronology of the facial close-up in early Russian cinema? An examination of existing archival holdings is not very rewarding - only about ten per cent of all Russian film output of the teens has survived, and, what is still worse, this percentage does not equally represent different studio productions. Khanzhonkov's studio style is fairly well known, while we have almost no idea what was the close-up policy of, say, Thieman and Reinhardt studio directors.

Memoir sources are interesting but particularly unreliable in regards to close-ups. Since later in the twenties close-up turned out to be considered the cornerstone of film poetics, memoir writers among filmmakers eagerly highlight their first encounter with this important device already in the teens. Anecdotal explanations were concocted as to how the close-up came about and who 'invented' it. One of these linked closer framing with bad acting. That is how a historical myth was born that associated close-up with the names of Yevgeni Bauer and that of the famous Russian film star Vera Kholodnaya. It was the memoir essay written by the set designer and director Czeslaw Sabinski that launched a theory avidly repeated by many writers. Sabinski maintained that:

... American shot dimensions and montage procedures infected Russian cinema and became the *de rigueur* fashion. Bauer used close up photography almost right from his SONG OF TRIUMPHANT LOVE [Pesn' torzhestvuyushchei lyubvi, 1915] in order to reveal Vera Kholodnaya's innermost feelings. As a matter of fact Vera Kholodnaya did not

know how to convey complex psychological nuances, and Bauer had to break the whole scene down into separate, unconnected, moments. For instance: 1) laughter; 2) a calm mask; 3) grief; 4) tears; 5) sobbing. Landscapes, vases, clouds etc were sandwiched between these disconnected psychological fragments to act as 'padding'. As a result of all these tricks the novice actress came across as a precious artistic force in her own right.<sup>1</sup>

We can dismiss this talk of Vera Kholodnaya as an actress without talent, but there is some substance to Sabinski's comments. Apparently the beautiful Vera Kholodnaya was indeed shot in close-up more often than other actresses. In any event, when she was shot in close-up less than usual the critics noticed that something was lacking: "V. Kholodnaya's acting in the main role was no better than the average; perhaps the director was guilty of not taking many close-ups, which are so effective with this actress, and of giving us only very short scenes."<sup>2</sup>

Possible implications about the quality of acting notwithstanding, some other actresses claimed the priority was theirs. If we had to trust memoir sources, we would have to put forward at least three more film titles for the 'first close-up in the history of Russian cinema.' Nina Gofman suggested that such was the big close-up of her eyes looking at the audience in *BLACK EYES*. Zoya Barantsevich remembered her picture *TANYA SKVORTSOVA - STUDENT*, only fragments of which have survived with no close-ups among them:

This was the first time extreme close-up was used: Tanya's face filled almost the whole screen. Before then no one had dared to try out this novelty, apparently not trusting the technology or for some other reason (perhaps the actors refused to do it?) But I can clearly remember the conversations we had about it; some actors were confused and frightened by such a novel idea, even some directors were, and they couldn't decide whether it was a good thing or not.<sup>3</sup>

In Vera Pavlova's memoirs we come across a similar account, this time concerning Boris Chaikovsky's film *A BALLERINA'S ROMANCE* [Roman baleriny, 1916]:

I cried when I first saw myself on the screen. I was upset and annoyed that nothing that I had tried to do and show had come out right. I didn't like my gestures or the way I moved. I just wanted to tear up or re-do some of the takes. All the same, it wasn't all hopelessly bad, and one shot, that of a big face of a dog and my tearful face taken in close up, was really remarkable.<sup>4</sup>

One fact about these reminiscences is interesting – all the three actresses mention films made in 1916. No wonder that neither the reviews of *TANYA SKVORTSOVA - STUDENT* nor those of *A BALLERINA'S ROMANCE* make mention of any new techniques – by 1916 a face filling the whole screen was not all that unusual in a Russian film. Yet, 1916 *was* the important year for the close-up. Far from being its year of origin, it was the year when filmmakers and film critics suddenly realised that rather than being an occasional device the close-up was turning into something dangerously central to the narrator system.

