

[Extract from]  
*THE MONTAGE OF FILM  
ATTRACTIVE<sup>1</sup>*

*Sergei Eisenstein*

Source: Translated by Richard Taylor, in Richard Taylor, ed., *S. M. Eisenstein: Writings 1922–34 Selected Works Volume 1*, London: British Film Institute, 1988, pp. 39–49. (Originally published as ‘Montazh Kinoattraksionov’, Eisenstein archive, TSGALI, Moscow, 1924.)

These thoughts do not aspire to be manifestos or declarations but they do represent an attempt to gain at least some understanding of the bases of our complex craft.

If we regard cinema as a factor for exercising emotional influence over the masses (and even the Cine-Eyes,<sup>2</sup> who want to remove cinema from the ranks of the arts at all costs, are convinced that it is) we must secure its place in this category and, in our search for ways of building cinema up, we must make widespread use of the experience and the latest achievements in the sphere of those arts that set themselves similar tasks. The first of these is, of course, theatre, which is linked to cinema by a common (identical) *basic* material – the *audience* – and by a common purpose – *influencing this audience in the desired direction* through a series of calculated pressures on its psyche. I consider it superfluous to expatiate solely on the intelligence of this (‘agit’) kind of approach to cinema and theatre since it is obvious and well-founded from the standpoint both of social necessity (the class struggle) and of the very nature of these arts that deliver, because of their formal characteristics, a series of blows to the consciousness and emotions of the audience. Finally, only an ultimate aspiration of this sort can serve to justify diversions that give the audience *real* satisfaction (both physical and moral) as a result of *fictive* collaboration with what is being shown (through motor imitation of the action by those perceiving it and through psychological ‘empathy’). If it were not for this phenomenon which, incidentally, alone makes for the magnetism

of theatre, circus and cinema, the thoroughgoing removal of accumulated forces would proceed at a more intense pace and sports clubs would have in their debt a significantly larger number of people whose physical nature had caught up with them.

Thus cinema, like theatre, makes sense only as 'one form of pressure'. There is a difference in their methods but they have one basic device in common: the montage of attractions, confirmed by my theatre work in Proletkult and now being applied by me to cinema. It is this path that liberates film from the plot-based script and for the first time takes account of film material, both thematically and formally, in the construction. In addition, it provides criticism with a method of objective expertise for evaluating theatre or film works, instead of the printed exposition of personal impressions and sympathies spiced with quotations from a run-of-the-mill political report that happens to be popular at a particular moment.

An attraction (NB for more details, see: *Lef*, 1923, No. 3,<sup>3</sup> and *Oktyabr myсли*, 1924, No. 1) is in our understanding any demonstrable fact (an action, an object, a phenomenon, a conscious combination, and so on) that is known and proven to exercise a definite effect on the attention and emotions of the audience and that, combined with others, possesses the characteristic of concentrating the audience's emotions in any direction dictated by the production's purpose. From this point of view a film cannot be a simple presentation or demonstration of events: rather it must be a tendentious selection of, and comparison between, events, free from narrowly plot-related plans and moulding the audience in accordance with its purpose. (Let us look at *Cine-Pravda*<sup>4</sup> in particular: *Cine-Pravda* does not follow this path – its construction takes no account of attractions – but 'grabs' you through the attraction of its themes and, purely superficially, through the formal mastery of its montage of separate sequences, which by their short footage conceal the 'neutral' epic 'statement of facts'.)

The widespread use of all means of influence does not make this a cinema of polished style but a cinema of action that is useful to our class, a class cinema due to its actual formal approach because attractional calculation is conceivable only when the audience is known and selected in advance for its homogeneity.

The application of the method of the montage of attractions (the comparison of facts) to cinema is even more acceptable than it is to theatre. I should call cinema 'the art of comparisons' because it shows not facts but conventional (photographic) representations (in contrast to 'real action' in theatre, at least when theatre is employing the techniques we approve of). For the exposition of even the simplest phenomena cinema needs comparison (by means of consecutive, separate presentation) between the elements which constitute it: montage (in the technical, cinematic sense of the word) is fundamental to cinema, deeply grounded in the conventions of cinema and the corresponding characteristics of perception.

