



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS PRESS



UNIVERSITY
FILM & VIDEO
ASSOCIATION

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Valery S. Galovsky

Source: *Journal of the University Film and Video Association*, Vol. 34, No. 3, ACCESS TO TELEVISION (Summer 1982), pp. 61-63

Published by: [University of Illinois Press](#) on behalf of the [University Film & Video Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20686903>

Accessed: 05/02/2011 17:10

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=illinois>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Illinois Press and University Film & Video Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the University Film and Video Association*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

sheer power drives the unfeeling reporter (Kirk Douglas) to crack himself open—to care, to commit, to weep, to bleed, and, not least, to believe.

All of which is to say that, although *Dark Screen* is not the last word on *film noir* or the only word, it is the first book on the subject both definitive and provocative enough to be worth arguing with. Drawing on the seminal critical work of at least three decades, Hirsch has clearly set down the current critical con-

sensus on *noir*. Cutting through idiosyncracies to a common core, he has validated and reinforced the dominant ideas on *noir* which have emerged in every new piece. Although subsequent books on *noir* will undoubtedly quarrel with Hirsch, on this point or that, the *noir* paradigm which he has so carefully established in *Dark Screen* is likely to endure for quite some time to come.

NANCY L. STEFFEN
New Jersey Institute of Technology

Kozintsev, Grigori. *The Age and Its Conscience*. Moscow: BPSK, 1981, 301 pp., 1 ruble, 40 copecks.

Grigori Kozintsev is rather well-known as a filmmaker, both for the films which he produced in the 'twenties in collaboration with Leonid Trauberg—*The Overcoat*, *CBD* (The Club of the Big Deed), *The New Babylon*—and for his film versions of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *King Lear* in the 'sixties.

But, like other Russian directors of the older generation, Eisenstein, Pudovkin, Dovzhenko and Kuleshov, Kozintsev was not only a practicing filmmaker but also a theoretician and a writer, who considered literary activity to be an essential component of his work as an artist. His book *Our Contemporary William Shakespeare* (1962) was published in two editions in the USSR and has been translated into English. Interesting facts from the history of the Soviet cinema of the 'twenties are to be found in his book *The Deep Screen* (1971). His study *The Extent of Tragedy* (1973) was published posthumously.

The director's wife, Valentina, is in the process of editing a five-volume edition of his creative legacy (the first volume of which is expected to appear in 1982). She has also prepared the small pocket edition of his diaries which constitutes the subject of this review. Kozintsev's literary contributions are for the most part in the form of brief, nearly aphoristic, notebook entries. He recorded his thoughts on a diversity of subjects—art, a book which he had read, an interesting encounter or excursion. There are a number of such notes in *The Extent of Tragedy*. Section one of the book is devoted to his notes from the period 1966 to

1970, concerning his work on *King Lear*, the second to notes for the film *Gogoliada*, never actually produced. The third section consists of his notes on a variety of subjects.

On the cover of *The Age and its Conscience* is an epigrammatic quotation from Kozintsev: "Conscience—the main theme of the age." The period during which Kozintsev lived did in fact make particular demands on the human conscience. He writes of this era: "Ideas never expressed by art are lodged in my throat like a lump. It is nonsense to say that an artist can give expression to material of any and every sort; he can only study it and try to master it. This is why the artist is an artist, because he is able to perceive what is most important to the times (p. 8). A later quotation reads: "I am always wondering: why has it become so difficult (especially the constantly tormenting feeling that everything I do is a failure) to work? Is it that the art of the cinema has changed so much that I have been left behind?" (p. 35).

But these are thoughts and doubts of a later period. Was Kozintsev at peace with his conscience when he made the insincere film *Alone*, celebrating the happy life to come at the same time that millions of peasants were being violently exploited by the Soviet government? And when he glorified the feats of the revolutionary Maksim in *The Vyborg Side*, during the years of Stalinist terrorism—where then was the conscience of the citizen and artist Kozintsev? Through all this, Kozintsev's ideals remained unchanged. After unsuccessfully trying his hand at the biographi-

cal genre with the film *Pirogov* (1947), he remained silent for nearly a decade, and then devoted the rest of his career to making such films as *Don Quixote*, *Hamlet* and *King Lear*. Kozintsev was honest and conscientious in his social and pedagogical activities. (His disciples included Gleb Panfilov and Ilya Auerbakh.)

In *The Age and its Conscience*, Kozintsev is presented to the reader as a person well-educated and highly cultured—and that not only because of his frequent references to and citations from Picasso, Mayakovsky, Anatole France and Shakespeare. The impression derives rather from his serious and thought-provoking reflections on art. As a truly intelligent person, he does not consider it imperative for others to share his opinions. They are his own personal, often highly subjective, opinions. Thus Western art remains alien to him, and his personal affections in film do not include anyone after Chaplin and Griffith. He drops several caustic remarks on cruelty in Western film, elements alien to him in the works of Alain Resnais or Michelangelo Antonioni, but he does not force his opinions on us.

Kozintsev wondered about his profession, about the film-maker's place in art. He mused as follows:

"On my search for a path as a director.
18 years—gaily turning the movie camera.
22 years—specifics of the cinema. Style and genre. Actor.
30 years—sense.
50 years—truth It now seems to me that the best thing about being a director is the possibility for instantaneous improvisation" (p. 10).

The task of the film director is, however, to create art. Kozintsev perceived art as a mystery, as a marvel, as the constant discovery of something new. "Art," he wrote, "not only reflects the world—it inhabits it" (p. 95). This is, of course, not exactly in accord with Marxist dogma, but Kozintsev realized that art is not capable of reproducing reality, that it has a different task, a more complex and lofty assignment.