Kristin Thompson quotes a French filmmaker, Victorin Jasset, who thus explained American experiments in closer framings in 1911: the Americans “sacrificed the decor” in order to better present characters.<sup>5</sup> Even though facial close-ups provided the psychological narrative motivation so much desired by Russian critics, for many of them this was too much of a sacrifice. By 1916 two positions, *pro* and *contra*, took shape in regards to American influence on close framing.<sup>6</sup> One of them was presented in a review of Otis Turner’s *BUSINESS IS BUSSINESS* (Universal, 1915), shown in Russia in 1916 under the title *THE SLAVE OF PROFIT* [Rab nazhivy]. The Russian reviewer writes:

Having made the correct reasoning that in a psychological [photo]play the viewer’s attention should be concentrated on the *actor’s facial expression*, because it is only on one’s face that the emotion of the soul is manifested in its profoundness, the director makes lavish use of the foreground – almost in every scene. More than that, shooting actors on the foreground is not enough for him, and the director recurs to the following device . . . Two actors seated, of course, as close as possible to the camera lens, mime a dialogue. We see on the screen almost nothing but the enlarged actors, and nothing showing on their faces escapes our attention. To enhance the effect, the director shields off a part of the frame with a diaphragm so that when one of the actors mimes his dialogue line we only see him and not the other one . . . One cannot but praise this device: all superfluous details are removed from the viewer’s field of vision, and all he sees is the actor’s face. Clearly, there is no device better suited for a *psychological* picture.<sup>7</sup>

Those voting against close-ups argued that they were introduced in order to cover the background space and thus reduce production costs wasted on sets. In his essay *Uncrumpled Pillows* Ilya Surguchov, for instance, genuinely supposed that American filmmakers used the same sets for all their films. A Western film, he wrote, can be recognized by the uncrumpled pillows betraying the essential fallacy of the unlivable rooms in which they are set:

They are aware that their rooms are sloppy fakes, and so they decided to film the faces in “close-up” and to have the actors looking directly “into the camera”. They hoped that the audience would remember the beauty of the faces and the “acting”, and that for a few seconds would not notice the lifelessness of the decor; but afterwards that only made the falseness of the room even more glaringly obvious.<sup>8</sup>

For some filmmakers the choice between decorative space and the close-up may have looked like a real collision. It certainly was not a simple choice for Yevgeni Bauer whose reputation (and, indeed, whose genius) was based on extraordinary settings. His art of the set designer reached its apex exactly in 1916 in an ambitious high-budget production *LIFE FOR LIFE* with lavish interiors filmed in very long shots with overhead space sometimes exceeding by double the height of the characters. As far as we can judge by his other films made the same year, Bauer was quite excited by the narrative perspective opened by the close-up. At the same time, as written sources

make one think, he also was somewhat scared by the perspective to sacrifice the decor. Contemporaries were conscious of the dilemma. *The Cinema Herald* [Vestnik kinematografii], the Khanzhonkov-owned trade journal which always fostered Bauer's career, stated it in a sympathetic review of NELLY RAINITSEVA (1916):

Bauer's latest productions – besides NELLY RAINITSEVA we mean OH IF ONLY I COULD EXPRESS IT BY MUSIC [no extant copy] – show that he has made the firm decision to favour 'genre pictures' and now prefers spirited portraits to the lifeless beauty of decor.

Big faces at the expense of decorative background – this is the new artistic choice of the director. And we must do him justice – Bauer's hand did not falter as he exercised this new principle in his latest productions.