Whereas in theatre an effect is achieved primarily through the physiological perception of an actually occurring fact (e.g. a murder),<sup>5,6</sup> in cinema it is made up of the juxtaposition and accumulation, in the audience's psyche, of associations that the film's purpose requires, associations that are aroused by the separate elements of the stated (in practical terms, in 'montage fragments') fact, associations that produce, albeit tangentially, a similar (and often stronger) effect only when taken as a whole. Let us take that same murder as an example: a throat is gripped, eyes bulge, a knife is brandished, the victim closes his eyes, blood is spattered on a wall, the victim falls to the floor, a hand wipes off the knife – each fragment is chosen to 'provoke' associations.

An analogous process occurs in the montage of attractions: it is not in fact phenomena that are compared but chains of associations that are linked to a particular phenomenon in the mind of a particular audience.<sup>7</sup> (It is quite clear that for a worker and a former cavalry officer the chain of associations set off by seeing a meeting broken up and the corresponding emotional effect in contrast to the material which frames this incident, will be somewhat different.) I managed to test quite definitively the correctness of this position with one example where, because what I should call this law had not been observed, the comic effect of such a well-tryed device as the alogism<sup>8</sup> fell flat. I have in mind the place in *The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr West in the Land of the Bolsheviks*<sup>9</sup> where an enormous lorry is pulling a tiny sledge carrying Mr West's briefcase. This construction can be found in different variants in any clown's act – from a tiny top hat to enormous boots. The appearance of such a combination in the ring is enough. But, when the whole combination was shown on the screen in one shot all at once (even though it occurred as the lorry was leaving the gates so that there was a short pause – as long as the rope joining the lorry to the sledge), the effect was very weak. Whereas a real lorry is immediately perceived in all its immensity and compared to a real briefcase in all its insignificance and [for comic effect] it is enough to see them side by side, cinema requires that a 'representation' of the lorry be provided first for long enough to inculcate the appropriate associations – and then we are shown the incongruous light load. As a parallel to this I recall the construction of an analogous moment in a Chaplin film where much footage is spent on the endlessly complicated opening of the locks on a huge safe<sup>10</sup> and it is only later (and apparently from a different angle) that we are shown the brooms, rags and buckets that are hidden inside it. The Americans use this technique brilliantly for characterisation – I remember the way Griffith 'introduced' the 'Musketeer', the gang-leader in *Intolerance*:<sup>11</sup> he showed us a wall of his room completely covered with naked women and then showed the man himself. How much more powerful and more cinematic this is, we submit, than the introduction of the workhouse supervisor in *Oliver Twist* in a scene where he pushes two cripples around: i.e. he is shown through his deeds (a purely theatrical method of sketching character through action) and not through provoking the necessary associations.

From what I have said it is clear that the centre of gravity of cinema effects, in contrast to those of theatre, lies not in directly *physiological* effects, although a purely *physical* infectiousness can sometimes be attained (in a chase, with the montage of two sequences with movements running against the shot). It seems that there has been absolutely no study or evaluation of the purely physiological effect of montage irregularity and rhythm and, if it has been evaluated, this has only been for its role in narrative illustration (the tempo of the plot corresponding with the material being narrated). 'We ask you not to confuse' the montage of attractions and its method of comparison with the usual montage parallelism used in the exposition of a theme such as the narrative principle in *Cine-Pravda* where the audience has first to guess what is going on and then become 'intellectually' involved with the theme.

The montage of attractions is closer to the simple contrasting comparisons (though these are somewhat compromised by *The Palace and the Fortress*<sup>12</sup> where the device is naively revealed) that often produce a definitely powerful emotional effect (chained legs in the ravelin and a ballerina's feet). But we must point out that in *The Palace and the Fortress* [from which this example comes] any dependence on comparison in the construction of the shots for this sequence was completely ignored: their construction does not assist association but disrupts it and it enters our consciousness through literary rather than visual means. For example, Nechayev, seen from the waist up and with his back to the camera, hammers on a barred door and the prison warder, seen in long shot somewhere in a corner by a window, holds a canary in a cage. The chained legs are shown horizontally whereas the ballerina's points are shot about four times larger and vertically, etc.

