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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the impact of popular music and film on early Shostakovich. The relationship between this composer, popular music and film has thus far received little attention in Shostakovich Studies. Over the past decade, Shostakovich Studies has grown considerably, yet the majority of the scholarship has focused on political, social and ideological issues in his music. This thesis aims to contribute to potential future discussions of and bridge the gap between the “popular” and the “art” Shostakovich. It focuses on the finale to his Piano Concerto No.1 of 1933, which adopts the concepts and techniques of Russian film to reveal musical quotations and stylistic allusions derived from the composer’s experience with the music-hall and the cinema. His work as a “pianist-illustrator” for silent films, as well as his collaborations with contemporary Soviet film directors, shaped his musical thinking, specifically in regard to musical form. With the finale of this concerto, the composer transcended genre boundaries and redefined established compositional principles using montage in place of traditional means of musical development. He assembled musical quotations and allusions into a form that allowed these fragments to collide and flow in a temporal progression comparable to the montage editing method in early Soviet film. The “usual” musical notions (theme, rhythm, meter, instrumentation) therefore were reinvented within a new film-derived language. His immersion in popular culture and his knowledge of past “art”
music works, provided ample musical material for various quotations and stylistic allusions, which were molded into an aural montage.

The development of Shostakovich's approach is discussed through the lens of writings by Soviet directors and by the composer, while the approach itself is exemplified by diverse elements of the finale of the concerto, including presentation and interaction of themes; rhythm; pace and tempo; and instrumentation. Altogether, the finale embodies and synthesizes Shostakovich's broad and extensive experience in musical and cinematic culture of the 1920s.
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INTRODUCTION

The Piano Concerto No.1 of 1933 by Dmitri Shostakovich is a fascinating work that uses quotations, stylistic allusions to reach across perceived cultural boundaries, particularly those of "art" and "popular" music. In this document, my primary objective is to analyze the finale of the Piano Concerto No.1 in light of its musical and artistic context. By examining the work in the context of the Russian artistic, musical, cinematic and literary climate of the 1920s and early 1930s, I will show how the work incorporates features of popular music including the music-hall, operetta and jazz, and cinematic approaches to form. This examination will lead to drawing parallels between montage and other devices of film construction and the formal design of the final movement of the finale of the Piano Concerto No.1. I will also show how the finale resonates with the attitude towards culture during the 1920s and 1930s, and include a discussion of Eccentrism and of the FEKS group, a young group of filmmakers who worked with Shostakovich in the late twenties and forward; and a discussion of the "montage of attractions," a concept developed by filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein.

This document is divided into three chapters. The first chapter addresses the cinematic context of the twenties and early thirties in Russia, focusing on key filmmakers and their specific approaches to the conceptual development of montage. The second chapter addresses the musical environment in which Shostakovich matured, focusing on
the relationships between the political, social and musical aspects of Soviet life. The
chapter also contains a brief discussion of a selection of Shostakovich’s early works,
including both “art” genres and “popular” genres. The third chapter contains an analysis
of the finale of the Piano Concerto No.1 and discusses the features of the work that can
be connected to the environment discussed in chapters one and two. Chapter three
focuses on aspects such as thematic presentation and its role in the movement; musical
development of motives and themes; instrumentation and key; and the referential quality
of the quotations and stylistic allusions. The main sources that I have used for this
document are in English and provided in the bibliography as well as through footnotes
throughout the document. Some Russian articles have been consulted as well.

Why, however, is a discussion of the Piano Concerto No.1 in this context
important at all? When I first heard this work, I was dazzled by the popular sensibility
and cinematic disposition of the final movement. The musical material (i.e., themes,
rhythms, and timbre) sounded familiar, as if the elements were referencing popular music
from the early twentieth century. Combined with a cinematic organization, what seemed
to be film music devices, this musical material sounded like it belonged in a Keystone
Cops film. The other movements, although interesting, did not have the eccentric and
popular quality of the finale. These perceived popular and filmic qualities led me to
investigate the context of the finale in favor of the other movements of the concerto and
discover a new facet of Shostakovich’s personality. It was clear to me that this “other”
Shostakovich needed to be addressed.

This side of Shostakovich’s character and specifically, the Piano Concerto No.1,
has received very little attention in Shostakovich Studies. Over the past decade,
Shostakovich Studies has grown considerably, yet the majority of the scholarship has focused on political, social and ideological issues in his music. This scholarship has addressed the conceptualization of Shostakovich’s music in the context of his time and has been extremely important in understanding this one facet of his personality. Although this particular study of this facet of Shostakovich’s character and his music is remarkably profound, there is another side to his personality. This “other” Shostakovich has been appearing recently in a multitude of compact disc releases, such as *Shostakovich: Theater Music* (2001) which includes previously unreleased works such as *The Bed Bug; Shostakovich: Waltzes* (1999) which contains waltzes from various ballets and film scores; *The Golden Age*, released as a complete ballet instead of a suite (1994); *Shostakovich: The Jazz Album* (1993); and his music-hall work *Hypothetically Murdered* (1993).¹ This “popular” Shostakovich has reached international scholarship and has only recently become a topic in Western scholarship. Sources such as Tatiana Egorova’s book, *Soviet Film Music* and a few articles, mostly in Russian, on Shostakovich and his film music have been published.² Only one article, published in the West, has addressed film techniques in Shostakovich’s music as an analogous manner of constructing form in other non-film musical genres.³ Thus, the popular aspects of the *Piano Concerto No. 1* have been mostly ignored along with the potential parallels between the montage formal

---


concepts that organized both film and film music, and the formal design of the work. I hope that this examination of the finale of the Piano Concerto No.1 will contribute to recent endeavors and assist in bridging the gap between the “popular” and the “art” Shostakovich.

By examining the finale of the Piano Concerto No.1 as a popular work that uses filmic techniques, Shostakovich emerges as multi-faceted composer, who maintained interests in both the “art” and “popular” music of his youth. By including a brief discussion of film, the visual arts and theater, the connections between them can be shown as an important trend of the time. In the final sentences of his article, “The Idea of Montage in Soviet Art and Film,” David Bordwell said:

“...we need inquiries which place the history of film-making and film theory in the history of modern art as a whole; the problem is to trace both formal and stylistic similarities and precise historical relationships. In short, the history of film does not exist in pristine isolation from that of the other arts; if we are to write adequate film history, we need to study more than just film.”

I believe that the same claim needs to be made for music, whether “popular” or “art,” in Russia during the twenties and early thirties. I hope that the culturally embedded approach exemplified in this document and the attention to other arts as they relate to Shostakovich’s music will contribute to the notion that music needs to regarded as part of a larger artistic environment, whether it be “art” or “popular.”

---

CHAPTER 1
Early Soviet Cinema and Montage (c. 1900-1930)

In the early decades of the twentieth century, film and filmmaking was in its infancy, growing in some ways out of the arts that surrounded it and developing an individual consciousness. As with any burgeoning art form, film in Soviet Russia experienced many identity crises, in regard to its role, its artistic goals and its future. In this section of my thesis, I will be addressing early Soviet film and filmmaking, which will involve a discussion of the issues surrounding film in the first thirty years of the twentieth century such as cinema specificity, Eccentrism, the idea of the popular, as well as a more detailed discussion of the concepts and the theory surrounding the editing technique, montage. In doing this, I hope to provide a backdrop for the cultural climate of the twenties and thirties in Soviet Russia that will, in the end, inform Shostakovich’s own experiences as a pianist-illustrator and film composer as well as an art music composer of works such as the Piano Concerto No. 1 of 1933.

In this section, I will be primarily addressing the montage of several of the canonical filmmakers such as Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Dziga Vertov and Sergei Eisenstein. I will also move beyond the canon to discuss filmmakers from the FEKS group, especially because they had contact both with Shostakovich and some of the aforementioned filmmakers. I will compartmentalize this section by filmmaker,
providing a brief biographical background and a summary of their specific approach to montage. I will begin each section noting how each filmmaker came to be in film, which was usually via the visual arts or the theater as well as their experiences in filmmaking during the Civil War from 1918-1920 with agitational-propaganda. In some cases, especially with Vertov and Eisenstein, I will briefly mention their relationship to other contemporaneous artistic movements, such as Constructivism, Cubism and Futurism. As I mentioned earlier, I will primarily discuss the editing technique of montage, favoring it over other aspects of filmmaking such as mise en scène, acting, and shooting, since it will be the focus of my analytic discussion of the Piano Concerto No.1. I will specifically examine each filmmaker's personal as well as general approach to montage. The general definition of Soviet Russian montage is the editing of images into a whole that persuades the audience and guides it to an understanding of an ideological message. But each filmmaker had his/her own approach, whether it be a fluid narrative of images that almost seamlessly tells a story; or at the other extreme, images that are forced together in a dialectical fashion to produce shock. By illuminating these approaches to montage, the film culture from which Shostakovich emerged as a composer and avid fan will be clear, which will allow for the comparison of specific montage techniques, such as Eisenstein's "montage of attractions," to Shostakovich's own compositions.

The Beginnings of Soviet Film

In the late nineteenth century, film was simultaneously invented in several countries and was first shown publicly in Paris by the Lumière Brothers. It quickly spread internationally, including to Russia, where the French filmmakers dominated the
film industry until the early twentieth century. It was at this time that Russian
filmmakers gained control of the industry. One of the first Russian filmmakers and
producers was Alexander Drankov, who began his own studio with borrowed funds in
1907. His status and experience as the State Duma and the court photographer helped
him to establish himself as a filmmaker and to produce one of the first Russian films,
_Stenka Razin_ (1908). Drankov was among many, including Yevgeni Bauer, Yakov
Protazanov and even Vsevolod Meyerhold, to produce films before 1918.¹ Beginning in
November 1917, the Second All Russian Congress of Soviets began to move toward a
nationalization of the film industry, which resulted in the dissolution of the private film
industry in Russia. One of the first decisions that they announced was the distribution of
the American film _Intolerance_ by D.W. Griffith, which has been hailed throughout many
history textbooks and other writings as the first move towards the eventual, prevalent use
of the editing technique, montage, in Soviet film.²

Unlike his tsarist predecessor, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin strongly supported film and
the cinema, recognizing its potential for agitation and propaganda. As he reported to
Anatoli Lunacharsky, "you must well remember that, of all the arts, for us the cinema is

¹ Meyerhoﬁ actually produced two ﬁlms in the mid nineteen-teens, supposedly using the technique of
montage. Unfortunately, the reels have disappeared, which makes analysis of his approach to montage
difficult. See Neya Zorkaya, _The Illustrated History of the Soviet Cinema_ (New York: Hippocrene Books,

² The historical information on ﬁlm in Soviet Russia in this paragraph and following is taken from the
following sources: Jack Ellis, _A History of Film_ (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1979), Neya Zorkaya, _The
Kegan Paul, 1988), Thomas J. Slater, _Handbook of Soviet and East European Films and Filmmakers_ (New
York: Greenwood Press, 1992), Peter Kenez, _Cinema and Soviet Society from the Revolution to the Death
George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1960), David Bordwell and Kristen Thompson, _Film Art: An Introduction_
the most important.”

This led to his signing of the “Decree on the Transfer of the Photographic and Cinematographic Industry and Trade to the People’s Commissariat of Education” in 1917. This decree nationalized the film industry and was an attempt to allow the government to control the content of future films made in Russia. This censorship, however, limited many filmmakers. As a result, most films from the twenties and thirties dealt primarily with the subject of the Revolution and its powerful effects. Despite the censorship, Lenin’s attitude towards film boosted the industry financially, allowing producers and directors economic freedom and access to resources previously unknown.

The Civil War years following the Revolution (1918-1921) were especially difficult for the newly supported film industry. Economic hardship, famine in certain parts of the country and continuing civil warfare created an environment that was ill-suited for an emerging artistic medium. Given Lenin’s support, however, some of the first film studios and distribution centers were founded. Among them was the Moscow Institute of Cinematography, also known as the State Film School, where many directors including Sergei Eisenstein, lectured in the thirties and forties. Also the Goskino, one of the main film studios in Russia (later known as Sovkino), was established in 1925 to further establish order and to aid in distribution abroad.

While the schools and other centers for film were being established in the city, the agit-trains were touring the country. Agit-trains were trains that toured both cities and villages, filming and presenting films. The genre agitka (also referred to as agit-prop,

---

3 Leyda, 161.

4 Zorkaya, 40.
i.e., agitation-propaganda) had begun starting as early as 1914 and were film shorts, much like newsreels, that served to agitate and educate the public with the most recent propaganda. This genre became mobile in 1918, when Lenin inaugurated the first agit-train. A description from English visitor Huntly Carter depicts the various happenings on the early agit-train:

"On November 1, 1918, Lenin inaugurated the first ‘Red Train,’ which toured the towns and villages of Soviet Russia. From this ‘Red Train’ of Propaganda over 20,000 pamphlets and books were sold for ready cash in the first seven days and 60,000 educational books were distributed freely to various local Soviets. The weekly sale of Izvestia also carried on this train, increased during the same period by 10,000 copies. Twelve mass meetings were held at various stopping places. Travelling with the train were cinematograph operators taking films, and painters making sketches of the life of each town visited. The films and sketches were exchanges in order to acquaint the people of the various districts with each other’s mode of life, habits, and dress." ⁵

This agit-prop was also transferred to other vehicles (there were also agit-steamboats) to spread the Bolshevik word across Russia. These agit-prop productions continued well into the 1920s, and often served as an introduction to film for many new, budding directors. Two of the more famous directors from the twenties that were part of the agit-prop productions early on were Lev Kuleshov and Dziga Vertov. Both of these directors spent considerable time on the agit-trains, which had a decisive influence on the film of the 1920s.