Maybe he was just a little bit upset when, after having put so much art into his set design for NELLY RAINITSEVA Bauer had to push it further to the background, to cover the sets (in the literal sense of the word!) by actors' bodies. Maybe the former Bauer, the architect of pillared halls and winter gardens, was indeed upset, but as the genuine artist he must be satisfied by this production . . . The close-up principle is a dangerous principle, you can pursue it only if you can have good performers. Ye. F. Bauer is aware of it, and in terms of performance NELLY RAINITSEVA cannot be overestimated.<sup>9</sup>

The shift from space-centered narrative to that centered on characters' faces involved a noticeable change in the mode of narration. As a rule, any innovative device immediately increased the intentionality of the text in the eyes of the beholder. All the more so in the case of the close-up. By its very nature - 'behold!' - the close-up was seen as a deixis, the textual gesture implying direct address. The new, space-free narrative mode was felt as subjective in contrast to the objective mode of the earlier space-bound narration. Some observers (one may presume that some filmmakers as well) did not seem too happy about this turn of events. Paradoxically, there were reviewers who, despite all the technical evidence, saw close up as a step back towards the theatre aesthetics with its premeditated, artful means of focusing the spectator's attention - for the reason that closer framing, too, revealed too much of authorial presence. In this sense Valentin Turkin's review in *Kinogazeta* [The Cinema Paper] of Peter Chardynin's STILL, SADNESS, STILL [Molchi, grust', molchi, 1918] is revealing:

American shots, which give separate moments of the general scenes in close-up, are no help at all. Close-ups used like this do nothing to mitigate the theatricality of the screen production, they even emphasise its conventionality and failure to convince. It is as if they were saying "In case you people couldn't make that out from a distance, you can have it close-up as well." It may at first glance seem paradoxical, but you can easily pick out a director suffering from a surfeit of theatricality by his attachment to the use of explanatory American shots.<sup>10</sup>

## 2. Cutting Rates

I have selected two films for a closer scrutiny of their cutting rates: *SILENT WITNESSES* (1914) by Bauer and *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT* (1918) by Kuleshov. This choice was dictated by my desire to sharpen the contrast between the old and the new. *SILENT WITNESSES* has been chosen because of its extremely slow pace (a contemporary reviewer poignantly defined its speed as "four miles per hour"<sup>11</sup> which helps to present the case of Bauer's cutting rate more clearly. The same goes for *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT* selected because it is one of the fastest films ever made and its cutting rate was over-accelerated in order to challenge the old Russian tradition of slow editing.

*SILENT WITNESSES* is a four-reel film that lasts 1 hour 2 minutes and 30 seconds at projection speed of 16 frames per second. It consists of 60 shots. If we stick to 16 fps, the Average Shot Length<sup>12</sup> of each shot is 1 minute and 2 seconds. However, I will give all subsequent data on the basis of the projection speed of 20 frames per second, which, it seems, is closer to what had been accepted in Russian film theatres. At this speed the asl of *SILENT WITNESSES* is 50 seconds. If we compare this figure to corresponding data given by Barry Salt (to whom we owe the first impressive results of statistical approach to style analysis) we will be surprised to notice that Bauer's cutting rate in *SILENT WITNESSES* is about three times slower than in the slowest American film of its period. In fact, Bauer is about three times slower than any other director timed by Barry Salt, slower than Lupu Pick and even slower than Max Ophuls.

If we compare *SILENT WITNESSES* with *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT* the contrast is quite striking. Instead of 50 seconds per shot, Kuleshov's Average Shot Length is 6 seconds at projection speed of 20 frames per second.<sup>13</sup> Was this increase in tempo part of the general acceleration of cutting rate between 1914 and 1918? To answer the question with certainty, one has to dispose of textometrical data for a representative number of Russian films made in these years. However, before any measuring is performed, one can assert that, apart from that of *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT*, the cutting rate of Russian films cannot have significantly increased between 1914 and 1918. No gradual development leads from the slow style of the Bauer school to Kuleshov's fast cutting. The six-seconds fast cutting rate for 1918 was something completely un-Russian. In fact, it placed *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT* among the fastest American films of the same year, such as *THE HIRED MAN* by Viktor Schertzinger or *A MODERN MUSKETEER* by Allen Dwan.<sup>14</sup> – As I am going to argue later, the cutting rate of *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT* was a deliberate *tour de force* on Kuleshov's part. Rather than prepared by some hidden processes within previous Russian filmmaking, the new cutting style was planned as a forcible importation (or, rather, intervention) of American style into Russia. It is noteworthy that this first injection of American cutting came in form of textual mimicry. *ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT* was the first Russian film set in America and its accelerated cutting must have looked like an attempt at stylization, or, rather, as a sort of a kinesthetic icon of what Russian spectators perceived as the American way of life. In 1918 one would hardly imagine that some years later Kuleshov would apply the same method to film stories set in Moscow.

