

Document Citation

Title	Kino -- excerpt
Author(s)	Jay Leyda
Source	<i>George Allen & Unwin</i>
Date	1960
Type	book excerpt
Language	English
Pagination	382-383
No. of Pages	1
Subjects	
Film Subjects	Boyarskii zagovor (Ivan the Terrible, part 2), Eisenstein, Sergei, 1958 Ivan groznyi (Ivan the Terrible, part 1), Eisenstein, Sergei, 1944

Lermontov, delayed by the war beyond the anniversary year, came from Soyuzdetfilm, still at Stalinabad. The most awaited of the historical films was *Ivan the Terrible*.

Eisenstein's several aims in making *Ivan the Terrible* have continued and will continue to be defined and argued. The theories find no common ground and do little to resolve the many questions the film evokes. For years we had only three pieces of evidence—the released version of *Ivan*, Part One; the published script of the whole two-part (later three-part) film; and denunciations and rumours of the unreleased *Ivan*, Part Two. On this basis were formed the political interpretation (Ivan IV shown as a prototype of Stalin), the psychological interpretation (explored, in detail, through Chapter XV of Marie Seton's biography of Eisenstein), the artistic interpretation (usually the formal freezing of a too deliberate artist), and other theories that explore side-issues or private phobias. Now we have another important piece of evidence, the released version of *Ivan*, Part Two. (The sequences filmed for Part Three are, it sadly appears, now unrecoverable.) A last piece of evidence will, I hope, become generally available soon: Eisenstein's notes and drawings in preparing the entire work. Weighing these materials brings one to the conclusion that the best perspective on *Ivan the Terrible* is still that given by Eisenstein in an introductory article on his approach to the historical place and complex character of Ivan IV:

'And thus—concealing nothing, smoothing over nothing in the history of the actions of Ivan Grozny—detracting nothing from the formidably impressive romanticism of that splendid image of the past, it has been our wish to present it in all its integrity to the audience of the world. This image—fearful and wonderful, attracting and repelling, utterly tragic in Ivan Grozny's inner struggle along with his struggle against the enemies of his country—can be comprehensible to the man of our day.'²⁰

A reading of the whole scenario, and a viewing of both parts—the only just way to experience Eisenstein's last film—shows a scrupulous execution of this large programme that he set himself. Ivan's historical 'mission' is never lost sight of, nor are the human contradictions in his motives and behaviour, along which the main dramatic line is built. The separation of the two parts by the film's critics is a fault for which they are not entirely responsible, for Eisenstein could not have foreseen how many years would pass between the appearance of Parts One and Two. Seen together at last, the majestic, ceremonial qualities of Part One, growing more passionate towards its conclusion, are transformed into the flaming bitterness and physical violence of Part Two. The calculated stylistic growth of the whole drama could only be guessed by the disgruntled critics of Part One, including the outraged Hollywood audience at its Academy preview. To see Part Two by itself must have been equally a shock to the private political viewers in 1946—here was the intrigue and carnage of *Hamlet*'s conclusion without the preparation and artistic justification of the first two acts, or the torture and storm of *Lear* without the introductory dramatic mask of ceremony and hypocrisy that Shakespeare spent scene by scene, stripping away. If any of the Kremlin viewers

had some parallel with Stalin in mind,* or even felt the need to change the popular concept of the *Terrible*, one can imagine how personally insulting Ivan's drama appeared.

An error, possibly fatal for both the work and its creator, may have been made in the war-time decision to divide Part Two, as published, into two parts—to produce a trilogy. Several scenes planned for the original Part Two required northern exteriors (and Tisse) that could not be adapted to the studio work in Alma-Ata. (In any case, reading the published Part Two today, it is difficult to see how all its material and ideas could ever have been crowded into a film of normal length.) The resulting trilogy plan thus concluded with a Part Three of great mass movement, battle, breadth, etc., transforming the new Part Two into a purely 'interior' dramatic interlude between grander and more open sections. This doomed Part Two to a concentration on psychology and on intrigue, the most dangerous elements in any 'social' treatment of Ivan's reign.

For a project of such complex magnitude it is good to see that Eisenstein was just as intent on efficiency of schedule and budget as in the simpler *Nevskey*, regardless of the multiplied problems of filming in the Palace of Culture at Alma-Ata—possible only at night, when the munitions factories were not using the power. Within a year after its start, in April 1943, almost all of Part One was in the cutting-room, along with much of Part Two; later scenes had often been filmed out of sequence, for the benefit of the set-builders and outside demands on the actors in the cast. The photography was divided between Tisse, who took the exteriors (including the siege of Kazan, and the thrilling 'shots in depth' at the end of Part One), and Andrei Moskvín, who filmed all interiors, the larger part of the film. The colour sequences of Part Two were also filmed by Moskvín. After a generation of discreet film colour it is a new stimulation to see colour used indiscreetly, boldly, and with ideas. Like another group of instruments it heightens every purpose it is applied to, and you can almost hear Prokofiev encouraged to orchestrate for it, with the same unreal dramatic enhancement that is in the boyarina's ambitious lullaby when her exultation is suddenly supported chorally. Though the cathedral climax between the two colour passages was filmed earlier in black and white, the transitions between colour and monochrome were turned ingeniously to the film's advantage.

The tasks that Eisenstein gave to the actors caused more friction than in any of his previous experiences with trained actors, for their training had not prepared them for the heroic Elizabethan manner, the startling 'noble' style invented for *Ivan*. The staging of Shakespeare tragedy had grown increasingly realistic; the works of his more extreme contemporaries, Marlowe and Webster, impossible to play realistically, were almost unknown in the Soviet theatre (though beloved by Eisenstein); and the one Russian 'Elizabethan' drama, Pushkin's *Boris Godunov*,† was unthinkable except on a realist stage. The most resistance came from the most trained actors; up to Eisenstein's death Nikolai Cherkasov (whom I had seen

* Plays about Ivan ran into the same trouble, trying to resolve the new historical attitude to him with a minimum of blood-letting. † In his Pushkin project of 1940 Eisenstein had tackled the problem of *Boris*; a facsimile has been published (*Iskusstvo Kino*, Mar. 1959) of his plan to film Boris's monologue, in a style anticipating *Ivan*.