Kozintsev's interests were diverse, a diversity reflected in the world of ideas, events and encounters found in the pages of his book, where one reads of movie cassettes and recollections of "FEKS", ideas on films and encounters with Fellini and Antonioni, musings on success in the world of the cinema, and the story of how Eisenstein filmed *Ivan the Terrible*.

Of the remaining two sections, on *King Lear* and *Gogoliada*, I was particularly fascinated by notes on the film *Gogoliada*—a movie about Gogol which remained at the planning stage. It was to have been a work which would somehow return the director to the 'twenties. This is not because Kozintsev was thinking of re-making *The Overcoat*, *The Portrait*, *Nevsky Boulevard* and other works by Gogol.

Kozintsev hoped to make a film about Russia of the past and Russia of the present. "If I film *Gogoliada*, as I have recently been considering, then I must forget all associations with Hoffman or Kafka. This is above all Russian art and the topic of conversation is Russia" (p. 227). The director dreamed of making a film which would be political and contemporary, about government and artist, poet and folk, art and its customers: "The conflict traditionally found in our literature: the artist and the crowd; the poet and the rabble; the intelligentsia and society—here complicated by the motif of temptation. It is tempting to enter into service, to learn to bow (to a customer, to a critic), to sell oneself" (p. 243). Further: "A film about Russian artists. Their nocturnal conversations in the smoke" (p. 241). "The essence of Russian art (in the direction Gogol-Dostoyevsky-Meyerhold-Shostakovich) lies in the fact that by condensing life it presents an explosion, a catastrophe. *Gogoliada* is a film charged with life as with gunpowder" (p. 239). He wonders: "Should I film *The Portrait* as an internal monolog? With Gogol's ideas on art?" (p. 234).

It is interesting to note that, while planning the film as a purely Russian production, Kozintsev was constantly affected by association with Western film. He recalls Roman Polanski's films, and the American color film *Medium Cool*. ("One must be familiar with technological advances", he writes on p. 252.) He plans on inviting Toshiro Mifune to play the role of the money-lender. ("It was his eyes that Gogol was writing of.") The *Petersburg Tales* would in their screen version most closely resemble *West-Side Story*. A *Petersburg musical*" (p. 217). One can perceive the irony of the profession in his exclamation: "Again I've gotten involved in a frivolous, simple-minded production!" (p. 227). One can imagine all the complexities involved in making such a film, abounding in allusions, under conditions of total state control over art. In any case, his ideas and descriptions of the scenarios are evidence that Kozintsev was prepared to voice his condemnation of contemporary life.

In the photos present in the book, Kozintsev looks especially well at home, in the solitude of his study, against a backdrop of books. We see before us an artist, a thinker, a true member of the Russian intelligentsia. That is precisely what he was, in both life and art. "The years pass," he wrote while working on *King Lear*, "and you notice not what is to be found in the tragedy, you discover what is most important,

that it is written about you yourself. It is taken from your own life; it is not life in general, you realize, but the story of your own soul, your own lifetime. That is all that is important" (p. 182).

VALERY GOLOVSKY
University of Michigan

BOOKS RECEIVED

Böker, Carlos. *Joris Ivens, Film-Maker: Facing Reality*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982, vi + 211 pp., \$39.95.

"I intend to show the continuity of Ivens' political and social commitment, and the correspondence between his aesthetics and his politics. . . . My position is the same as the filmmaker's: aesthetic considerations are subordinate to political commitment; it is the content of the film that will dictate its form, and aesthetics can therefore never be disassociated from ideology. . . . I attempt to show how Ivens' films, with few, if any, exceptions, are dialectic statements, presented in the form of a primeval myth: the documentary is an epic in which man-the-builder is confronted by the forces of destruction, or of darkness; these can be colonialism, imperialism, or untamed nature."

Daley, Brian. *Tron*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1982, 173 pp., \$2.75 (paper).

A novelization of the screenplay by Steven Lisberger.

Eagle, Herbert. *Russian Formalist Film Theory*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1981, x + 174 pp., no price given (paper).

"The idea for a Formalist volume addressing central issues in the theory and practice of cinematic art originated with Boris Ejxenbaum in 1926 and was realized during the following year. *Poëtika kino (Poetics of Cinema)* was published in the spring of 1927 with Ejxenbaum as editor and includes articles by Ejxenbaum, Tynjanov, Kazanskiĭ, Piotrovskij, Šklovskij, and the

cinematographers Mixajlov and Moskvina. . . . Unlike the writings of the filmmaker-semioticians Kulešov, Pudovkin, and Eisenstein, *Poëtika Kino* remained largely unknown in the West. . . . In my introductory study I attempt to integrate, synthesize, and illustrate . . . the ideas originally presented in *Poëtika kino*, and demonstrate their relationship to the later writings on cinema of Eisenstein, Jakobson, Mukařovský, Lotman, and Ivanov. A final section comments on the viability of the Formalist 'film semiotics' with respect to present-day theory. There follow translations of all the articles appearing in the original *Poëtika kino*, with the exception of a brief three-page note by Šklovskij."

Fleischer, Leonore. *Annie*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1982, 151 pp., \$2.50 (paper).

A novelization of the screenplay by Carol Sobieski.

Hoban, Robert E. *Rocky III*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1982, 152 pp., \$2.75 (paper).

A novelization of the screenplay by Sylvester Stallone.

Lees, David and Berkowitz, Stan. *The Movie Business*. New York: Random House, 1981, xx + 196 pp., \$4.95 (paper).

"This book will provide you with a clear picture of the way Hollywood works. Not only will we look at how movie deals are initiated and how movies are distributed and exhibited, but we'll see what part personalities play in this highly idiosyncratic business. We have chosen to view movies mainly from the economic perspective."