### 3. Was the Length of Take Dependent on the Shot Length?

The introduction of the facial close-up and the increase of cutting tempo are two factors usually mentioned together when the emergence of the 'montage style' is discussed. Were these factors interconnected? In other words, can the increase of cutting rate be presented as the corollary of increasingly closer framing? In regards to SILENT WITNESSES, I tried to make one step further than it is usually done in textometrical analysis. I was interested if any kind of correlation can be statistically established between the scale of each shot and its length as a take. First, I subdivided the shots of the film into three groups feeling that just these three groups were really relevant for Bauer. Very Long Shots formed a separate group because, since VLS constitute close to half of the total number of shots in SILENT WITNESSES, I felt this framing must have been something like the neutral scale (a kind of a "zero degree of framing") for Bauer. Medium Shots, Medium Long Shots and Long Shots were grouped together because Bauer's long takes left much time for characters to move closer or further away from the camera which made the boundaries between these three shot scales particularly blurred. The third group consisted of Medium Close-Ups, Close-Ups and Big Close-Ups.

Predictably, the Average Shot Length of Very Long Shots is considerably higher than that of the rest of the shots: it is 65 seconds. The Average Shot Length of the second group comprising medium scales is for 24 seconds lower (41 seconds) and the 'close-up group' takes are still shorter, 33 and a half seconds. Bauer's close-ups are almost twice shorter than Very Long Shots. Correlation between shot scales and the time they stay on the screen indeed exists, at least in SILENT WITNESSES.

### 4. Average Shot Density

One assumption immediately suggests itself: longer shot scales take longer takes because they are capable of containing larger 'portions' of narrative. But if such things as length and closeness can be measured, how can one measure narrative? The notion of 'event' has no quantitative constituents.

However, some quantitatively definable components of the diegesis may be indirectly connected with the narrative core of the film. The number of characters is a quantitative parameter, and, as research in the field of theatre semiotics has shown, the type of dramatic narrative depends on what combinations *dramatic personae* form in this or that scene or act.<sup>15</sup>

Speaking of cinema, one can make an *a priori* assumption that longer shots (by their sheer geometrical nature) tend to accommodate more characters than closer ones. We do not have to count all characters in all existing films to postulate that the general rule of framing was and remains long shots for crowds and close-ups for individuals. It is less easy to say if any kind of correlation exists between the length of take and the number of characters in it. Does a longer take mean more characters in the shot? If future research in film textometry proves that such a thing as the sca-

le/time correlation (established above for SILENT WITNESSES) is true for the statistical majority of films, one will have to agree that the longer a take is, the more characters it is likely to contain. However, it is not so in the case of *Silent Witnesses*. First, there seems to be no stable correlation between the shot scale and the number of characters within the frame. Secondly, two of the longest takes in this film (together they last 3 minutes and 33 seconds and they are separated only by a short point-of-view insert) are very long in terms of framing scale with the protagonist alone aimlessly strolling the room. Conversely, the biggest close-up (head and shoulders) in the whole film (apart from letter inserts) contains *two characters*.