Despite the successful production and distribution of the agitki, the film industry experienced hardship as the result of the Civil War. With the New Economic Policy in 1921, however, there began a restoration of the film industry. The main objective was to create a self-supporting industry. Lunacharsky, the People’s Commissariat for Enlightenment, suggested that audiences be drawn in to the theaters with “entertaining”

⁵ Leyda, 138.
films, the profits of which would fund propagandistic newsreels. Lunacharsky was also, however, fighting against a public that much preferred to watch foreign movies with Charlie Chaplin, Mary Pickford or Douglas Fairbanks. In fact American films were preferred over native films, even the films we know today as “classics,” such as Eisenstein’s *Battleship Potemkin*. The emphasis on the propagandistic and the political eventually prevailed: by 1928, the first Five-Year Plan was initiated, which turned the role of the cinema towards political tasks. The March 1928 Party Conference on Cinema outlined the responsibilities of the cinema, leading to a complete reorganization of the industry by 1930.

**Film Style of the 1920s**

As I have mentioned earlier, there were a myriad of distinct film styles and approaches to montage that emerged in the twenties from each of the canonical directors, as well as the FEKS group. The directors that I will discuss in this section will include: Lev Kuleshov, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Dziga Vertov, Sergei Eisenstein, and FEKS (Grigori Kozintsev, Leonid Trauberg and Sergei Yutkevich). I will not address every individual that had an influence on early Soviet filmmaking in the twenties and thirties. I will however, provide a discussion of each of the aforementioned directors in the context of their time, as well as a specific discussion of their approaches to montage. I will also show how these directors are not just individuals, separate and autonomous; they are part of a constantly shifting context. I will include a discussion of the various “trends” or ideas that permeated the times, and I will illustrate the connections between these directors in the development of and execution of their ideas.
In some histories of early Russian film, certain authors address the notion that two separate trends emerged in early cinema. Simply, they have been referred to as the right and left wings, although, "the labels weren’t essentially political." The right wing continued the theatrical tradition, "using the conventional methods and styles but substituting commissars, peasants and Red Army soldiers for the upper-class cast of characters of traditional theater." The plots were concerned with issues involving the "new state," and continually addressed the sociological problems that later ensued, "with greater sophistication." The right wing eventually became the only sanctioned approach after the advent of socialist realism in the 1930s.

The left wing, however, was more radical and concerned not only with subject, but with form as well. Certain directors have been considered more leftist than others. Vertov, in various histories, is often seen as the director on the fringe and the most experimental, due to his "pure" documentary approach and insistence on the importance of editing. Kuleshov and Eisenstein was also very concerned with editing, but also focused on other aspects such as mise en scène. Pudovkin was more focused on acting than his contemporaries, but still advocated the importance of montage, while FEKS tended to follow in the footsteps of their friend, Eisenstein. Essentially, most of the canonical directors were situated further to the left, than right. These distinctions

---

6 See Ellis and Leyda as extensive examples of this approach to history.

7 Ellis, 116.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid.

10 Ellis, 116.
however, are somewhat artificial when one considers the context of each director, as I will in the following sections.

**Lev Kuleshov (1899-1970)**

Lev Kuleshov is known not only as one of the first directors in Russian history, but also as a writer, teacher, theorist and thinker. He has had an indisputable influence on twentieth century Soviet and Russian film, and claimed that over fifty percent of the students since 1920 had been his own.\(^{11}\) He took great pride in teaching and considered it more important than producing films. Two of his more famous students, Eisenstein and Pudovkin, dominated most of the film industry in the twenties, thirties and forties, with approaches that both exemplified and departed from their teacher’s own film style. Kuleshov’s early experiments with montage marked the beginning of the Soviet fascination with film editing and his writings fueled further interest and discovery in film art.

Kuleshov had his first break into the film industry as a stage-designing assistant for Yevgeni Bauer, a well-known pre-revolutionary director. Working in Bauer’s studio, Kuleshov produced his first film in 1917, *The Project of Engineer Prite*, before the Revolution. After fighting for the Red Army during the Revolution, Kuleshov was dispatched to the Eastern Front to work on the agit-trains. In May 1920, he began teaching at the newly founded State Film School, where he was granted his own workshop known as the Creative Arts Workshop within the school. Here Kuleshov produced *On the Red Front* (1920) a documentary of the war, where he continued to

---

develop his ideas on editing principles, primarily montage, and gathered a team of students that would later assist him with his future films.

In his interviews, Kuleshov states that his interest in montage began in 1917, as evidenced in his first film, *The Project of Engineer Prite*, as well as in a series of articles on montage and cinema. During the war, 1918-1920, he practiced the montage that he started to develop in *The Project of Engineer Prite* “without film.” This involved analyzing and re-cutting existing films and rearranging the different scenes to create multiple outcomes and meanings. His next film, *On the Red Front*, continued the experimentation with montage in his studio, although betraying some influence of Griffith’s *Intolerance*, which had premiered in Russia in 1917. In the early 1920s, there was a film stock shortage as a result of the famine across the Soviet Union and the blockade of imported goods from the West. The Kuleshov studio had little new film stock to work with, which resulted in the “films without films.” These “films without films” were short études where a variety of shots (long, medium and close up) would be assembled in montage. Kuleshov and his studio continued to practice in this manner until the effects of the NEP finally surfaced in 1923.

---


14 Kuleshov, 66.
The Kuleshovian Montage

Within Kuleshov's approach to cinematography exist several elements that contribute to the creation of a film. First, and most importantly for Kuleshov, is montage and the creative control that a director has over the raw material. Second, there is the role of the actor. Kuleshov was one of the first to rebel against the theatrical tradition of acting in films and instead preferred to use people that were generally untrained as "models," or in essence, "types." Third, there is the construction of the scene, or "mise en scène." Kuleshov expressed a particular interest in lighting and also in using natural backgrounds as opposed to the studio backgrounds. Of these three aspects of Kuleshov's film style, I will focus specifically on the idea of montage and its development under Kuleshov.

Coming from the French word monter, montage is the art of assembling a variety of shots, scenes or sequences to create a new meaning.\(15\) This definition is deceptively simple, however. Montage is not only an editing principle that engaged many of the earlier film directors in the Soviet Union, but also a whole concept that constitutes the absolute core of early Soviet filmmaking. Montage as a concept began in the Soviet Union with Kuleshov and was immortalized in his films, writings, theories and most importantly, his students. Previously, montage had been used in American films and according to Kuleshov, in Russian literature as well. He states:

\[\text{\footnotesize\ }\]

“First was the films of Griffith, and the American cinema of that period, so different from the Russian cinema of Tsarist times...I was always struck by the reaction of audiences to American films. The reaction was violent, and showed how much the audience was carried away by the film, the extent to which they lived the action on the screen. I thought a lot about this and arrived at the conclusion that the power of this cinema lay in the montage and on the use of close-ups, methods which were never used by the Russian film-makers. This was the first influence on me.

The second was Russian literature. Two men. And above all, Leo Tolstoy. In my book, Fundamentals of cinema mise en scène I quote a letter in which Tolstoy speaks of montage, calling it 'connection.' He says astonishing things without knowing anything about the cinema, for the very good reason that the cinema did not exist at the time this letter was written. Yet the whole construction of Tolstoy's work is extremely 'montagist.' Pushkin, too, uses montage. You can take any poem by Pushkin, number the shots, and you have a true cinema decoupage, ready to shoot just as it is.”

Every director that followed Kuleshov, many of which were his students, continued the development of this principle throughout their own careers in the twenties, thirties and forties. Although his students developed their own film styles and approaches to montage, they nevertheless deem their teacher the innovator of “Russian montage.”

In his Art of the Cinema (1929), Kuleshov proclaimed, “Montage is the organization of cinematic material.” Although this appears to be a simple proclamation, it has many implications of the role of the director, the cameraman and the actor when creating a film. For Kuleshov, the most important aspect of filmmaking is the editing and the organization of the material to create a specific context. Kuleshov states:

“Separate shots of cinema film constitute cinematic material... For the present we are working on a method of organizing the given material, that is, in montage, since montage is the main source of the power of cinematic effectiveness. That effect is evident only in cinematography and the optimum impression is attained only through the montage, when that montage is not merely of ordinary scenes, but of scenes filmed by the American method of shooting, that is, employing scenes in which every given sequence shows what is essential for the viewer to perceive, and shows them in the closest and clearest shots possible.”

16 Kuleshov, 71. Also, this issue of the “American” in Russian culture will be a point I pursue further later in this thesis.

17 “Russian montage” is the montage that the world eventually associated with early Soviet film. Kuleshov initially referred to it as “American montage,” which was essentially the montage style of Griffith-like films involving rapid cutting and frequent close-ups. See Kuleshov on Film: Writings by Lev Kuleshov, ed. Ronald Levaco (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 4.

18 Kuleshov, Kuleshov On Film, 50.
It was through his early experimentation with montage and the “films without films” that led Kuleshov to move from his initial etudes, to the “artificial landscape” also known as “creative geography.” In a 1965 interview, Kuleshov describes his first discovery of “artificial landscape:”

“Let us suppose that in a certain place we are photographing a certain object. Then, in a quite different place, we film people looking at this object. We edit the whole thing, alternating the image of the object and the image of the people who are looking at it. In The Project of Engineer Prije, I show people looking at electric pylons in this way. It was thus that I made an accidental discovery: thanks to montage it is possible to create, so to speak, a new geography; a new place of action. It is possible to create in this way new relations between the objects, the nature, the people and the progress of the film.”

This is primarily the type of montage for which Kuleshov is known. Often described as the “Kuleshov effect,” or as a “brick by brick montage,” this montage is designed to narrate a part of a story. The images are put together to create a specific narrative that the director intends. The result therefore is that the story of the film is told neither in the acting or the mise en scène, but in the editing. As Pudovkin has said, “Film-art begins from the moment when the director begins to combine and join together the various pieces of the film.”

In another famous example of the “Kuleshov effect” involving the actor Ivan Mozhukin, Kuleshov demonstrates how the context given by the arrangements of the shots, as opposed to the acting, affects the perceived meaning of the scene.

---

19 Kuleshov, *Cinema in Revolution*, 68.

20 The term “Kuleshov effect” can be found in most common histories on early Soviet film. The term “brick by brick” is mainly found in Leyda, *Kino*, 211-212.

21 Vsevolod Pudovkin, *Film Technique*, (London: George Newnes, Ltd., 1933), 139.
"In the second experiment...[Pudovkin] and Kuleshov selected some closeups of the Russian actor Ivan Mozhukhin. They were static, neutral shots, Mozhukhin's face expressing no particular emotion. Those shots were then intercut with closeups of other material. First was a bowl of soup standing on a table; it seemed quite obvious that Mozhukhin was looking at the soup. The actor's face was followed by shots showing a coffin in which lay a dead woman. In the third instance the face was followed by a shot of a little girl playing with a funny toy bear. When the three combinations were shown without explanation to an audience what was the result? The audience raved about Mozhukhin's acting! They pointed out the heavy pensiveness of the mood created as he regarded the forgotten bowl of soup, the deep grief expressed as he looked at the dead woman, the light, happy smile that played across his face as he gazed at the little girl. In all three cases, of course, Mozhukhin's facial expression has been virtually the same, and expressing very little at that."

Thus, the arrangement of shots in montage can change meaning of the narrative depending upon the surrounding shots. The context arises from the juxtaposition of these images, not the individual images themselves. Montage therefore is not only a technique, but an artistic means that strives to manipulate audience perception to create a cinematic reality.

During the teens and twenties, Kuleshov constantly tried to establish the cinema as an art separate from the other arts, including theater. Previous to this time, the public and the government considered film either a novelty or a tool for propaganda. The idea that fiction film, despite its revolutionary leanings, could be regarded as “art” was certainly new and hardly acceptable. This prevalent attitude could explain the focus of some of Kuleshov's articles from this time. In his 1917 article, "The Tasks of the Artist in the Cinema," for example, Kuleshov emphasizes the differences between painting, theater and cinema. Specifically outlining the role of the actor and the construction of the mise en scène by the artist (in this case, lighting, color and line), Kuleshov describes

---

22 Ellis, 128-129. Also in Pudovkin, 140-141.

an approach to the cinema that is specifically geared for film, not theater. At one point he states that the mise en scène artist must drop his formal training, knowing that, “his canvas is the film camera’s 35 degree angle of perception, like a triangle on a plan.”24 He continues further asserting that, “This is their principal task, which artists who have come from the stage or from a painter’s studio find difficult to appreciate.”25 Kuleshov observed that the film lens perceives the filmed object differently than an audience watching theater. He states, “There is a great difference between the perception of the place of action by a theater audience and by the film camera. The theater public sees the stage from many points in the auditorium but the camera sees it only from the single point of the lens.”26 Implicitly, this allows the director final control over the filmed material and allows him complete control over what the audience will see and most likely, perceive. Therefore, it is necessary, as Kuleshov has outlined in this article, to have a specifically film-oriented approach to technical matters such as mise en scène or acting. Kuleshov thus separates film from the other visual arts and because of its specific needs and its potential for “new paths,” hails it as the most “powerful of the arts.”27

Furthering some of the more implicit ideas in his 1917 article, in his “The Art of the Cinema,” Kuleshov specifically addresses how the cinema is an art.28 Succinctly, he


26 Ibid.


seems to shout from the page that the art of the cinema lies in its “specificity.” He states in a rather modernist fashion:

“Our art is abused for its cinema specificity [kinematografichnost’]. ‘You are not always literary! You are not theatrical! The whole point of cinema lies in its great degree of cinematic specificity. Actors, directors, artists, inscribe your banner in clear letters: the idea of cinema is the cinematic idea.”

So what is the cinematic idea? For Kuleshov, the cinematic idea is the specific quality of the cinema that no other art has: the possibility of projecting depth with a flat screen, and the use of montage. For film, “the method of expressing an artistic idea is provided by the rhythmical succession of individual still frames or short sequences conveying movement – that is technically known as montage.”

Taking the relationship between the arts further, he states, “Montage is to cinema what color composition is to painting or a harmonic sequence of sounds is to music.” Hence, the cinema is an art because it has separate needs and functions from the other arts, as demonstrated by the editing technique, montage. Since no other art is capable of something such as montage, the cinema is therefore justifiably an “art.”