The method of the montage of attractions is the comparison of subjects for thematic effect. I shall refer to the original version of the montage resolution in the finale of my film *The Strike*: the mass shooting where I employed the associational comparison with a slaughterhouse. I did this, on the one hand, to avoid overacting among the extras from the labour exchange 'in the business of dying' but mainly to excise from such a serious scene the falseness that the screen will not tolerate but that is unavoidable in even the most brilliant death scene and, on the other hand, to extract the maximum effect of bloody horror. The shooting is shown only in 'establishing' long and medium shots of 1,800 workers falling over a precipice, the crowd fleeing, gunfire, etc., and all the close-ups are provided by a demonstration of the real horrors of the slaughterhouse where cattle are slaughtered and skinned. One version of the montage was composed roughly as follows:

1. The head of a bull. The butcher's knife takes aim and moves upwards beyond the frame.
2. Close-up. The hand holding the knife strikes downwards below the frame.

3. Long shot: 1,500 people roll down a slope. (Profile shot.)
4. Fifty people get up off the ground, their arms outstretched.
5. The face of a soldier taking aim.
6. Medium shot. Gunfire.
7. The bull's body (the head is outside the frame) jerks and rolls over.
8. Close-up. The bull's legs convulse. A hoof beats in a pool of blood.
9. Close-up. The bolts of the rifles.
10. The bull's head is tied with rope to a bench.
11. A thousand people rush past.
12. A line of soldiers emerges from behind a clump of bushes.
13. Close-up. The bull's head as it dies beneath unseen blows (the eyes glaze over).
14. Gunfire, in longer shot, seen from behind the soldiers' backs.
15. Medium shot. The bull's legs are bound together 'according to Jewish custom' (the method of slaughtering cattle lying down).
16. Closer shot. People falling over a precipice.
17. The bull's throat is cut. Blood gushes out.
18. Medium close-up. People rise into the frame with their arms outstretched.
19. The butcher advances towards the (panning) camera holding the blood-stained rope.
20. The crowd rushes to a fence, breaks it down but is met by an ambush (two or three shots).
21. Arms fall into the frame.
22. The head of the bull is severed from the trunk.
23. Gunfire.
24. The crowd rolls down the precipice into the water.
25. Gunfire.
26. Close-up. Teeth are knocked out by the shooting.
27. The soldiers' feet move away.
28. Blood flows into the water, colouring it.
29. Close-up. Blood gushes from the bull's throat.
30. Hands pour blood from a basin into a bucket.
31. Dissolve from a platform with buckets of blood on it . . . in motion towards a processing plant.
32. The dead bull's tongue is pulled through the slit throat (one of the devices used in a slaughterhouse, probably so that the teeth will not do any damage during the convulsions).
33. The soldiers' feet move away. (Longer shot.)
34. The head is skinned.
35. One thousand eight hundred dead bodies at the foot of the precipice.
36. Two dead skinned bulls' heads.
37. A human hand in a pool of blood.
38. Close-up. Filling the whole screen. The dead bull's eye.  
Final title.

The downfall of the majority of our Russian films derives from the fact that the people who make them do not know how to construct attractional schemas consciously but only rarely and in fumbling fashion hit on successful combinations. The American detective film and, to an even greater extent, the American comedy film (the method in its pure form) provide inexhaustible material for the study of these methods (admittedly on a purely formal level, ignoring content). Griffith's films, if we had seen them and not just known them from descriptions, would teach us a lot about this kind of montage, albeit with a social purpose that is hostile to us. It is not, however, necessary to transplant America, although in all fields the study of methods does at first proceed through imitation. It is necessary to train ourselves in the skill of selecting attractions from our own raw material.