What about character/scale correlation in ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT? Despite the considerable amount of Very Long Shots in PRAIT (46%), they seem scarcely populated. If we introduce a new textometrical criterion, that of *Average Shot Density*, it will help us to distinguish statistically between films that prefer to pack narrative into single-shot sequences and those that prefer to cut sequences into several shots. The Average Shot Density is the number of characters which take part in each shot divided by the total number of shots in the film. Evidently, if the Average Shot Density is less than 2, it means that the stylistic strategy of the film is based on *decoupage* rather than single takes. ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT is unique in this respect. Its Average Shot Density is 1.6, whereas the same figure for SILENT WITNESSES is 3.2 characters per shot. One has the impression that Kuleshov was reluctant to use even routine establishing shots because they reminded him too much of traditions of Russian directing. Sometimes it seems that ENGINEER PRAIT'S PROJECT is too fast to articulate its own narrative.

### 5. Framing, Cutting and the Concept of Narrative

Cutting and framing were more than fleeting fashions in film style. They determined the mode of narrative. In its turn, the mode of narrative linked cinema with more general tendencies in art and literature of the 1920s, and, through them, to large-scale patterns in culture and ideology of the early Soviet epoch.

What was the ideology of the narrative in pre-revolutionary filmmaking? As a rule, 'cultural' directors tended to turn each shot into a single-shot sequence. This did not result, as one might expect, in intensified narratives of the type we encounter in films produced before 1910. Whereas early single-take sequences used to present narrative chains compressed to the point of being impossible to read without oral commentary,<sup>16</sup> single-takes sequences in Bauer's films of the 1910s tended to minimize the narration while at the same time expanding the scale and extending the duration of the shot. Empty space and subdued action were central to Bauer's style of filmmaking in general - something explicitly formulated<sup>17</sup> and consciously cultivated by Russian directors as their national aesthetic *credo*. The frame had to be a tableau, and only then a part of the story. If not totally denied, the narration within Russian film style was suppressed and often neglected.

This bias towards thinking in static rather than moving pictures raised the issue of narrative skills of Russian pre-revolutionary directors. In his talk at a one-day conference held in Pordenone after Russian films had been shown at *Le Giornate del Cinema Muto* in 1989, Kevin Brownlow defined their narrative as having only two speeds: slow and stop. Indeed, sometimes these films do not seem to move at all. Was this narrative incompetence or a kind of antinarrative stance? In a very interesting talk on Bauer's style given at one of the seminars on early Russian cinema organized in 1990 by the British Film Institute Barry Salt opted for incompetence:

a negative point about Bauer, is (I am sorry about this but I've got to say it) that his dramatic sense was truly terrible, his sense of narrative was truly appalling by anybody's standards: let alone American standards of 1914–1915, but even by French and Danish standards. And even by Russian standards I think it was very poor, and it seems to me that his success in this department (and I am just talking about simple dramatic narrative), seems to depend on his scriptwriters. In the case when he wrote the script himself which apparently he did in some cases we can expect something rather poorly constructed, to put it mildly. The best films from this point of view like *SILENT WITNESSES* apparently would depend on [Alexander] Voznesenski who wrote the script < . . . > In the case of *YURI NAGORNI* [1916] the woman, the elder sister is going through all these manoeuvres, in fact ludicrous, for which you don't know if there is any reason, these bizarre manoeuvres, and you have to wait till halfway through the film when you get the flashback which explains what it's all about < . . . > And this seems to me, to put the case very clearly, Bauer's dramatic narrative incompetence. You might find scenes which are totally unnecessary and which could be removed from the film and accelerate the dramatic flow greatly, and you get scenes where it seems that he has misunderstood constructions which already existed years before in American films, like cross-cutting.<sup>18</sup>

Another participant of the seminar Ian Christie suggested an alternative reading of Bauer's approach to narrative. Christie argued that narrative fluency as Western norms of storytelling demand it, has always been (and still is) something quite foreign to Russian filmmaking. Rather than seeing neglect or incompetence in Bauer's way of handling the story one should better investigate what mechanisms Bauer used to fight the narrative progress of his films. As an example, Ian Christie pointed at Bauer's technique of creating complex multi-tier structures (in terms of settings as well as actors' (re-) positioning) thus extending the time period the viewer needed in order to 'read' the shot. This explains why Kuleshov who professed the new Soviet cult of efficiency would later insist on arranging the composition within the frame according to the highest possible legibility. Kuleshov's doctrine of one-shot-one-sign ratio was formed in opposition to Bauer's compound frame constructions.