There are several aspects of Kuleshov’s filmmaking that include montage, mise en scène and acting. However, there is another issue interwoven with the idea of

29 Ibid., 45.

30 Ibid., 46.

31 Ibid.

32 Although acting and mise en scène have not been addressed in this thesis, I do want mention the notion of “models” or “types,” with which Kuleshov was greatly concerned. His notions of selecting an actor based on how s/he physically fit the role of the character was something that Eisenstein adopted as “typage” later on. See Kuleshov, Kuleshov On Film, 55-67 and 99-115 and Lev Kuleshov, “Art, Contemporary Life and Cinema,” The Film Factory: Russian and Soviet Cinema in Documents 1896-1939, ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988), for more information on his notions of “models” and “type.”
montage: Americanism. Although mainly limited to his early years in filmmaking, Kuleshov was completely enamoured of American films, especially detective pictures. In his article, “Americanism” (1922), Kuleshov praises American films for their naturalness, their economy of time and space and most importantly for their use of montage. Using the American detective film as his prime example, Kuleshov draws a comparison to the Russian psychological film (i.e., films that are based on the traditional, theatrical dramatic methods), calling for a recognition of what he later deems “American shots,” or shots that uses time and space with economy in montage.

“If we study American films and juxtapose our observations with the results of the unsuccessful attempts to achieve greater ‘cinema specificity’ and not a reproduction of ‘theatricality’ in films by using the well-known methods of our Russian directors, we cannot fail to appreciate the particularly strong impression left by films that are consciously composed of combinations of a series of rapidly changing scenes. Cinema is not able to register every individual scene (or fragment). The method of transcending cinematic raw material, the essence of cinema, lies in composition, the change from one filmed fragment to another.”

Kuleshov’s call for things American was not uncommon for the time. During the twenties, Russian culture was absorbing American culture, mainly including film and music, which became reflected in their own art. American popular music was rampant, and movies mocking capitalist society were not unusual. Kuleshov saw Americanism, specifically the American cinematic art form, as positive and useful. The appropriation of American culture became a powerful trend in the twenties and even the thirties. As I will demonstrate later, it was important in the musical scene as well.

---


34 See Kuleshov’s own Mr. West in the Land of the Bohheviks (1924) as an example of commentary on American society.

35 Kuleshov, “Americanism,” 73.
As a theorist, teacher and director, Kuleshov was in part responsible for the beginnings of early Soviet film. He developed innovative approaches to montage, mise en scène and the role of the actor that laid the foundation for future development by his students, including Pudovkin and Eisenstein. Montage also raised the issue of cultural difference and the notion of the popular in regard to Americanism, which also became involved in future theories espoused by his students. In many ways, Kuleshov was every Russian film director’s teacher. As his main supporters and former students have said: “We make films – Kuleshov made cinematography.”

Vsevolod Pudovkin (1893-1953)

Before entering the film industry, Vsevolod Pudovkin studied physics, chemistry and mathematics at the Physics and Mathematical Faculty at the Moscow University. He then served in the army in the teens, before returning to Moscow in 1918. After seeing Griffith’s *Intolerance* in 1919, he became interested in acting, and began work as one of Kuleshov’s actors in his studio. In 1922, he entered the State Film School and continued to work with Kuleshov as an actor, designer, writer and editor on films such as *Mr. West in the Land of the Bolsheviks* (1924) and *The Death Ray* (1925). In 1925, he directed his first film, *The Mechanics of the Brain*, a scientific documentary based on Ivan Pavlov’s experiments with conditioned reflexes. Around this time he also produced *Chess Fever*, a two-part comedy that used shots from a chess tournament intermingled with preplanned, acted out scenes. In these two films, Pudovkin began some of his first experiments with montage and rhythm. His most famous films, known for his particular brand of montage
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36 Pudovkin, Obolenski, Komarov, Fogel, “Foreword” to the *Art of Cinema*, 41 in *Kuleshov on Film.*
followed this time: *Mother*, (1926) based on a novel by Maxim Gorky, *The End of St. Petersburg* (1927) and *Storm Over Asia* (1928). In 1930, Pudovkin collaborated with Eisenstein and Alexandrov on a manifesto on the coming of sound cinema. After experimenting with sound in the early thirties, he produced his first sound film, *Deserter* (1933). At this time, Pudovkin fell into disfavor along with others, including Eisenstein, but produced eleven films before he died in 1953.

**Pudovkin and Montage**

As a student of Kuleshov, Pudovkin continued experimenting in the various aspects of filmmaking that Kuleshov had begun: editing (montage), *mise en scène* and acting. In some ways, Pudovkin’s approach to montage was fluid and narrative, as was Kuleshov’s approach. He aims to tell a certain story according to the arrangement of the shots. With *mise en scène*, Pudovkin paid extraordinary attention to the use of space and line in composition. It was with the role of the actor that Pudovkin made his strongest break with Kuleshov.

Although Kuleshov has given specific attention to the role of the actor in his films, the actor was schooled in a “non-artificial” manner that Kuleshov thought was appropriate for film, which in the end was eventually manipulated by the director-editor by montage. Pudovkin on the other hand, preferred to rely more on the actors and generally supported the theatrical approach to acting in his films. Pudovkin referred to Kuleshov’s approach to film acting as the “direction of actors as ‘purely mechanical mimicry.’”

In his film *Mother*, for example, Pudovkin used professional actors from

---

37Kenez, 194.
the Moscow Art Theater, who were trained in the Stanislavsky tradition of naturalism.\textsuperscript{38} Using theater actors in a film and relying on their skills as theater actors instead of focusing upon the role of the director is something Kuleshov would be vehemently against. Pudovkin did, however, mesh some of Kuleshov’s ideas with his own. Although considerably more subtle, Pudovkin did use a kind of “typage,” the idea of using an actor based on appearances. In \textit{Mother}, Pudovkin draws attention to the enemies of the main revolutionary characters by implicating them as “animals.” In one scene, the factory’s “black guards” are discussing how they will crush the revolutionaries, while disgustingly devouring fish. In another scene, during the trial of the main revolutionary character, the tsarist judge pays more attention to his pet horse, even drawing a picture during the trial, instead of being concerned with the accused at hand.\textsuperscript{39} In some ways, Pudovkin relies less on the “type” of person and concentrates more on the acting. He therefore creates a fusion of typage with the traditional training of his professional actors that in addition to \textit{Mother}, can also be seen in his last silent film, \textit{Storm Over Asia}.\textsuperscript{40}

At times, the emotional state of a character in his films would be illustrated in symbolism. Sometimes objects would represent the emotions, or the events in a certain character’s situation, as seen in \textit{Mother}, where shots of the grieving mother as she sits next to her dead husband are interwoven with shots of water dripping into a pan in the


\textsuperscript{39} Slater, 9.

\textsuperscript{40} Also, it should be mentioned that many authors seem to use the words “model” and “typage” interchangeably. Whether they intend the Kuleshovian model to be equivalent to the Eisensteinian typage is unclear. See also Herbert Marshall, \textit{Masters of the Soviet Cinema: Crippled Creative Biographies} (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983).
corner. Often the symbol would be the main focus of the frame that would be manipulated by montage, as in the case of *Mother*. The result is a symbolic representation of a character (and his emotional state), combined with the fluid narrativity one might expect from a Kuleshov film, with the editing technique of montage. Thus, many authors use the terms, “poetic,” or “prosaic,” to describe Pudovkin’s nuanced move between narrative fluidity and symbolic montage.\footnote{For such terms see Leyda, Marshall, and Zorkaya to name a few.} These terms “poetic” and “prosaic,” first appeared in a famous quote from Victor Shklovsky, where he described Pudovkin’s film *Mother* as, “a peculiar sort of centaur, altogether a centaur – the queer animal starts out as prose with expository subtitles that gets in the way of the images, and ends up as absolutely formal poetry.”\footnote{Leyda, 212. Originally from *Poetics of the Cinema* (1927) by Victor Shklovsky.} It seems that this is a combination of the symbolic and the narrative: the poetic montage structure that Pudovkin uses illustrates certain points in his film, cutting between the symbol and the object it symbolizes. In *Mother*, this poetic approach happens often, especially in the last section of the film, where Pudovkin cuts between the building revolt of the people and the coming together of streams to form a river in spring. This image of linking the land with the people began earlier, in a scene where Pavel reads a letter about his impending escape. At the moment he realizes he will be free, Pudovkin intercuts scenes of breaking ice on a river in early spring and a laughing child. These two examples of montage are essentially “poetic” in the sense that they are more abstract and symbolic.\footnote{Also, in *Mother*, Pudovkin arranged the action of the film according to sonata form (allegro-adagio-allegro-presto). Pudovkin has an innate sense of tempo and rhythm in his filmmaking, which I will elaborate upon more later. See Leyda, 207.} The narrative approach is essentially prosaic: it is
more fluid and less abstract than the poetic approach. It uses montage in a way that appears more fluid, similar to Kuleshov's "brick by brick" approach. The poetic approach surfaced in the thirties as "intellectual," after the notions that Eisenstein espoused in the twenties had been discredited.

All the directors discussed here had their own distinct approach to montage. As we have seen, Kuleshov used his montage is a more narrative fashion, either to link places or people within the time and space of cinematic reality, and also to create new meanings and ideas that arise form the alternation of certain images.

Pudovkin however, tried to separate himself from his teacher and his colleagues.

"In that picture [Mother] first of all tried to keep as far away as I could from Eisenstein and from much that Kuleshov had taught me. I did not see how it was possible for me to limit myself, with my organic need for inner emotions, to the dry form which Kuleshov preached...I had a strong instinctive inclination for living people whom I wanted to photograph and whose soul I wanted to fathom, just as Eisenstein had fathomed the soul of his Battleship Potemkin." \(^{44}\)

In addition to being described as "poetic," "lyrical," sometimes Pudovkin's brand of montage is referred to as "associative."\(^{45}\) These terms are linked to shooting, but are often used in reference to montage. Pudovkin's associative montage is created by linking shots that are related, but neither shocking or entirely fluid. This editing is therefore referred to as "associative," because of the associative relationship between the shots. In some ways, Pudovkin's montage falls between the "shock" montage of Eisenstein and the fluid editing of Kuleshov.\(^{46}\)

\(^{44}\) Leyda, 209.

\(^{45}\) See Leyda, Zorkaya.

\(^{46}\) I will talk more about Eisenstein's "shock" montage later.
Pudovkin’s “associative” approach to montage was observed by his contemporaries as well. In his Film Form, Eisenstein states:

“In front of me lies a crumpled yellowed sheet of paper. On it is a mysterious note:

‘Linkage – P’ and ‘Collision – E’

This is a substantial trace of a heated bout in the subject of montage between P (Pudovkin) and E (myself)...This has become a habit. At regular intervals he visits me late at night and behind closed doors we wrangle over matters of principle. A graduate of the Kuleshov school, he loudly defends an understanding of montage as a linkage of pieces. Into a chain. Again, “Bricks.” Bricks, arranged in series to expound an idea...I confronted him with my viewpoint on montage as a collision. A view that from the collision of two given factors arises a concept.” 47

Here, Eisenstein summarizes the differences between himself and Pudovkin, and illuminates the idea that Pudovkin is “poetic.” According to Eisenstein, Pudovkin uses montage as “linkage,” as in opposition to Eisenstein’s “shock” montage. This “linkage” that Eisenstein identifies in Pudovkin’s films is yet another description of Pudovkin’s “poetic” or “associative” style of montage.

Another development in montage that involves Pudovkin is the debate over sound film. The advent of sound film in the U.S. in 1927 with The Jazz Singer awakened other countries to the possibility of a film with added sound. This was especially problematic for montage cinema, since the power of montage in silent film relies upon visual articulations through the assembly of the shots. The addition of sound posed a threat to the primarily visual nature of Soviet film. In 1928, a group of directors including Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Alexandrov wrote “Statement on Sound” addressing the

possible approaches to sound in Soviet film. Although embracing the advent of sound, they assert that Soviet filmmakers are not technically prepared for sound. Asserting that montage is the heart of cinema, the authors outline ideas and approaches to the integration of sound in film that will eventually be employed in their own future films. First, if sound is used in film, it should not be theatrical (i.e., sound accompanying a filmed drama) or include every sound that a shot contains in a montage sequence. If every naturally made sound of a montage sequence were lumped together in the same time that the sequence occurred, it would create chaos and also betray the theory of montage, which juxtaposes or alternates fragments to form a whole. The authors instead suggested that sound be used contrapuntally with the images, which would result in, “the creation of a new orchestral counterpoint of visual and sound images.” This evocation of musical terminology with film suggests that the authors had their own ideas on how musical sound, whether it be an orchestral score, or piano accompaniment, could relate to image. In an article entitled, “Sound Film,” by Vladimir Messman published approximately one month after the “Statement on Sound” in 1928, the notions of musicality and the film composer were addressed in relation to the concept of montage. Messman strongly asserts that although they may be musically intuitive, Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Alexandrov need to pay close attention to how to synchronize sound with the image, with the help of a film composer. Messman claims that these directors construct their montage films based on, “intuition, with no regard for the laws of rhythm,

48 Russia did not have the means for sound film until the early 1930s. In fact, Vertov’s Enthusiasm was the first film to employ sound. See Leyda for further information.

tempo and metre.” This statement of course reflects Messman’s own opinion, and can be strongly contested, at least with Pudovkin’s and Eisenstein’s work. Both of these directors were ardent lovers of music and approached their work “musically.”

In Deserter (1933), Pudovkin paid very close attention to rhythm and sound.

“In the first reel of Deserter I have a meeting addressed by three persons one after the other, each producing a complexity of reactions in their audience. Each one is against the other two; sometimes a member of the crowd interrupts a speaker, sometimes two or three of the crowd have a moments’ discussion among themselves...

I sought to compose these elements by the system of montage. I took sound strips and cut, for example, for a word of a speaker broken in half by an interruption, for the interrupter in turn overswept by the tide of noise coming from the crowd, for the speaker audible again, and so on. Every sound was individually cut and the images associated are sometimes much shorter than the associated sound piece...Sometimes I have cut the general crowd noises into the phrases with scissors, and I have found that with an arrangement of the various sounds by cutting in this way it is possible to create a clear and definite, almost musical rhythm...”

This attention to the montage of sound is something that very few directors had experimented with prior to 1933. This approach also echoes Messman’s own call for a “montage score.”