Thus we are gradually coming to the most critical problem of the day: the script. The first thing to remember is that there is, or rather should be, no cinema other than agit-cinema. The method of agitation through spectacle consists in the creation of a new chain of conditioned reflexes by associating selected phenomena with the unconditioned reflexes they produce (through the appropriate methods). (If you want to arouse sympathy for the hero, you surround him with kittens which unfailingly enjoy universal sympathy: not one of our films has yet failed to show White officers juxtaposed to disgusting drinking bouts, etc.). Bearing this basic situation in mind we should handle the question of played films with great care: they wield such enormous influence that we cannot ignore them. I think that the campaign against the very notion of such films has been caused by the really low level of scripts as well as the technique of the performers. I shall return to the latter in greater detail later. As far as the former is concerned, our approach allows us to conceive of arranging something other than 'little stories' and 'little romances' with a 'little intrigue', kinds of film which on the whole (and not without reason) frighten people away. An example of this sort of arrangement may be provided by the project that I put forward for the treatment of historical-revolutionary material and that was accepted after long debates with the supporters of 'Rightist' real-life films who dream of filming the life of some underground conspirator or notorious *agent provocateur*, or an imaginary story based on real-life materials. (Incidentally, these materials are completely ignored by the 'wistful' men of cinema and left at the disposal of right-wing directors who abuse them: viz. *Andrei Kozhukhov*, *Stepan Khalturin*<sup>13</sup> and *The Palace and the Fortress*!)

The most important consideration in my approach to this theme was to give an account of and depict the *technique of the underground* and to provide an *outline of its production methods* in individual characteristic examples. How they sewed boots – how they prepared for the October Revolution. Our audience, trained to take an interest in production, is not the least interested in, and *should not be* interested in, the emotions of an actor made up as Beideman or in the tears of his bride. It is interested in the prison

regime at the Peter and Paul Fortress and this is to be presented not through the personal sufferings of the hero but through the direct exposition of its methods.

It is not the life of Malinovsky the *agent provocateur* that interests us but the varieties and types (what are the characteristics of a particular type) and what makes an *agent provocateur*, not the presence of someone in a deportation prison but the prison itself, the conditions there, the mores in their numerous variants. In a word, the presentation of every element of underground work as *phenomena that are represented in the greatest possible number of varieties and examples*. The conditions in which proofs were corrected, the underground printing press, etc., in the form of sequences characterising particular moments and not joined into a seamless plot centred on an underground printing press but edited with a view to the thorough exposure, for example, of the underground printing press as one of the facts of underground work. The emphasis is on the most interesting montage tasks. Without 'staging' this is quite unthinkable but in a quite different context! There is an example of the montage (e.g. in the episode of the 'flight') of pure adventure material preserving all its attractional quality in the orientation towards historical familiarisation. The theme of a strike was chosen first of all for the transition to constructions of this kind: in terms of its saturation with the mass it is most suited to the intermediate form between a film whose purpose is a purely emotional revolutionary effect conditioned by the plot and the new way of understanding its construction. For a number of reasons, dictated mainly by the material itself, it has to adhere more closely in its form to the first of these.

As far as the question of the necessity or otherwise of a script or of free montage of arbitrarily filmed material is concerned, we have to remember that a script, whether plot-based or not, is (as I wrote with reference to theatre: see *Lef*<sup>14</sup>), in our view, a prescription (or a list) of montage sequences and combinations by means of which the author intends to subject the audience to a definite series of shocks, a 'prescription' that summarises the general projected emotional effect on the audience and the pressure that will inevitably be exerted on the audience's psyche. More often than not, given our scriptwriters' utterly feeble approach to the construction of a script, this task falls in its entirety to the director. The transposition of the theme into a chain of attractions with a previously determined end effect is the definition we have given of a director's work. The presence or absence of a written script is by no means all that important. I think that, when it is a matter of operating on the audience through material that is not closely plot-based, a general scheme of reference that leads to the desired results is enough, together with a free selection of montage material based on it (the absence of such a scheme would not lead to the organisation of the material but to hopeless Impressionism around a possibly attractional theme). But, if it is carried out by means of a complex plot construction, then obviously a

detailed script is necessary. Both kinds of film have the same citizenship rights because in the final analysis we are going above all to see in *Nathan the Wise*<sup>15</sup> the amazing work of the cavalry, its jumping past the camera, exactly as we see it in Vertov's work at the Red Stadium.