Working 'against' narration had been, indeed, one of the staples of Russian pre-revolutionary filmmaking. This was also true for the acting style set against action. This, again, was a deliberate, not to say militant, aesthetic position: the director Vladimir Gardin proudly called his method "the braking school" [tormoznaya shkola] of acting. In an article published by an emigree magazine in Paris in 1928 Sergei Vol-

konski, Russia's greatest authority in acting theory and actor's training, thus described this school of acting prior to 1918:

There was a time when Russian screen suffered from two ailments: literature and introvert psychology. It worked as a kind of "internal combustion engine." This was a tendency to transplant to the screen the acting devices developed by the [Moscow] Art Theatre. "Feel!" – the director would say to the actor. And the actor had to "feel into" his fictional character – that was his "task". I do not want to discuss here the value of the Art Theatre's acting method for the "live" stage, but, applied to the silent screen, the result it brought about was smashing. It killed movement. "Feel!" the actor was told. Can you understand the meaning of the imperative for the word "feel"? I cannot. But that was the order, and the actor "felt". Slowly, he inhales the smoke of his cigarette, slowly, he runs his fingers through his hair, then, slowly and with meaning, he inserts his finger between his neck and his collar . . . There is minimum of movement, it is unbearable as spectacle, but the "feeling" is there. If the screen beam could be supplied by a sort of psychological X-ray extension, we would probably see the serpent of jealousy eating his heart, or the flood of remorse rising over the brink of his tortured conscience, or the shots of heroic intensions growing in the dark depth of his intense thought . . . We would see it if . . . But what we do see is an arrogant gentleman with a thoughtful finger behind his collar, his hair emitting this very special cinematic gloss, the ashtray and the smoke . . .<sup>19</sup>

The "braking school" and tableau aesthetics was seen as a Russian alternative to American cinema (usually referred to as "Western" cinema as opposed to the Russian style). The concept of "Russian style" was formulated after 1914. The World War 1 which closed so many borders for film import turned out to be the golden age of the Russian film industry: as never before or after the War, Russian films dominated the Russian film market. Besides, the war time was favorable for the emergence of nationalist cultural doctrines, to which the creed of Russian style in cinema certainly belonged. Russian directors defined this style as introvert as opposed to the "superficial" imported pictures, and as psychological "cine-novels" [kinopovest'] as opposed to American action films. In the 1910s the "American cutting" was perceived in Russia as a sign of an off-hand production rather than that of a "quality picture." Trade paper reviewers would pinpoint "the American influence" diagnosed by the abuse of "American close-ups" and the hectic pace of action. Zygmund Wieselowski, a director who worked for the Liebken provincial studio, was nicknamed "a Russian American" for his careless manner of arranging events.

It is well-known that Kuleshov was strongly opposed to the narrative technique imposed by the "braking school" and the long-shot-long-take editing professed by Bauer. This opposition was in tune with the more general process of cultural reorientation that was taking place in the Soviet Russia after 1917. The new Russia was seen as a direct reversal of what the old Russia had been before. In many ways, this Utopian image of "the future Russia" was formed according to the Russian idea of America. Americanization of everything was the number one slogan. The Russian cult of

America was centered around the idea of efficiency. Suddenly, the notion of a well-made plot [sjuzhet] and rapid narrative became important in literature and film. It corresponded to the general cult of the “American” tempo, Taylorism, leather jackets (originally the car driver’s outfit, leather jackets suggested the idea of speed), free love, the Dalcroze acting technique,<sup>20</sup> etc. Soviet culture was fascinated by the image of Ford’s production line, a perfect metaphor for the efficient narrative. In the context of this intellectual fashion, it is easy to understand why Kuleshov’s method of film editing was epitomized in his famous dictum describing montage in terms of bricklaying. The very story of PRAIT is about the conflict between the oil-generated electric power (which, as we are told, is less efficient) and the more efficient peat-generated energy. Prait himself, an American engineer in leather jacket and a boxer by temper provided the model for a Soviet proletarian hero for more than ten subsequent years of cinema in Russia.