“We are rationalising the organisation of our films and we shall significantly improve their artistic value (including their montage texture) when the production of a film has not just an author’s and a director’s script but an exemplary montage plan, a montage score. From this a straight path leads to an organic composition of visual and sound images.”

Despite his contempt for the authors’ assumed lack of musicality, Messman does point out an interesting idea: the organic composition of visual and sound images. His idea of
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50 Pudovkin, for example, structured his film Mother after the form and tempo structure of sonata form.

51 Leyda, 295-296. See also Vsevolod Pudovkin, “Rhythmic Problems in My First Sound Film,” Film Technique (London: Geogre Newnes, Ltd., 1933).

52 Vertov’s Enthusiasm (1931) experimented with this montage approach to sound, which resembles Pudovkin’s discussion cited in footnote 51.

53 Messman, 235.
a “montage score” underlies the notion that the organization of musical sound could be linked with images to complement the physicality and the psychology of the action. In essence, this article is an indication that in 1928, the concept of musical sound in cinema is not just musical accompaniment to an image, but the fusion of the visual and the aural as one.

Dziga Vertov (1896-1954)

Dziga Vertov (also known as Denis Kaufman) is considered the foremost director of documentary film in Russia. Similar to many directors he had artistic beginnings: he studied music and wrote science fiction earlier in his life, and became significantly influenced by the Futurist movement from 1914-1916, which led him to change his name from Denis Kaufman to Dziga Vertov.\textsuperscript{54} In 1916-1917, Vertov studied medicine in St. Petersburg, while at the same time beginning his experiments with verbal montage structure with sound recording and assemblage.\textsuperscript{55} He later studied at the Neurological Institute in Moscow, which he later left to work on the agit-trains in 1918. Later that year, he established, directed and edited the \textit{Kinonedelia}, the new Soviet newsreel, producing over thirty issues, as well as \textit{Kino-Pravda}, the primary periodical report or “film journal” of the nation between 1922-1925. In 1922, as a member of the “Council of Three,” he established the “Kinoki” or the Kino-Eyes.\textsuperscript{56} This group co-authored manifestoes, such as \textit{We: A Version of a Manifesto} and \textit{The Kino-Eyes. A Revolution},


\textsuperscript{55} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{56} The group included Vertov, Elizaveta Svilova, Ilya Kopalin, Boris Kudinov, P. Zотов, I. Bushkin and Mikhail Kaufman.
which among other things, addressed the supremacy of the film camera, or the machine 

eye.

"...I am the eye of the cinema. I am a mechanical eye. I am a machine. And show the world as only I see 
it. 
...I am continual motion. I come up close to the objects, and I move away. I crawl under them, and I leap 
atop of them. I trot beside the muzzle of a running horse, and I cut full speed into a crowd. I run ahead of 
attacking soldiers. I fall over onto my back, and I rise up into the air along with the airplanes. Up and 
down I go, up and down. My road leads to a fresh perception of the world. I uncode an unknown world 
and do it in a way that is absolutely new."  

Vertov believed in the idea of "life caught unawares," a phrase that has practically 
become a slogan, representative of Vertov and his documentary approach to cinema. 

Vertov's desire for this kind of 'truth' and realism in his shooting has been described as 
kino-pravda, known in later international cinema as cinéma verité. He strongly believed 
that cinema should not be staged, acted or directed, as one would see in films by 
Kuleshov, Pudovkin or Eisenstein, but instead should observe "non-played" reality – life 
running its natural course. Vertov detested the Russian psychological film school, the 
acting style associated with that school as well as any other theatrical or artistic tradition. 
Similar to Kuleshov, he desired cinema specificity, focusing on the qualities specific to 
film and not to past traditions. He considered himself an extreme leftist, but did not 
formally belong to the Left Front. Vertov celebrated the supremacy of the machine, and 
the editing control of the director, linking him to art movements associated with the Left 
such as Futurism and Constructivism.

Vertov's work was always considered experimental and more extreme than that of 
his contemporaries. He spent the majority of his life producing newsreels and

---

57 Zorkaya, 55. Original source in Russian.
documentary style cinema using montage, a technique common to many directors at the time. Similar to many others of his time, he was persecuted and generally forgotten about in the thirties and forties for his experimental style and lack of interest in fiction film.

**Vertovian Montage**

For Vertov, the only creative control that a director should have is the choice of what should be filmed in its natural setting and how to edit the film after it has been collected. Since Vertov chose to shoot “truth,” he believed that the majority of the director’s control and artistry lies in the editing of the film and not in mise en scène and shooting. Montage therefore became the central element in Vertov’s technique. Vertov’s brand of montage, similar to his contemporaries, is tightly interwoven with his political ideology as well as contemporaneous artistic movements such as Futurism, Constructivism and Cubism. Vertov sought after a film style that would reject the entertainment aspect of fiction films and reflect high art but also fill the needs of a revolutionary cinema. He wanted to create a cinematic reality where the “kino-eye” catches more than the human eye could comprehend. He essentially “quotes” moments from life that he assembles into a new, poetic reality that can only be captured by the camera.
Kinoglaz or kinooko. Hence the kinoglazovtsy or kinoks. The kinoks' primer gives a short definition of kino-eye with the formula: "kino-eye = the kino recording of facts."

Kino-eye = kino seeing (I see through the camera) + kino-writing (write on film with the camera) + kino-organization (I edit).

The kino-eye method is the scientifically experimental method of exploring the visible world –
a. based on the systematic recording on film of facts from life;
b. based on the systematic organization of the documentary material recorded on film.58

Thus, Vertov's kino-eye, as he states further, is, "the documentary cinematic decoding of both the visible world and that which is invisible to the naked eye."59 His 'quotes' from reality, formed by montage, are thematic instead of plot-based and work upon dichotomies (city vs. country, sleeping vs. waking). He claims that the "kino-eye plunges into the seeming chaos of life to find in life itself the response to an assigned theme."60 He assembles these thematic pieces using montage to organize real life into a cinematic reality normally unavailable to humans. He strove to, "organize the film pieces wrested from life into a meaningful rhythmic visual order, a meaningful visual phrase, an essence of "I see.""61 His shooting, coupled with his montage therefore creates a new truth or reality that exists only with the help of the kino-eye. Continuing his description of the role of the kino-eye, he states:

"Kino-eye uses every possible means in montage, comparing and linking all points of the universe in any temporal order, breaking when necessary, all the laws and conventions of film construction."62

58 Vertov, Kino-Eye, 87.
59 Ibid.
60 Vertov, Kino-Eye, 88.
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid.
In some ways, Vertov’s writings reveal that he had something in common with Kuleshov. Vertov’s constructed reality, allowed by the superiority of the kino-eye, can consist of multiple temporalities and spaces similar to Kuleshov’s geographical approach to montage known as the “Kuleshov effect.” For Vertov, the kino-eye, “means the conquest of space, the visual linkage of people throughout the entire world based on the continuous exchange of visible fact...”\textsuperscript{63} This dominance of multiple spaces and times is part of the alternate yet ‘truthful’ reality that Vertov creates in his films. In essence, both kino-eye based shooting and montage come together to produce Vertov’s own sense of propagandistic truth in his films and documentaries.

Another aspect that informs Vertov’s technique was his futuristic worship of the machine. His insistence on the power of the kino-eye over the human eye to capture and recreate a truthful reality was linked to the Vertov’s perceived perfection of the machine. In his \textit{We...}, Vertov held a utopian ideal that people could be perfected through the machine, claiming that “Our path – \textit{from a bumbling citizen through the poetry of the machine to the perfect electric man}.” Viewing his films therefore would not only be propaganda, but also artistically reflective of its time. Vertov’s obsession with the perfecting qualities of the machine, and his montagist, fragmentary, “non-plot” and “non-played” approach to cinema reflects both Constructivism and Cubism.

Another aspect of Vertov’s montage and shooting style is rhythm and pace. In his \textit{We...}, he states that:

“Cine-Eye is the art of organising the necessary movements of the objects in space and time into a rhythmic artistic whole, in accordance with the characteristics of the whole and the internal rhythm of each object.”

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid.
Throughout *We...*, Vertov uses terminology reminiscent of music and the other arts. Similar to Pudovkin, he emphasizes meter, tempo and movement, even going as far as to discuss interval and phrase, as organizational components of shooting and inevitably montage. As hinted at earlier, Vertov sought to construct a kind of “film poem” from the order of movements within a shot organized by montage. This approach can also be described as quotation (shooting) and placement (editing), which, as I will explore later, is also found in music. In essence, Vertov’s construction of his kino-reality is a visual collage of his perception of truth in life. As seen with Pudovkin, and will be especially apparent with Eisenstein, film directors of this time often used musical terminology and concepts as well as poetic descriptors to evoke their pictorial ideas.

Although the bulk of Vertov’s films were mainly newsreels such as *Kinonedelia* and *Kino Pravda*, he did produce films in a documentary style. His *Man with a Movie Camera* (1928) exemplifies the kino-eye as well as the combination of his use of montage, revolutionary ideals and artistic drive. The primary goal of this film is to present the world through the kino-eye, calling attention to the power and potential of the camera and of the director to manipulate the viewer. Vertov does this through editing and a variety of special effects, including stop-motion cinematography, superimposition and split screen. Within the layers of montage, Vertov uses these special effects to self-consciously depict the camera as instrument and observer of the loosely related themes of daily life. Examples include a scene where he superimposes images of dancers and a pianist to convey the idea of sound and the final frame, where a human eye is superimposed over a camera lens, hence emphasizing Vertov’s “kino-eye” staring back at
the viewer. He also uses special effects such as pixillation to show a camera moving on its own – crawling out of its box and hopping up onto a tripod.64

The use of these techniques not only draws attention to the camera itself, but also reflects certain artistic movements and revolutionary thought of the time. Vertov’s obsession with the machine can be considered Futurist, especially given his particular leanings toward the movement earlier in his life. The Cubist aspect can be seen in the editing and montage. The whole idea of cutting and pasting images together is inherently cubistic, as well as superimposition and the layering of images atop each other. The association of Vertov with Constructivism is a highly debated one, but can be generally summarized as follows:

“Vertov’s disdain of the mimetic, his concern with technique and process, their extensions and disclosure, stamp him as a member of the constructivist generation. He shares with them an ideological concern with the role of art as an agent of human perfectibility, a belief in social transformation as the means for producing a transformation of consciousness and a certainty of ascension to a “world of naked truth,” paradoxically grounding his creed in the acceptance and affirmation of the radically synthetic film technique of montage.”65

Essentially, Vertov’s love of “fact instead of fiction” film, his exploitation of the film camera as a “modern” object and the articulation of his ideas through manifestoes and other writings reveals his connections to Constructivism. In many ways, Constructivism has its roots in Cubism. In praise of the cubist and revolutionary qualities of the Monument to the Third International, one author claims that,

64 The observations of the human eye superimposition and the “dancing tripod” not just my own, but also belong to David Bordwell. See David Bordwell and Kristen Thompson, Film Art: An Introduction (New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc., 1997), 415-420.

65 Michelson, Kino-Eye, xxv.
"...Receiving and diffusing bulletins and directives, distributing manifestos, projecting film, broadcasting news, inscribing weather forecasts in light upon the heavens, the tower was based upon the cubist formula just as Vertov’s master film – multiple, polyvalent, contrapuntal in its structure, celebrating the turning wheels of industry – was grounded in the technique of montage."

The comparison of Vertov’s montage with the “cubist formula” of Tatlin’s work, underlies the idea that montage is inherently cubist, “multiple, polyvalent and contrapuntal.”

Vertov’s revolutionary ideals continued into the thirties, where he began to experiment with sound film. He produced three films: Enthusiasm (1930), Three Songs for Lenin (1930) and Lullaby (1934), all of which set new standards in documentary filmmaking. In some ways, these films show a move away from the more strict documentary style that Vertov claimed in his earlier films. Three Songs for Lenin, designed as a tribute to Vertov’s favorite leader, was entirely acted and planned, yet still filmed using montage. Vertov most of his contemporaries, Vertov embraced sound film, regarding it as an opportunity for a new layer of montage. Quite dissimilar to Eisenstein, Vertov concentrated more on the aural version of the kino-eye, known as “radio-eye.” While Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Alexandrov called for a contrapuntal correlation of sound and image, Vertov was less concerned with counterpoint, but instead with applying the “non-played” aspect of montage from the silent film of the twenties, to sound film, thus coining a new, yet old term, “non-played sound.” In his ‘The Radio Eye’s March” (1930), he states:

---

66 Michelson, Kino-Eye, xxxiii.

67 Ibid.
"To a question on the role of sound in documentary film we recently replied:

...that neither correspondence nor non-correspondence between what is seen and what is heard is by any means necessary for either documentary or played films;

that sound shots are edited on the same bases as silent shots: they may correspond or not correspond in the montage or they may be interwoven one with another in various appropriate combinations;...

Vertov was striving for sound film where sound would not be rigidly confined to one doctrine. Generally however, Vertov wanted sound to be “documentary” the “radio-eye” that reproduced sound in the same fashion as the kino-eye, recording natural sounds, but organizing them in a manner suggested above, either corresponding or not corresponding to the visual montage. Natural, on-location sounds were as important to Vertov as “life caught unawares” was to the visual. One of Vertov’s most famous sound clips is from Enthusiasm (1930), a film that just began to experiment with sound. Vertov was interested in correlating sound and image, as he demonstrated in an interview with a woman in close-up, where he aligned the accompanying sound with the “montage and narration rhythm.” Also within this film, Vertov experimented with what could be called one of the first “montage scores.” The opening sequence of the film not only juxtaposes images but different excerpts of sound, taken from folk song, chant and other pre-composed works. With Enthusiasm, Vertov was thus one of the first filmmakers to experiment with montage in sound.

In all, Vertov’s film style and approach to montage is experimental, extreme and closely allied with current modernist artistic movements. Although the content of his films is revolutionary, and he uses montage as a guiding principle in his work, he is

---

68 Zorkaya, 62.
separated from his contemporaries by his extremism and intolerance for any past artistic traditions. He was the first major documentary director and producer in Russia, and his staunch support of non-fiction film certainly revolutionized Soviet and later international cinema.

Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948)

Of the film directors in Russia in the twenties, thirties and forties, Sergei Eisenstein is the most celebrated and debated. As with some of his contemporaries such as Vertov, he was a thinker, writer as well as a director and polymath. He had wide-ranging interests in a variety of cultures and their approach to the arts, which he constantly applied to his current artistic goal. Throughout his childhood he traveled extensively with his parents throughout Europe and mastered several languages including French, Italian and German. In his youth he also nurtured a love for the circus and for theater.⁶⁹ In 1918, he joined the Red Army to provide drawings and decorations as well as to organize theatrical productions for the agit-trains. After returning to Moscow in 1919, he studied Japanese at the General Staff Academy, beginning a lifelong and significant involvement with Japanese culture. He eventually left the Academy to work for the Proletkult Central Worker’s Theater as a scenic designer and director of workshops.⁷⁰ This particular branch of Proletkult (Moscow) tended to be more avant-


⁷⁰ “Proletkult (the Proletarian Culture movement) had been founded in early 1917 by the philosopher Alexander Bogdanov. Taking up suggestions in the Marxist classics, he advocated the development of a distinctly proletarian art that would replace that of the declining bourgeoisie. Bogdanov asserted that art would play a central role in Communist society by organizing experience into emotional, often utopian ‘images.’” Taken from Bordwell, Cinema of Eisenstein, 2-3.
garde than other branches and served in some ways as an introduction to avant-garde culture. Within a workshop of this theater, Eisenstein worked with Nicolai Foregger, where he learned about commedia dell’arte techniques. He was also introduced to Constructivist theater through Boris Arvatov, with whom he collaborated with on several Proletkult productions. Around this time, he was also introduced to Vsevolod Meyerhold, who significantly influenced Eisenstein’s film style.\(^7\) A few years later in 1921, Eisenstein enrolled in Meyerhold’s State Higher Directing Workshop, studying performance and production methods as well as scenic design. After a year, Meyerhold dismissed Eisenstein from the workshop, claiming that Eisenstein had outgrown him. Eisenstein worked with Meyerhold as an assistant director thereafter. According to Bordwell,

Eisenstein’s belief in controlling the spectator through the performer’s bodily virtuosity; his emphasis on rhythm and pantomime; his interest in Asian theater, the circus and the grotesque; even his 1930s attempt to create a curriculum in which film directors would undergo stringent physical and cultural training – all were initiated or strengthened by the association with Meyerhold.\(^8\)

Eisenstein also befriended several other influential people throughout the twenties. Grigory Alexandrov, a colleague who worked with Eisenstein at the Proletkult theater, later became an important collaborator and co-producer. Sergei Yutkevich, a member and founder of the FEKS group (The Factory of the Eccentric Actor), accompanied Eisenstein to American movies and worked with him on several productions. In 1922, Eisenstein and Yutkevich collaborated on an article that addressed

\(^7\) Meyerhold was a significant figure in experimental theater in the teens and twenties in Russia, who worked with both Eisenstein and Shostakovich.

\(^8\) Bordwell, 4.
the Eccentrism of the “American detective adventure comedy film” as a style of film.73 Around the same time of this article, Meyerhold produced works such as Magnanimous Cuckold and Tareikin’s Death that operated on the ideas of Eccentrism. Bordwell describes these theater productions and later film productions as “emblematic of “Eccentrism,” a performance style mixing grotesque clownishness with mechanized acrobatic stunts in the manner of American cinema.”74 From these connections and experience, Eisenstein began his lifelong preoccupation with montage and specifically the “montage of attractions.” Yutkevich was also instrumental in introducing Eisenstein to the other members of the Leningrad FEKS group, Grigory Kozintsev and Leonid Trauberg, directors who later worked with Shostakovich.

In addition to his connections with Meyerhold and the FEKS group, Eisenstein also associated with the Left Front through a fellow Proletkult member, Sergei Tretyakov. Through him, Eisenstein was exposed to the most recent artistic and ideological trends, including futurism, constructivism and productivism. Later, Eisenstein worked with Tretyakov on The Wiseman (1923), Eisenstein’s first major production, where he employed his theory of the “montage of attractions.” In an article published by Tretyakov to promote the play, Eisenstein describes the “montage of attractions” as an assembling of moments of shock or surprise, usually consisting of circus stunts or other stunts grotesquely expressive of certain emotions. This also led to another collaboration with Tretyakov, where they created a theory of “Expressive


74 Bordwell, 5.
Movement.” This theory, similar to Meyerhold’s experiments with biomechanics, essentially strove to integrate mechanical movements with organic ones to produce a theater- or film-specific emotionally expressive movement.75

After briefly working in Kuleshov’s workshop from 1922-23, Eisenstein began work on his first film, Strike (1924). This film ushered in Eisenstein’s film career and ended his theatrical one. Nonetheless, Strike does exhibit elements from his previous theater works; there are aspects of clownishness and circus elements (acrobatic fights) as well as grotesque depictions of villains compared to the realistic portrayal of workers. This film, like many of his to follow, is based on a proletarian theme, emphasizing the same revolutionary ideology as that of Vertov. In his “The Problem of the Materialist Approach to Film” (1925), an article concurrently released with the film, Eisenstein attacks Vertov’s “pure” documentary approach and calls for a more dynamic, forceful and unashamedly artistic presentation of propagandistic films. Through this article, Eisenstein supports the influence of the theater and culture that penetrates the overall aesthetic and political sense of Strike.

Eisenstein produced three more silent films before he began experimenting with sound: the famous Battleship Potemkin (1925), October (1927) and The Old and the New (1930). In Battleship Potemkin, Eisenstein applies his “montage of attractions” and experiments with typage, a technique cultivated of his knowledge from the commedia dell’arte tradition. With October, he continues to develop his theories of montage and also, through contemporaneous articles, ascribe and develop a “language” for film. This experimentation continues into The Old and the New, where Eisenstein continued to

75 This discussion is a summary of Bordwell, The Cinema of Eisenstein, 5-7.
establish new montage types. Each of these films was accompanied by several articles published by Eisenstein, which acted as guide to and commentaries on the new versions of montage that he was developing. The concept and the technique of montage was a constantly evolving and changing idea for Eisenstein throughout his life.

With the first “talkie” in the U.S., The Jazz Singer of 1927, an international debate and discussion was furthered, centering around the usage of sound in cinema. Certain factions within Russia were specific in their approach to sound. In a well-known 1929 article “Statement on Sound,” Eisenstein, Alexandrov and Pudovkin called for the acceptance of sound on the grounds that it be contrapuntally aligned with images. Deemed “audio-visual counterpoint” (again, note the usage of musical terminology!), the three authors, and most importantly Eisenstein, believed that sound should complement, not conflict with the image. This approach manifested itself in both Pudovkin’s films as previously discussed and in Eisenstein’s films from the thirties and especially the forties.

Before experimenting with sound however, Eisenstein left Russia for the U.S. and Mexico to produce Hollywood-sponsored films. He returned in 1932 to a less friendly environment, during the advent of socialist realism and the beginnings of the attacks on specific artists from the realms of music, film and literature. Several years after returning to Russia, and having produced no new films, Eisenstein was attacked as a “formalist” for his experimental film language and his perceived lack of ability to produce any more films. Shortly thereafter, Eisenstein set to work on Bezhin Meadow (1935), where he first experimented with his ideas of audio-visual counterpoint as well as attempts at begin socialist realist. As was fairly common at the time, the film was attacked for being “anti-
artistic and politically unsound." Treading more carefully in this political arena, he took the idea for his next film, *Alexander Nevsky* (1938), from a suggestion given to him by Shumyatsky, the person mainly responsible for the attack on *Bezhin Meadow*. Unlike *Bezhin Meadow*, *Alexander Nevsky* was enormously successful and Eisenstein gained favor with the government.

While continuing to write articles and returning to work in the theater, Eisenstein embarked on his last film, *Ivan the Terrible*, in 1941. As with *Nevsky*, the idea for a film about *Ivan the Terrible* was offered by an official, in this case, Andrei Zhdanov. Although the film was originally conceived in three parts, Eisenstein only finished the first, which was well-received, and the second, which had to be refilmed according to Stalin’s order. Unfortunately, Eisenstein died before he could refilm the second or attempt to create the third section.

**Eisensteinian Montage**

Of all the montage types in Russia at this time, Eisenstein’s was most widely known. Similar to his colleagues, his film style was tightly interwoven with his political ideology and artistic trends of his time. Each of his films had an underlying pro-Soviet theme and was generally intent on assuaging the viewer into a state of fervent faith in the Soviet cause through the use of montage. Beginning in the twenties, Eisenstein began developing and evolving his ideas of montage and using his films as testing

---

grounds for his theories. In the mid to late twenties, Eisenstein began to discuss montage as part of a film language, consisting of several components.\textsuperscript{77} In \textit{The Cinema of Eisenstein} Bordwell explains this desire for a film language as part of the idea of the “psycho-engineer” — one that engineers a language that presents and imposes a concrete idea.\textsuperscript{78} Eisenstein’s goal was to rouse his audience’s pro-revolutionary leanings and convince them of a particular ideal or point through a persuasive and psychologically manipulative film language. As a result, montage, as a central component of this film language, was carefully planned with specific ideological goals in mind.

Although closely tied up with his political goals, Eisenstein was intent on producing art that was socially functional, as opposed to the functional “non-art” of Vertov’s films. Starting in the twenties, Eisenstein began to develop his theories of montage into greater, more varying types. Beginning with the “montage of attractions,” he eventually codified several other types of montage through various articles and films. By the thirties and forties, he began to employ his theories and continue developing them up through his final film, \textit{Ivan the Terrible}. In this sense, Eisenstein’s montage theory and practice is thus described as evolutionary.

As many scholars have explained, it is remarkably difficult, if not sometimes impossible to categorize and typify Eisenstein’s montage over several decades.\textsuperscript{79} Relying primarily on Eisenstein’s articles, I will briefly outline the major points of his montage in the twenties and thirties, beginning with the “montage of attractions.” Although

\textsuperscript{77} With film language I mean the use of certain techniques, such as montage, in a fashion that resembles the structure of grammar in language. See Bordwell, \textit{The Cinema of Eisenstein}, 5, 35-36, 132-133.

\textsuperscript{78} Bordwell, 5.

\textsuperscript{79} See Bordwell, 132-133.
Eisenstein’s montage types of the late thirties and forties grew out of his twenties-era montage types, I will not discuss them here because they do not concern Shostakovich and the Piano Concerto No. 1.

**Montage of Attractions**

The montage of attractions is the earliest and most famous montage type associated with Eisenstein. In two articles from early in his career, Eisenstein discussed in full detail what first, defined the montage of attractions and, shortly thereafter, the montage of film attractions.⁸⁰ His first article, “The Montage of Attractions” (1923), was released as a promotional piece for Eisenstein’s theatrical debut, *Enough Simplicity for Every Wiseman*, known in his version simply as *The Wiseman*. Eisenstein’s co-producer of this theater piece, his colleague and connection to *LEF* (the Left Front) was Sergei Tretyakov, the main promoter of the play, who published Eisenstein’s article in *LEF* as a manifesto of ideas employed in *The Wiseman*. Together, he and Eisenstein worked on many productions, perfecting their ideas about “expressive movement” in acting (a combination of mechanical and naturalistic performance), Eccentrism (a performance style cultivated by Meyerhold and later by the FEKS group consisting of Kozinstev, Yukevich and Trauberg), and the “montage of attractions.” Eisenstein defines the “montage of attractions,” also known as shock montage, as:

---

⁸⁰ See “The Montage of Attractions” (1923) and “The Montage of Film Attractions” (1924). Both of these can be found in many anthologies of Eisenstein’s writings, including *S.M. Eisenstein: Selected Works, Volume 1: Writings: 1922-34*, edited and translated by Richard Taylor and *The Eisenstein Reader*, edited by Richard Taylor, translated by Richard Taylor and William Powell.
"An attraction (in our diagnosis of theatre) is any aggressive movement in theatre, i.e., any element of it that subjects the audience to emotional or psychological influence, verified by experience and mathematically calculated to produce specific emotional shocks in the spectator in their proper order within the whole. These shocks provide the only opportunity of perceiving the ideological aspect of what is being shown, the final ideological conclusion." 

Essentially, the montage of attractions is the assembling of attractions into a whole to create a specific final theatrical effect. These “shocks” or attractions are derived from the circus and the music hall, and are essentially vaudevillian in style. Eisenstein states:

"The school for the montageur is cinema and principally, music hall and circus because (from the point of view of form) putting on a good show means constructing a strong music-hall/circus programme that derives from the situations found in the play that is taken as a basis." 

_The Wiseman_ was a string of variety acts, loosely held together by a plot, instead of a play with occasional “eccentric” decoration. This type of montage is therefore firmly rooted in the Eccentrism trend at the time, and later extended to Shostakovich as well.

As Eisenstein claims in the above quote, “the school for the montageur is the cinema,” thus emphasizing the importance of the cinema over theater. Shortly after his production of _The Wiseman_ and several other theatrical productions that explored Meyerholdian approaches to the theater and the use of the commedia dell’arte, Eisenstein produced _Strike_ (1924), his first film experiment with the montage of attractions.

Another article, “The Montage of Film Attractions,” appeared the same year, further defining the montage of attractions for the cinema and using _Strike_ as its premiere

---


82 Ibid., 88. This also echoes Shostakovich claim that the circus and music hall are examples of a particular kind of discipline. I will discuss this in further detail later.
example. Retaining the ideas of the Eccentric, *Strike* contains, “elements of the grotesque,” that, in Eisenstein’s mind, play on the psyche of the audience quite differently from theater. Instead of viewing an actually occurring fact, the cinema 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.

Montage of attractions in film is therefore “chains of associations that are linked to a particular phenomenon in the mind of a particular audience.” This montage is designed, as in the theatrical version, to provoke and shock the audience to get a specific reaction. Using *Strike* as his example, full of instances of the montage of attractions, Eisenstein describes a sequence in a detailed list form to illustrate the elements of contrast and association between ideas. In this case, he compares a mass of strikers to a bull, both of which are attacked, cornered and slaughtered accordingly. This comparison is also known as “associational,” which achieves the effect of horror, revulsion and shock, as the director intended. Thus, Eisenstein’s “montage of attractions” creates a certain dissonance and tension from the juxtaposition of associational yet separate fragments.