Incidentally I shall touch here on one purely directorial moment in our work. When, in the process of constructing, shooting and moulding the montage elements, we are selecting the filmed fragments, we must fully recall the characteristics of cinema's effect that we stated initially and that establish the montage approach as the essential, meaningful and sole possible language of cinema, completely analogous to the role of the word in spoken material. In the selection and presentation of this material the decisive factor should be the immediacy and economy of the resources expended in the cause of associative effect.

The first practical indication that derives from this is the selection of an angle of vision for every element, conditioned exclusively by the accuracy and force of impact of the necessary presentation of this element. If the montage elements are strung together consecutively this will lead to a constant movement of the angle of vision in relation to the material being demonstrated (in itself one of the most absorbing purely cinematic possibilities).

Strictly speaking, the montage elision of one fragment into another is inadmissible: each element can most profitably be shown from just one angle and part of the film fact that proceeds from, let us say, an inserted close-up, already requires a new angle that is different from the fragment that preceded the close-up. Thus, where a tightly expounded fact is concerned, the work of the film director, as distinct from the theatre director, requires, in addition to a mastery of production (planning and acting), a repertoire of montage-calculated angles for the camera to 'capture' these elements. I almost managed to achieve this kind of montage in the fight scene in *The Strike* where the repetition of sequences was almost completely avoided.

These considerations play a decisive role in the selection of camera angles and the arrangement of the lights. No plot 'justification' for the selection of the angle of vision or the light sources is necessary. (Apart, that is, from a case where the task involves a particularly persistent emphasis on reality. For instance, *contre-jour* lighting is by no means 'justified' in American interior shots.)

On a par with the method of staging a scene and taking it with a camera there exists what I should call the Futurist method of exposition, based on the pure montage of associations and on the separate depiction of a fact: for example, the impression of that fight may be represented through the montage of the separate elements that are not joined by any logical sequence in the staging of the scene. The accumulation of the details of conflicting objects, blows, fighting methods, facial expressions and so on produces just as great an impression as the detailed investigation by the camera of all the phases in a logically unfolding process of struggle: I contrast both kinds of

montage, done separately, in the scene of the shooting. (I do not, for example, use the chain: the gun is cocked – the shot fired – the bullet strikes – the victim falls, but: the fall – the shot – the cocking – the raising of the wounded, etc.)

If we move on to the persistently posed question of the 'demonstration of real life' as such, we must point out that this particular instance of demonstration is covered by our general position on the montage of attractions: but the assertion that the essence of cinema lies only in the demonstration of real life must be called into question. It is, I think, a matter of transposing the characteristics of a '1922/3 attraction' (which was, as is always the case, a response to social aspirations – in this instance, the orientation towards 'construction' as the raw material for these aspirations and towards a 'presentation' that advertised this construction, e.g. an important event like the Agricultural Exhibition) to the entire nature of cinema as a whole. The canonisation of this material and of this approach as the only acceptable ones deprive cinema of its flexibility in relation to its broadly social tasks and, by deflecting the centre of gravity of public attention to other spheres (which is already noticeable), it leaves only a single aesthetic 'love for real life' (to what absurd lengths the game of love for 'machines' has been taken, despite the example of a very highly respected Soviet whodunit in which the cartridge-producing and dual-printing presses of the 'short film' begin to work for a mechanical conglomeration when the military chemical factory is set in motion!). Or we shall have to effect a 'revolution in the principles of cinema' when it will be a matter of a simple shift of attractions.

This is by no means a matter of trailing under the cover of 'agit tasks' elements that are formally unacceptable to, and uncharacteristic of, cinema in the same way as an incalculable amount of pulp literature, hack-work and unscrupulous behaviour in theatre is justified as agitational. I maintain my conviction that the future undoubtedly lies with the plot-less actor-less form of exposition but this future will dawn only with the advent of the conditions of social organisation that provide the opportunity for the general development and the comprehensive mastering of their nature and the application of all their energy in action, and the human race will not lack satisfaction through fictive energetic deeds, provided for it by all types of spectacle, distinguished only by the methods by which they are summoned forth. That time is still a long way off but, I repeat, we must not ignore the enormous effectiveness of the work of the model actor [*naturshchik*]<sup>16</sup> on the audience. I submit that the campaign against the model actor is caused by the negative effect of the lack of system and principle in the organisation of his work.