The textometrical data referred to by the author and listed in an appendix are available upon request. Please write to the editors.

- 1 C. Sabinski, ‘Iz zapisok starogo kinomastera’ [From the Notes of an Old Master of Cinema], the memoir text preserved at the Moscow Film Museum, p. 11.
- 2 ‘Kriticheskoe obozrenie’ [Critical Review], *Proektor*, 1915, no. 3, p. 16.
- 3 Z. Barantsevich, ‘Fil’my, lyudi, vstrechi’ [Films, People, Encounters], the memoir text preserved at the Moscow Film Museum, p. 8.
- 4 V. Pavlova, ‘Zabytoe iskusstvo’ [A Forgotten Art], the memoir text preserved at the Moscow Film Museum, p. 5.
- 5 Kristin Thompson, ‘The Formulation of Classical Style, 1909-28’, in: D. Bordwell, J. Staiger, K. Thompson, *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*, London, 1985, pp. 155–240., p. 190.
- 6 In Russian film articles the American influence was often not identified as American but just “Western”.
- 7 *Proektor* [Projector], 1916, No 9, p. 14.
- 8 I. Surguchov, ‘Nesmyatye podushki (o kino-rezhisserakh)’ [Uncrumpled Pillows (On Film Directors)], *Kulisy* [The Wings], 1917, nos. 26, 27, p. 12.
- 9 *Vestnik kinematografii* [The Cinema Herald], 1916, No 122, p. 17.
- 10 V. Turkin, review in *Kinogazeta* [The Cinema Paper], 1918, no. 23, p. 14.
- 11 *Teartal’naja Gazeta* [Theatre Newspaper], 1914, no 19, p. 11.
- 12 For detailed discussion of the notion see: Barry Salt, *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*, London: Starword, 1983, pp. 176–7.
- 13 In the Appendix to this article the scale-and-time summary report of ENGINEER PRAIT’S PROJECT the length of take is given on the basis of 24 frames per second.
- 14 Salt, op. cit., p. 176.
- 15 This approach has been developed by Max Bense in Germany and Solomon Marcus in Romania. See: Felix von Cube, ‘Das Drama als Forschungsobjekt der Kybernetik,’ *Mathematik und Dichtung*, München, 1965, S. 333–45.

16 Thompson, op. cit., pp. 174–7.

17 For more detailed account of Russian tempo see: Yu. Tsivian, 'Some Preparatory Remarks on Russian Cinema', in: P. Cherchi Usai, L. Codelli, C. Montanaro, D. Robinson (eds), Yu. Tsivian (research), *Silent Witnesses: Russian Films 1908–1919*, BFI, Edizioni Biblioteca dell'Immagine, 1989, pp. 26–34.

18 Barry Salt's talk transcribed from the audiotape recording of the seminar (BFI possession).

19 S. Volkonski. 'O russkom ekranie' [On Russian Screen], *Zveno* [The Link], (Paris), 1928, no 4. Reprinted by N. Noussinova in *Kinovedcheskiye zapiski* [Film Research Papers], Moscow, 1992, no 13, pp. 150–153.

20 On Kuleshov's acting theory and its dependence upon J. Dalcroze see: Mikhail Yampolsky, 'Kuleshov's Experiments and the New Anthropology of the Actor', Richard Taylor, Ian Christie (eds) *Inside the Film Factory: New Approaches to Russian and Soviet Cinema*, London, New York: Routledge 1991, pp. 31-50.