---

83 Bordwell, 61.


86 The relationship between the notion of the montage of attractions and contemporaneous artistic movements such as cubism and constructivism have been addressed in film literature, specifically the connection between cubist forms and Eisenstein’s montage. See Bordwell, *The Cinema of Eisenstein* and for constructivism related to the montage of Vertov, see the introduction to *Kino-Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov*. 
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Eisenstein also addresses other aspects of montage in this article in a somewhat Kuleshovian fashion. For at least a paragraph, Eisenstein takes a moment to emphasize the importance of American filmmaking and its approach to form, generally citing American detective films and comedies as well as the films of D.W. Griffith. This supports the conclusion that Russian montage is heavily dependent upon American films of the twenties, extending Kuleshov’s call for the “Americanism” previously discussed. He also addresses acting, and the role of content within a montage fragment. Acting, as well as mise en scène and lighting, play a part on the overall rhythm of the frame, which in turn becomes part of a whole montage sequence. This concern for rhythm and the desire for associational montage provides a foundation from which Eisenstein will continue to build in his later writings and films.

Eisenstein’s desire to continually develop his ideas in theory and set them into practice either at the same time or later, has been described by Bordwell as “technē,” a term coined by Aristotle for, “the unity of theory and practice within skilled activity.” Following his articles on the montage of attractions in film and theater, Eisenstein exemplified his technē approach in his two well-known articles, “Beyond the Shot” (1929), the “Dramaturgy of Film Form” (1929), and “The Fourth Dimension in Cinema” (1929). Within these articles, Eisenstein demonstrated a concern for the development of a specific language for film as a separate “art,” setting out to create a typology and set of definitions that would further define the function and development of montage in Soviet cinema.

---

87 Bordwell, 35.
In “Beyond the Shot,” and “The Dramaturgy of Film Form,” he discusses many facets of semantics, logic, dialectics and visual esthetics in relation to montage. Stating outright that montage is an element of “Japanese representational culture,” and the Japanese ideogram, Eisenstein presents a discussion of Japanese culture and hieroglyphic writing that he claims is relevant to Soviet montage. For Eisenstein, a concept is created out of the juxtaposition of two Japanese ideograms.

“But in my view montage is not an idea composed of successive shots stuck together but an idea that DERIVES from the collision between two shots that are independent of one another (the ‘dramatic’ principle). (‘Epic’ and ‘dramatic’ in relation to the methodology of form and not content or plot!!) As in Japanese hieroglyphics in which two independent ideographic characters (‘shots’) are juxtaposed and explode into a concept. THUS:

Eye + Water = Crying
Door + Ear = Eavesdropping
Child + Mouth = Screaming...”

It is not at all surprising that Eisenstein would use the Japanese ideogram as an analogous example for his notions of montage, given Eisenstein’s wide interest in the art and language of other cultures. This interest continued to permeate his ideas and allowed him to draw connections between Russian and other cultures throughout his life. These connections always supported the underlying assertion that his montage, unlike the more fluid and smoothly narrative montage style of Kuleshov and Pudovkin, involved conflict.

---


and juxtaposition, that would create other realities, images or concepts in the viewer’s mind. This idea of conflict had political implications and was always present in his discussion of montage from this point forward, and was evidently practiced within his films.

This interest in juxtaposing opposites to create an outcome has its roots in dialectical thought of his time. Eisenstein coined this new montage, “dialectical,” based on the Hegelian dialectic of thesis + antithesis = synthesis. Arising from his studies of Engel, Hegel and Lenin’s writings, Eisenstein sought to apply the dialectic to film and image. Unlike his contemporaries Kuleshov and Pudovkin, who link a series of shots together for fluidity, Eisenstein says that montage creates a synthetic concept derived from conflicting, successive shots. A series of images, like the aforementioned Japanese ideographic characters, should be juxtaposed, from which would arise a concept that is created only in the viewer’s mind. This dialecticism continues into his next article, “The Fourth Dimension of Cinema,” where he builds upon the dialectical idea and further delineates categories of montage.

Perhaps the most interesting and certainly most typological article by Eisenstein from the twenties is “The Fourth Dimension of Cinema” (1929). Continuing where he left off in previous articles such as the “Dramaturgy of Film Form,” Eisenstein further outlines his “film syntax,” designating several types of montage that he had practiced in his films. This article was his first to directly address montage as an evolutionary concept and introduce the montage type, “overtonal.” He begins by defining (in a typical

---

91 See page 21 of this chapter, where I quoted Eisenstein’s opinion of Kuleshov’s and Pudovkin’s montage from “Beyond the Shot.” This view of his contemporaries complements the above quote, reasserting how his montage is essentially more cinema-specific and relevant.
Eisensteinian cryptic manner) overtonal montage and then provides a history of the various montages he had used to date that led up to and would continue to be a part of overtonal montage. For Eisenstein, at this time, montage can either have a dominant idea or sign that prevails in the montage sequence, or a combined series of dominants, that essentially acts as equals, complementing a general dominant. Eisenstein deemed the first type tonal montage, while the second was overtonal. Thus, overtonal montage is, “In a word a whole complex of secondary stimulants [that] always accompanies the central stimulant.”\(^{92}\) Eisenstein compares this definition to music (hence the term overtonal), stating that “This is precisely what happens in acoustics (in the particular instance of instrumental music). There, alongside the resonance of the basic dominant tone, there is a whole series of secondary resonances, the so-called overtones and undertones.”\(^{93}\) Eisenstein further states that overtones and overtonal montage can therefore be “physiological” as opposed to “classical,” affecting the listener on an emotional and psychological level. To Eisenstein, the overtonal is the fourth dimension of cinema: a dimension not sketched out in the statics of a shot or in a score, but seen or heard when the thing is performed. Although abstract, Eisenstein ends finally by addressing the issue of sound and cinema, declaring that sound and cinema exist in the same dimension, both physiological. In a famous quote Eisenstein states: “For the musical overtones (a beat)


\(^{93}\) Ibid.
the term ‘I hear’ is no longer strictly appropriate. Nor ‘I see’ for the visual. For both we introduce a new uniform formula: ‘I feel.’”

In addition to the definition of this new montage type, “overtonal,” Eisenstein also defines his previous montage types, outlining their basic traits thoroughly and clearly. Building upon his rhythmic/graphic montage types discussed in his “Beyond the Shot,” Eisenstein clearly defines metric, rhythmic, tonal, overtonal and intellectual montage. Metric montage is based on “the absolute length of the shots, which are joined together according to their lengths in a formula-scheme. These shots can be organized into musical time signatures, if appropriate. Rhythmic montage is a type where the content of the shot equals the physical length of the shot. Tonal montage is essentially an impressionistic measurement of shot, or the dominant emotion that is central to the shot. Eisenstein says achieves this dominant emotion through lighting or mise en scène. Intellectual montage is a continuation of overtonal montage that affects the perception or the mind of the viewer. Eisenstein opposes it to metric, rhythmic or even overtonal montage, which as part of his definition, can only affect the viewer on a emotional-physical level (like tapping one’s foot or swaying to a certain rhythm).

In addition to these types of montage, several other kinds emerged: associative, harmonic, vertical and polyphonic montage. The first two of these montages were in

94 Ibid., 184. This approach to the unification of sound and image foreshadows his future discussion of vertical and polyphonic montage types in the late thirties and forties.

95 Eisenstein provides examples of “four time, march-time and waltz-time (3:4, 2:4, 1:4, etc.),” citing other directors, such as Kuleshov. As an example of metric montage, he describes the lezginka dancing sequence from October, where the length of the shots coordinate with the rhythm of the dance. See page 184.

96 An example of this is seen in the Odessa Steps sequence from Battleship Potemkin, where the soldiers are marching down the steps, with their feet are not entirely in sync with the editing, creating new and
Eisenstein's "The Fourth Dimension in Cinema," while the last two were explained in articles from the late thirties and forties. 97 Though usually relevant to a discussion of Eisenstein, these montage types are beyond the scope of my thesis.

It can be said that Eisenstein was prolific writer and was dedicated to creating a typology for film; to create a film language for filmmakers as well as define and analyze his own works. Montage for Eisenstein was a constantly changing concept that sprouted from its foundations in theater and popular culture in the twenties, into a technique that encapsulated and resonated with the other arts, including painting, poetry, literature and music. His approaches and his theories echo and resonate with other artists and filmmaker of his time, and contribute the overall image and definition of early Soviet montage.

FEKS (Factory of the Eccentric Actor)

Contemporary with Eisenstein and Pudovkin, were the members of a group later known as the Factory of the Eccentric Actor (FEKS). These members included Sergei Yutkevich, Grigory Kozintsev and Leonid Trauberg. Each of these directors had contact with the other directors of the time, including Eisenstein and Meyerhold. Yutkevich especially was well acquainted with Eisenstein, frequenting many movie theaters and

popular shows with him. It was in fact Yutkevich who introduced Eisenstein to the other members of FEKS, which began a long held respect, and to some degree imitation of, Eisenstein’s film style.

The FEKS group was founded in 1921, with the intention of reinventing the socialist theater with the use of principles derived from the circus and vaudeville. Each of its members had been involved in the theater or in the visual arts before creating this group, and many of their experiences within the modernist art and theater circle in both Moscow and Petersburg were represented in some form in their later films. All three of these people had close ties with the popular culture of the twenties and formed many friendships with other prominent directors as well as composers.

Eccentrism was a trend initiated by the FEKS group in 1922 with their Eccentric Manifesto. This series of statements, presented in a series of advertising posters representative of the time, defined the “Eccentric” in opposition to “high” art and culture. It praised the beauty of many aspects of American culture, including detective novels, dance fads (the foxtrot, etc), jazz, the advertising poster and popular film. They cruelly and bluntly denounced the aesthetic value of the major art trends of the time such as Expressionism and Cubism. They claimed, in a poster-like fashion:

"Life requires art that is hyperbolically crude, dumbfounding, nerve-wracking, openly utilitarian, mechanically exact, momentary, rapid, otherwise no-one will hear, see or stop. Everything adds up to this: the art of the 20th century, the art of 1922, the art of this very moment is Eccentrism."


They also expressed the value of youth over age, underlying a rather modernist rebellion against past traditions and past representatives of those traditions. Citing Mark Twain, they claim, “Better to be young pup than an old bird of paradise.”

Importantly as well, they emphasized the superiority of American culture, specifically citing America on several occasions as the technological innovator and the producer of modern art. In one section of the manifesto, they list the “new” (and hence young!) versions of the “art of today:”

“In literature – the chansonnière, the cry of the auctioneer, street language. In painting – the circus poster, the jacket of a cheap novel. In music – the jazz band (the commotion of a negro orchestra), circus marches. In ballet – American song and dance routines. In theatre – the music-hall, cinema, circus, café-chantant, boxing.”

FEKS was declaring war on the past traditions of art, and welcoming the “hyperbolically crude” as the new culture. Although not an author to this manifesto, Eisenstein, held interests in American culture and incorporated them into his eventual definition of the “montage of attractions” from 1925, with the help of Sergei Yutkevich.

In a recollection, “Teenage Artists of the Revolution,” Yutkevich describes the environment of the twenties, his involvement with FEKS and with Eisenstein. In a nearly chronological fashion, he describes how he frequented many popular theaters, witnessed many mass street spectacles and attended American pop films, especially those including Charlie Chaplin. For him, the elements of what would later become Eccentrism belonged

---

100 Kozintsev, Trauberg, Yutkevich, Kryzhitsky, 58.

101 Kozintsev, Trauberg, Yutkevich, Kryzhitsky, 59.
to the new, young generation: the music hall, circus, and American comedies. In his recollection, he describes the beginnings of Eccentrism and its reason for being:

"The reason is that in its search for new directions, the whole young generation of Soviet artists had turned towards minor genres, the kind of popular art which the aristocracy and bourgeoisie had scorned. To be precise: the music-hall, the circus and the cinema. To all these genres, hitherto considered 'in poor taste,' the Revolution had opened up entirely new possibilities; and they became particularly influential." 102

Yutkevich, as did the rest of FEKS, regarded this new form of expression as a way of creating a new revolutionary spectacle. As with Eisenstein and other directors of this time, the objective of FEKS was to create both theatrical and cinematic entertainment that used revolutionary expression (popular culture) for a revolutionary time. Yutkevich goes on to say:

"So our infatuation for the circus, music-hall and cinema was not a chance thing. But led us to overturn all aesthetic concepts and create a new aesthetic of the revolutionary spectacle. From this resulted on the one hand the mass spectacles and popular show, and on the other the introduction of minor genres into classical form. Quite definitely the reactionaries at that time were those whom we now call abstract artists." 103

Yutkevich came to theater and film as an artist. In 1922, he and Kozintsev participated in the "Left Stream Exhibition," exhibiting paintings that resembled popular circus posters of the time. The previous year, Yutkevich had enrolled in Meyerhold’s Workshop along with Eisenstein, where he learned biomechanics and mise en scène directly from Meyerhold. Meyerhold’s biomechanics was strongly influenced by the commedia dell’arte tradition and the acrobatic circus, instead of the stylized dance traditions, such as ballet. Sometime later both Eisenstein and Yutkevich worked for


103 Ibid., 18.
Foregger's Theater as mise en scène artists, whose productions mainly consisted of commedia dell'arte revivals. During this time they participated in the short-lived "Theater of Four Masks," a theater in Foregger's flat, based on revised "Soviet" versions of commedia dell'arte characters, such as "The Merchant (of the NEP period)" and "The Intellectual Mystic" (a reference to Andrei Bely). While working for Foregger, Yutkevich and Eisenstein began producing their own plays. Eventually the FEKS group decided to "divide their spheres of influence:" Yutkevich and Eisenstein remained in Moscow, while the other two members of FEKS, Kozintsev and Trauberg, went to work in Leningrad. Both FEKS groups continued to work in theater until opportunities for excursions into film presented themselves.