This 'play' is either a semi-narcotic experience with no account of time or space (and really only a little off the 'place where the camera is standing'), or a stereometric spread in three-dimensional space of the body and the extremities of the model actor in different directions, remotely recalling some forms of human action (and perceived by the audience thus: 'Aha, apparently he's

getting angry') or consecutive local contractions of facial muscles quite independent of one another and their system as a whole, which are considered as mime. Both lead to a superb division of space in the shot and the surface of the screen that follow strict rhythmic schemas, with no single 'daubing' or unfixed place. But . . . a rhythmic schema is arbitrary, it is established according to the whim or 'feeling' of the director and not according to periods dictated by the mechanical conditions of the course of a particular motor process; the disposition of the extremities (which is precisely not 'movement') is produced outside any mutual mechanical interaction such as the unified motor system of a single organism.

The audience in this kind of presentation is deprived of the emotional effect of perception which is replaced by guesswork as to what is happening. Because emotional perception is achieved through the motor reproduction of the movements of the actor by the perceiver, this kind of reproduction can only be caused by movement that adheres to the methods that it normally adheres to in nature. Because of the confirmation of the correctness of this method of influence and perception I agree in this matter (this problem has been examined and elaborated in detail in my brochure on expressive movement published by Proletkult<sup>17</sup>) even with Lipps<sup>18</sup> who cites as proof of the correctness of his investigations into the cognition of the *alter ego* the statement that (citing Bekhterev) 'the emotional understanding of the *alter ego* through the imitation of the other leads only to a tendency to experience one's own emotion of the same kind but not to a conviction that the *alter ego* exists.'

Leaving aside the last statement, which hardly concerns us, we have a very valuable confirmation of the correctness of our approach to construction, to an 'effective construction' (in the particular instance of film), according to which it is not the facts being demonstrated that are important but the combinations of the emotional reactions of the audience. It is then possible to envisage in both theory and practice a construction, with no linking plot logic, which provokes a chain of the necessary unconditioned reflexes that are, at the editor's will, associated with (compared with) predetermined phenomena and by this means to create the chain of new conditioned reflexes that these phenomena constitute. This signifies a realisation of the orientation towards thematic effect, i.e. a fulfilment of the agitational purpose.<sup>19</sup>

The circle of effective arts is closed by the open essence of the agitational spectacle and a 'union' with the primary sources is established: I think that the celebrated dances in animal skins of the primitive savages whence theatre derived' are a very reasonable institution of the ancient sorcerers directed much less towards the realisation of figurative tendencies ('for what purpose?') than towards the very precise training of the hunting and fighting instincts of the primitive audience. The refinement of imitative skill is by no means a matter of satisfying those same figurative tendencies but of counting on the maximum emotional effect on the audience. This fundamental

orientation towards the role of the audience was later forfeited in a purely formal refinement of methods and it is only now being revived to meet the concrete requirements of the day. This pure method of training the reflexes through performance effect deserves the careful consideration of people organising educational films and theatres that quite unconsciously cram children with an entirely unjustified repertoire.