Before working in film, Eisenstein and Yutkevich remained very close, producing their own shows in Moscow. Around the time of the production of the Garter of Columbine, Yutkevich claims that the famous idea of "attractions" was invented. The Garter, as with past productions, used Eccentrism throughout, designed to "shock" the viewer. Yutkevich explains:

"One day after one of these 'excursions' I arrived at Eisenstein's home so excited and worked up that he asked me what was the matter. I told him that I had just had ten turns on my favourite fairground attraction. The he exclaimed: 'Listen! That's an idea! Why not call our work "scenic attraction"?' After all we want to shock the spectators with much the same physical effect as the attraction does." On the cover of The Garter of Columbine, above the dedication, he put: 'Invention of scenic attractions by Sergei Eisenstein and Sergei Yutkevich.' Subsequently Eisenstein changed the term to 'montage of attractions.'" 104

Evidently, at least according to Yutkevich, the invention of the famous "montage of attractions" was a mutual creation between Eisenstein and Yutkevich.

104 Ibid., 32.
In 1922-23, Yutkevich left Foregger's theater for political reasons. Shortly thereafter, Yutkevich was thrown into the position of director on the film, *Give Us Radio!*, inaugurating his first foray into film directing. After working with Abram Room as an assistant director and scene designer, Yutkevich gained reputation and fame with his own subsequent films, including *Lace* (1928). Throughout the rest of the twenties and thirties, Yutkevich continued to be part of FEKS, producing the sound film *The Golden Mountains* (1931) and also worked with another director, Frederikh Ermler on the film *The Counterplan* (1932). It was on these two films that Shostakovich worked with Yutkevich and Ermler for the first time, composing film scores. In the forties, like many directors, his career was threatened, but managed, unlike Eisenstein, to live through it.

The other half of FEKS, Kozintsev and Trauberg were mainly educated and worked in Kiev and Leningrad. Kozintsev began by studying painting at the Academy of Fine Arts in Petrograd where he met Leonid Trauberg and later organized FEKS with Yutkevich. He also worked on the agit-trains as a decorator, before experimenting in theater with Yutkevich. In his "A Child of the Revolution," Kozintsev describes the objectives of FEKS, the aura of the twenties and his own influences. Similar to Yutkevich, Kozintsev paints a vivid picture of the web of influences and trends in the twenties and thirties as well as his eventual move from theater to film. Describing the same elements that make up Eccentrism, Kozintsev goes a bit further, claiming that Eccentrism is avant-garde and utterly different in its approach from the West. The environment in which FEKS and other young artists lived was different from their Western contemporaries and, since Kozintsev saw art as inextricably linked to life and culture, the youth of that time were a different sort of avant-garde. Kozintsev seems to
attribute Eccentrism as a kind of avant-garde style through his description of his first production, Gogol’s *The Marriage*. As Yutkevich explained, Eccentrism strives to get away from past techniques, emphasizing on the popular. Kozintsev adds to this, saying that,

“...the novelty of things (in this case, things ‘eccentric’) was initially felt not in themes nor in characters, but in rhythm. *Art changed rhythm.* The new epoch had found its first expression in rhythm.”

This association of rhythm with the newness of the age and the idea of the avant-garde, resonates well with the other influences Kozintsev would betray in his films, particularly that of montage, as well as with the FEKS manifesto from 1922.

Similar to the other members of FEKS, Kozintsev worked in the theater until he produced his first film, *The Adventures of Oktyabrina* in 1924. Kozintsev described this film as practically a “propaganda film-poster,” based on the same principles of Eccentrism that FEKS practiced in theater. The *Devil’s Wheel* (1926) followed shortly thereafter, and is said to be a mixture of Eccentrism and realism. This film marked the beginning of FEKS slow departure from Eccentrism and experimentalism with other influences. In this film, traces of German expressionism were used to show the “bottom of the city barrel,” to depict the ugly and the corrupt. Eccentricity was still present, but is seen in the lesser characters. Similar to Eisenstein’s *Battleship Potemkin*, which had premiered a year prior to *The Devil’s Wheel*, Kozintsev also used typage to illustrate the characters of life in this film.

---


106 Zorkaya, 106.

107 Ibid.
Around this time, Kozintsev and the rest of FEKS were studying Eisenstein’s films, especially *Strike*, and Griffith’s *Intolerance*, very closely. Their films, including *The Adventures of Oktjabrina* and *The Devil’s Wheel*, used the principles of montage in combination with the eccentric and German expressionism. Three other FEKS films followed, mainly produced and directed by Kozintsev and his Leningrad partner Leonid Trauberg, each exploring a somewhat new approach: *The Overcoat* (1926), based on Gogol’s work, *SVD* (*The Club of the Big Deed*, 1927), which romanticizes materialism and *The New Babylon* (1927), which included a score by the FEKS new music composition partner, Dmitri Shostakovich. *The New Babylon* was the last silent film of the Leningrad FEKS group.

Three years after the “Statement on Sound,” Kozintsev and Trauberg experimented with their first sound film in 1931. Their film, *Aion* was one of the first “talkies” in the Soviet Union, though planned and executed as a silent film. The musical score added later by Shostakovich is considered to be tightly interwoven with the action of the film. That same year, Yutkevich produced *Golden Mountains* (1931), whose soundtrack, written again by Shostakovich, was an attempt at the audio-visual counterpoint discussed in the “Statement of Sound.” Ushering in the era of socialist realism, Kozintsev and Trauberg produced their *Maxim Trilogy*, consisting of *The Youth of Maxim* (1934), *The Return of Maxim* (1937) and *The Vyborg Side* (1938). Kozintsev and Trauberg continued to work together until the late forties, when they separated to produce their own films. All three of the original FEKS members: Kozintsev, Trauberg and Yutkevich went on to teach and head film studios, ushering in the new generation of film students.
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Similar to their contemporaries, the FEKS group was exposed to, studied and implemented montage in their films. The use of montage can be seen as early as The Devil's Wheel. When sound became common in the Soviet Union in the thirties, audio-visual counterpoint became as much an issue for FEKS as it had been for Eisenstein. On all of the sound films mentioned, from Alone through the Maxim Trilogy, the group strove to arrange sound and image in montage. From my understanding, the FEKS did not experiment with the variety of montages that Eisenstein was concerned with in the twenties and thirties, but did have a composer, given his experience with The Golden Mountains, who knew the theory of audio-visual counterpoint. Shostakovich wrote for FEKS and more specifically for Kozintsev in the forties, starting with The New Babylon, through the Maxim Trilogy. The active approach to "aural" montage in the film score can be seen in the first FEKS/Shostakovich collaboration, The New Babylon. The music for the film exhibits some of the same editing found in the visual images, acting in complement or as a commentary on the action, as opposed to merely "illustrating" the action. The montage techniques in The New Babylon, however, is something I will discuss in detail in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 2

Dmitri Shostakovich and his Musical Environment in the 1920s and 1930s

Shostakovich, Art and Film Music in the 1920s and 1930s

Musical life in Russia in the twenties and thirties was complex, diverse and closely connected to other facets of artistic life, including the realm of the visual arts. Emerging from the Civil War (1918-1920), Russia launched into the NEP years (New Economic Policy), which brought stability, economic security as well as stricter government control over the arts. Lenin had established his leadership in Russia, but with his death in 1925, Stalin took control of Russia and became the new leader. By the early thirties, cultural life was more restricted and reforms such as socialist realism became a reality by 1932.\(^1\) In essence, the assumed freedoms of the twenties came to halt by the early thirties, where aspects of culture including music, the visual arts and literature were closely scrutinized and evaluated by the government. It was in this political environment that Shostakovich studied at the conservatory and produced his earliest works in art music, film and the music-hall.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) April 23, 1932 is the official birth date of socialist realism.

Beginning early in the twenties, Russia began to see more evidence of a split between the past and present, the old and the new and in the case of music, the art and the popular. Part of this was encouraged by the revolutionary ideals of the time, where the new government encouraged a rejection of the tsarist bourgeois past and an embrace of a Soviet utopian future. The music, as well as the other arts of the time, were also split along these lines, or at least echoed this political split. Revolutionary songs and songs praising the homeland appeared alongside the introduction of jazz and American popular music and dance in the twenties. In the conservatory, approaches to art music and pedagogy were on the way to becoming divided as well. In this chapter, I will discuss the various facets of cultural and musical life in the twenties and early thirties. I will focus my attention specifically on the Leningrad conservatory, only mentioning Moscow's musical context when appropriate. The post-revolutionary environment in which the popular music, both revolutionary (mass songs) and American (jazz and ragtime), as well as the art music coming out of the Leningrad conservatory at that time were flourishing. I will focus specifically on Shostakovich's musical experience in Leningrad and briefly discuss some of his major compositions in both art and popular music up to 1933. I will present a limited overview of specific aspects of musical life in

---


4 There was a debate between the “conservative” faction, affiliated with the Rimsky-Korsakov line of pedagogy and the “innovative” faction associated with Vladimir Shcherbachyov and Boris Asafyev. I will discuss this in more detail later.
Russia in the twenties and early thirties, addressing the “art” and popular sides of musical and cultural life as it relates to Shostakovich’s own experiences and eventually to his Piano Concerto No. 1 of 1933.

The main representatives of “art” music were primarily situated in the conservatory, while popular music existed in various music and theater halls, jazz clubs and cinema houses. Until the time of Shostakovich’s graduation in 1925, the Leningrad conservatory followed the pedagogical traditions of Rimsky-Korsakov. As it happened with other places in Europe, modernism as a trend and way of musical life was present and began to find its place in the conservatory; eventually it came to challenge the traditional Rimsky-Korsakovian pedagogical approach. In the early twenties, two main proponents of modernism, Shcherbachyov and Asafyev eagerly fought for the cultivation and exploration of new music. Shcherbachyov studied as a composer with many people including Steinberg before the Revolution. He was involved with certain circles of modern music and later strove to reform the conservatory curriculum, encouraging students to freely compose within the first few years of study, without having passed through years of restricted technical training as required by the Rimsky-Korsakov tradition. His reform was successful and by 1925 there was a split in the conservatory between the conservatives and the innovators. The former Korsakovian approach was still strongly upheld by Glazunov and Steinberg, and who remained in opposition to the
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5 I am aware that the term “modernism” is complex and often defined in various ways. When I use the term “modernism” in this document, I mean a trend that tends to negate the past; is rather utopian in its outlook; separates “high” and “low” culture as “art” and “popular;” and with some modernists such as Schoenberg, tends to see a distinction between the mass and an elite group. Other composers such as Debussy and Shostakovich however, tended to combine the “high” and “low” in their music.

6 Shcherbachyov also studied with Vasily Kalifati, Anatoly Lyadov, Josef Vihtol as well as Steinberg. See Haas, 7.
new reform. According to Haas, this allowed a more flexible atmosphere for students such as Shostakovich to engage in an “open door” policy allowed them to switch between the two approaches, gaining experience from both sides. ⁷

Several attempts were made to establish modern music societies that performed music from the West and recent Russian music. Asafyev, known mainly as a music critic and scholar, started his own circle of contemporary music performance at the Art Historical Institute in 1921 and played a major in the eventual creation of LACM (Leningrad Association of Contemporary Music) in 1926. The Monday evenings at the home of Anna Vogt was another main venue for music, where many gathered to hear both contemporary music of young composers, including Shostakovich as well as “older” music from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. LACM eventually became the central proponent of contemporary music performance, but in its infancy, it was torn apart by difficulties between the conservatives and the innovative factions in 1926. As a reaction to the conservative LACM members, both Shcherbachyov and Asafyev decided to create their own organization, the Circle of New Music. After a brief separation, LACM and the Circle reunited, until it dissolved a few years later in 1928. Despite the problems involved with organizing a cohesive and consistent contemporary music organization, Shcherbachyov, Asafyev and Nikolai Malko continued to support the programming of contemporary music in the local theaters and halls. As a result, the works of many European composers such as Schoenberg, Hindemith, Stravinsky, and

⁷ For more information on Leningrad modernists and the emergence of the “Shcherbachyov” school, see Haas, 22.
Berg were premiered in Russia in the major concert halls alongside emerging Russian composers, such as Shostakovich.

Throughout his conservatory years, Shostakovich frequented many instrumental music concerts as well as the ballet. He performed for the Red Army and also at Palaces of Culture and local factories. He had the opportunity to hear "modern" music from Europe at Anna Vogt's gatherings and performed his own and others' works at the early LACM and the Circle of Friends. Like with many young composers, Asafyev supported the premiere of Shostakovich's First Symphony in 1926, though did not show for the performance due to the rivalry between LACM and the Circle that year. Shostakovich had therefore attempted to make himself known to everyone, and involve himself in everything musically modern.

The freedom to experiment and the opportunity to hear non-Russian contemporary composers began to end however starting in the late twenties and early thirties. At this time there were politically strong groups such as the RAPP (Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) and RAPM (Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians) that held sway over cultural life. By the early thirties, RAPM was railing against "light" music and rallying for the use of mass song in all compositions. The severe anti-Western sentiment more present in the early thirties than in the twenties, forced this abolition of "light" music and the encouragement of a type of music that

---

8 "Light" music was a category of music that included American popular music, such as jazz; the tango, the foxtrot or other popular dances; and operetta from the nineteenth century by composers such as Offenbach or dances such as the galop and the waltz by composers such as Strauss. Russia also had a tradition of vaudevillian-inspired shows that began in the late nineteenth century. The popular music that the government wanted people to listen to in the 1920s was primarily mass songs that celebrated the Soviet nation.
seemed appropriately Soviet. Thus, many composers, Shostakovich included, were asked to "repent" and denounce all popular music.\textsuperscript{9} Other composers and scholars were also attacked, including Shcherbachyov and Asafyev, for being "formalists" i.e., experimental and generally supportive of contemporary music. RAPM's objectives can be summarized as follows:

"Proletarian Musician, as well as Music and October [RAPM's other journal]: a) will fight against the influence upon our youth from the side of decadent bourgeois music in the fields of composition, musicology and performance; b) will fight for the assimilation of that which is best, healthiest and closest to the proletariat in the musical legacy of the past; c) will lay paths, clear the soil and give aid to the emergence and formulation of new proletarian musical art."\textsuperscript{10}

In 1932 however, RAPP and RAPM were dissolved according to a resolution from the Central Committee and "Unions" were established in their places. The Union of Composers was thus developed, which was served by the same people who had experienced difficulties with RAPM, including Shcherbachyov, Asafyev and Shostakovich.