### Notes

- 1 Source: 'Montazh kinoattractsionov', a typescript, dated October 1924, held in the Eisenstein archive, TsGALI, Moscow, as yet unpublished in Russian in its complete form and reproduced by kind permission of the USSR Union of Film-Makers. It has recently been discovered that a distorted version of this article was in fact published by Alexander Belenson under his own name in his *Kino segodnya, Ocherki sovetskogo kinoiskusstva (Kuleshov – Vertov – Eizenshtein)* [Cinema Today, Essays on Soviet Cinema (Kuleshov – Vertov – Eisenstein)], Moscow, 1925. In this and subsequent documents E is somewhat inconsistent in his use of the Russian equivalents of 'effect' and 'affect'. The Editor was initially tempted to improve on the original by making the English translation more systematic but ultimately felt it fairer to both E and the reader to reproduce E's usage. Both *vozdeistvie* and *effekt* are therefore translated as 'effect', *deistvennost'* as 'effectiveness' and *vozdeistvuyushchii* as 'effective', while *affekt* and *affektivnyi* are rendered as 'affect' and 'affective' respectively. The reader should however constantly bear in mind the possibility of the alternative meaning. Similarly, *sopostavlenie* has been translated as either 'comparison' or 'juxtaposition' but retains both meanings in Russian.
- 2 The Cine-Eyes (*Kinoki*, singular: *Kinoglaz*) were the documentary film-makers grouped around Dziga Vertov (pseudonym of Denis A. Kaufman, 1896–1954). The group published two major, and numerous minor, attacks on fiction film and on the concept of 'art' as a manifestation of bourgeois culture to be torn down 'like the Tower of Babel': 'We. A Version of a Manifesto' ['My. Variant manifesta'] in the Constructivist journal *Kino-Fot*, no. 1, 25–31 August 1922, pp. 11–12, and 'The Cine-Eyes. A Revolution' ['Kinoki. Perevorot'] on pp. 135–43 of the same issue of *Lef* as E's 'The Montage of Attractions'. Both Cine-Eye documents are translated in: A. Michelson (ed.), *Kino-Eye, The Writings of Dziga Vertov*, Berkeley, Calif., 1984; London, 1985, pp. 5–9, 11–21; and R. Taylor and I. Christie (eds.), *The Film Factory: Russian and Soviet Cinema in Documents*, London and Cambridge, Mass., 1987, pp. 69–72 and 89–94.
- 3 See 'The Montage of Attractions', pp. 33–38 above.
- 4 *Cine-Pravda (Kinopravda)* meaning 'Cinema Truth' and pointing the analogy with the name of the Party newspaper *Pravda*, was the name of the newsreel produced by the Cine-Eye group in twenty-three issues between June 1922 and 1925.
- 5 A direct animal audience action through a motor imitative act towards a live character like oneself, as distinct from a pale shadow on a screen. These methods of theatrical effect have been tested in my production of *Can You Hear Me Moscow?*
- 6 See 1923, n. 12.
- 7 In time (in sequence) clearly: here it plays not merely the role of an unfortunate technical condition but of a condition that is necessary for the thorough inculcation of the associations.
- 8 *Alogizm*: a neologism coined by E to denote an action or event that had no logical explanation in its particular context.

## LANGUAGE

- 9 *The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr West in the Land of the Bolsheviks* (*Neoby-chainye priklyucheniya Mistera Vesta v strane bol'shevikov*) (USSR, 1924) was directed by Lev Kuleshov (1899–1970) and satirised Western notions of the Bolsheviks. It was Kuleshov who first developed the notion of montage as the essence of cinema specificity.
- 10 And a large number of bank premises are shown first.
- 11 *Intolerance* (USA, 1916) was made by D.W. Griffith (1875–1948).
- 12 *The Palace and the Fortress* (*Dvorets i krepost'*) (USSR, 1923) was directed by Alexander V. Ivanovsky (1881–1968).
- 13 *Andrei Kozhukhov* (Russia, 1917) was directed by Yakov Protazanov after the February Revolution and starred Ivan Mosjoukine as the revolutionary Populist hero. It was still in distribution in 1924. *Stepan Khalturin* (USSR, 1925) was made by Ivanovsky.
- 14 See 'The Montage of Attractions', pp. 33–38 above.
- 15 The reference is to the play *Nathan der Weise* by the German dramatist Gottfried Ephraim Lessing (1729–81).
- 16 *Naturshchik*: a 'model' or 'mannequin', the word used by E, Kuleshov and others to denote an actor who functioned as a mere tool of the director and expressed his emotions through specific physical actions.
- 17 See 1923, n. 3.
- 18 Lipps, *Das Wissen vom fremden 'Ich'* [The Consciousness of the Alien Ego].
- 19 We must still bear in mind that in a spectacle of dramatic effect the audience is from the very first placed in a non-neutral attitude situation and sympathises with one party, identifying itself with that party's actions, while opposing itself to the other party, reacting from the very first through a *feeling of direct opposition* to its actions. The hero's anger provokes your own personal anger against his enemies; the villain's anger makes you jeer. The law of effect remains essentially the same.