Popular culture, particularly that of the West, emerged during the NEP era in all facets of cultural life. Various theaters, clubs, and music halls were bursting with music and dance from the West. Vaudeville, jazz, popular dances of the time, including the foxtrot, as well as the circus and the popular theater were available to anyone.

Cinema houses sprang up across Russia many decades earlier, and were a significant presence in every city by the beginning of the twenties. American films were

\textsuperscript{9} In the late twenties and early thirties, Shostakovich was persuaded by RAPM to write articles and make statements in opposition to "light" music. See Fay, Wilson and Schwarz for discussions of this issue in English.

\textsuperscript{10} Haas, 28.
the most popular films and most film-going Russians were infatuated with Douglas Fairbanks, Mary Pickford or Charlie Chaplin as opposed to Eisenstein or Vertov. The youth of the time were embracing this new culture and many innovative composers, directors and painters attempted to incorporate popular culture into their art in some fashion. Popular culture thus flooded many aspects of cultural life and was a “second university” for many artists, especially those looking for a new form of revolutionary and modern expression. For Shostakovich and his colleague Gavriil Popov:

“That extracurricular “second university” was none other than the modern culture of NEP Leningrad in which opera, ballet, symphony concerts, and recitals coexisted with nightclub dancing, workers’ theaters, vaudeville, circus, cinema and the vast world of amateur choruses, ensembles, and festival Olympiades of amateur music-making.”

Similar to the “art” culture however, popular culture lacked a simple homogeneity. Many aspects of what was “popular” in the Soviet Union was not necessarily Western and what was Western was not necessarily popular. Many people were opposed to jazz, American theater and anything considered a symbol of capitalism. Many artists admired the technique of Chaplin, but detested the political environment from which he came. Jazz and “light” music could be enjoyed, but at the same time, be separated from its context. In essence, the art and technique of American films, music and dance were closely studied and admired, but its assumed ideology produced problems. According to Richard Stites:

---

11 See Haas, 25 for his discussion of this “second university.”

12 Quoted from Haas, 25.
“Mass culture needed accommodation, which encouraged diversity of opinion (though not open-mindedness) even when ideological orthodoxy ran high. Styles varied, tastes fluctuated, schools contended for public approval. Ideologically correct songs competed with jazz tunes; radical activism struggled with political apathy; liberals and conservatives squared off. Echoes from distant times and cultures were heard at unexpected moments: revolutionary posters borrowed from commercial advertisements; socialist rituals mimicked Orthodox Christian rites. Outsiders often imagined Soviet society to be united and uniform and insiders sometimes shared, even encouraged, the illusion.”  

The main goal for Soviet artists at this time was therefore to strive to unite what could be considered American “technique” with their own ideology. Various filmmakers, including Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Kuleshov studied American films and adjusted the learned techniques according to their own ideology. There was a call for Soviet writers to concoct “Red Pinkertons:” stories that exploited audience grabbing techniques and carried an ideological charge. Old genres such as serial adventure novels, detective stories, movie melodramas and street ballads could be infused with revolutionary ideals.” In the music for film, quotations or stylistic allusions to Western musical genres such as jazz often played a leitmotif-like role, typifying the “bourgeois decadence” of Western characters. Essentially, Soviet artists in general took what was modern and popular from the West, but altered it according to their ideological needs. This was especially necessary because the mass audience loved popular American films, detective novels and other medium. Propaganda was the main concern of the government and spreading ideology through any kind of art proved to be an effective strategy.

In addition to music halls, worker’s theaters and jazz clubs, new and popular

13 Geldern and Stites, xii.


15 See Geldern and Stites, xv, for a discussion of how American ideas were used, while American ideology was discarded in popular culture.
music was also heard in the cinema houses. In the first twenty years of Soviet cinema, pianists and orchestras accompanied silent films as they were viewed in the theater. Pianists improvised as they watched the film, illustrating the images musically. Musical interpretations of films varied radically and the need for planned music arose in the mid-twenties. Improvising pianists were therefore replaced by full orchestras that would play music compiled from the traditional repertoire. Eventually, the film studios perceived the need for composed music and began programming their own excerpted musical fragments with their films. The idea of asking a composer to write original music for a film quickly followed in late twenties, allowing for the emergence of the film composer.\textsuperscript{16}

Until 1930, films were “silent” in the Soviet Union. The late twenties saw the emergence of the film score, although the idea for a film-symphony had been addressed by Eisenstein years earlier.\textsuperscript{17} One of the first “art” composers to write for film was Dmitri Shostakovich, who made his debut in film composition with \textit{The New Babylon} (1929). Although the film had a disastrous musical premiere, it was one of the first films to use an original, composed score. Tatiana Egorova, a scholar who specializes in early Soviet film music, considers \textit{The New Babylon} to be the first great score for silent film.

\textsuperscript{16} The phenomenon of the film composer thus began to surface starting in 1928. Shostakovich was one of the first film composers to emerge.

\textsuperscript{17} At a meeting in 1925, Eisenstein requested that Meyerhold, on his trip to France, contact Sergei Prokofiev and ask him to write a film-symphony for his new film, the \textit{Battleship Potemkin}. Meyerhold never made it to France however, and consequently Eisenstein never received his much desired film-symphony. They soon met however and collaborated on Eisenstein’s last films, \textit{Alexander Nevsky} and \textit{Ivan the Terrible}. For more information on their relationship see Tatiana Egorova, \textit{Soviet Film Music} (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1997).
According to Egorova, it was innovative because unlike the pianist-illustrators who
musically imitated the image, the music to *New Babylon* participated with the action; and
similar to the action, the music had a powerful emotional and ideological influence on the
audience that was necessary for propagandistic times.\(^{18}\) From *The New Babylon* forward,
most films, silent and sound, used the music as a complement to the images, not just as
pure illustration. The “Statement on Sound” from 1928 reinforced this idea of the
counterpoint of image and sound, paving the way for more innovations in film
composition, which I will discuss in more detail later.

Music and image became synchronized for the first time in the thirties with the
appearance of sound film.\(^{19}\) Composers could therefore use film as proving ground for
experiment with aspects of musical composition such as timbre, intonation, techniques of
composition involving “montage joins” of different types of material and, “associative
interconnections of remote themes and images.”\(^{20}\) The results of this experimentation
later fed into non-film music compositions, in which composers employed cinematic
techniques such as superimposition and cross-cutting.\(^{21}\) In many ways, experimentation
with the technique of film music perpetuated the spirit of the experiments with form that

---

\(^{18}\) Egorova, 7.

\(^{19}\) As far as I know, the first Soviet film to use synchronized sound was Vertov’s *Enthusiasm* in 1930.

\(^{20}\) Egorova, 20.

\(^{21}\) Schwarz discusses the overlap of film music into ‘absolute’ music in the twenties. He states: “In the
1920s the term “cinematification” of music was coined. A British critic compared the Twelfth (Lenin)
Symphony of Shostakovich to a ‘sound track.’ Shchedrin’s Second Symphony of 1963 was likened to
music composed for cinematic ‘frames’ because of its rapid changes of moods. Indeed, in listening to some
colorful — and not over-profound — Soviet scores, one can easily imagine the sound track of a non-existing
moving picture. Certainly, the demands of Socialist Realist aesthetics — concreteness, closeness to life —
came nearest to implementation in Soviet film music.” See Schwarz, 137.
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composers had begun in the early twentieth century, allowing them to create cinematic approaches to in music. According to Egorova, two types of film composition resulted: the “symphonic” and the “song” types. The “symphonic” type was composed music with a marked sense of fluidity. It was mainly used for historio-revolutionary and dramatic films throughout the thirties and forties by composers such as Shostakovich, Shcherbachyov, and Popov. The “song” type was primarily used for comedies, and was based on popular songs of the time. Many of the dramatic films of Kozintsev and Trauberg (Alone) and of Yutkevich (Golden Mountains) were “symphonic,” while many comedies by directors such as Ivan Pyriev and Grigory Alexandrov used composers such as Isaak Dunayevsky, who had an extensive background in “light” music and music for the theater. Egorova’s categorization, although rather simplistic, does summarize the basic approaches to film music composition in the late twenties and thirties. The reality was more complex, however, as each composer wrote differently for each film, depending upon the theories and practices of the directors. The film music of both Prokofiev and Shostakovich reflect the influence of the directors with whom they worked.

For the remainder of the chapter, I will provide a brief discussion of Shostakovich’s film and theater works of the twenties and thirties, and a general overview of works outside of his cinematic and theatrical output, to facilitate an understanding of the idiosyncratic characteristics found in the finale of the Piano Concerto No. 1. These characteristics include Shostakovich’s approach to musical form that resembles montage, the use of dance “topoi” such as the galop, the foxtrot or the

---

22 Egorova, 20.
waltz (of which only the galop is mainly applicable to the finale of the *Piano Concerto No. 1*) and the presence of the grotesque. This discussion is not intended to provide a comprehensive analysis of his 1920s works, but instead, it will contribute to the basis of my future analysis in the final chapter.

**Shostakovich’s “Art” Music**

Although Shostakovich was involved with theatrical and cinema culture in the twenties, he still composed in traditional genres and forms. Throughout the twenties, he wrote symphonies, an opera, ballets and small chamber works that revealed Shostakovich’s preoccupation with the grotesque and his relationship to modernism.

Some of his first works, dating from around 1923-1924 consisted of the *Symphony No. 1* (his graduation piece), the *Trio No. 1*, and *Three Pieces for Cello and Piano* and his *Two Pieces for String Octet*. Each of these pieces had traces of the beginnings of Shostakovich’s relationship with the grotesque. In a letter from the time in regard to his teacher Steinberg, Shostakovich said:

“...He [Steinberg] tore it to shreds. He said, “I cannot say anything about such music. What is this enthusiasm for the Grotesque? There were already Grotesque bits in the Trio. All the cello pieces are Grotesque and finally this Scherzo [of the Symphony No.1] is also Grotesque!””

Shostakovich continued to write in a manner distasteful to his teacher and progressively more modern. His symphonies, as well as some of his previous piano works, including

---


his ten genre studies *Aphorisms* (1927) reveal Shostakovich’s further emerging personality which “with brittle linearity and dissonance the composer continued to shake off academic shackles.”²⁵ Around this time, Shostakovich was performing Prokofiev’s piano works, including his First Piano Concerto and had also started his own First Piano Concerto, but abandoned it due to a serious lack of inspiration. During the middle to late twenties, Shostakovich spent a great deal of time composing piano related works, attempting to keep himself performing while he continued to find his compositional voice. It seems that the Piano Concerto No.1, which was finally realized in 1933, might actually belong more to the Shostakovich composer/pianist of the twenties, than the Shostakovich of the thirties.

Despite his teacher’s disgust with his more “youthful” experiments, Shostakovich continued to approach modernism and the grotesque in his larger works. His Symphony No.2, ‘To October’ was finished that same year and was received well, but chastised by his teacher Steinberg and critics like Asafyev. Shostakovich himself had described the symphony as “dialectically linear,” moving away from the “verticality” favored by his teacher. This “linear” approach is associated with Russian modernist music in general in the twenties, yet it is not an issue I will discuss here.²⁶

Shostakovich’s next symphony, *Symphony No.3, The First of May* (1930), resembles the Second Symphony in its layout, choral ending and “linear” sense and resonates with his theater, film and music-hall works. The instrumental sections of the

---
²⁵ Fay, 39.
²⁶ For a discussion of Shostakovich’s “linearity” see Haas and Schwarz.
symphony reflect a modernist tendency in its use of dissonance and complex
organization, while the choral ending is more traditional, in its use of tonality and clear
organization. In the fourth section of the piece, the rhythms and instrumental colors bear
resemblance to the “galops” of Hypothetically Murdered and The Nose and tend to be
extremely complex dissonant, and at times “intentionally cerebral.”

Also, in the choral
ending, the music illustrates the poetry like it would if it were film, which is noticeable
especially when the idea of a “march” is suggested. Although there is no image per se,
the music is sensitive to the shift of montage in the poetry. When the term march is sung,
or about to be hinted at, the music shifts radically to a martial rhythm to accommodate
the poetic imagery. These shifts are quick and resemble a nuanced version of the
“montage joins” found in his film music such as The New Babylon.

Thus this
symphony, like many of his “art” works composed by that time, certainly demonstrates
that Shostakovich’s compositional language reflected a diverse background borrowed
from the music-hall, the theater and the cinema.

Shostakovich’s The Golden Age (1930), although a frustrating venture, used
“light” music that very quickly became the target of RAPM’s attacks. The “light” music
used in this ballet, however, was Western in origin and included music such as the
foxtrot, tango, can-can and popular salon dances, as a way of typifying the “unhealthy

27 Schwahrz, 80. See pages 80-81 for a discussion of Symphonies 2 and 3 as both “proletarian” and
“modernist” music.

28 “Montage joins” is a term borrowed from Egorova. See page 71 of this chapter. Also, Schwarz has
described this symphony as “episodic” and with sections that are “thematically unrelated to each other.”
This comment resonates well with the idea of “montage joins” of different material. See Schwarz, 80.

29 I am not discussing the Symphony No. 4 here because it was not composed before 1933.
eroticism” of Western bourgeois culture. He pitted the Western music against music of “Soviet proletariat” represented as marches and pioneer songs that represented a “robust physical health and athleticism.” Despite the use of “light” music to criticize the West as the popular enemy of the time, the timing of The Golden Age was unfortunate and led to several attacks on Shostakovich and his desire to employ any kind of “light” music in his works. RAPM’s control in this regard soon passed and despite his apologies for his “light” music indulgences at the time, returned to jazz and other “light” music in the thirties, composing works such as the Jazz Suite No. 1 and Lady Macbeth.

One of Shostakovich’s more modern and grotesque works from the twenties was The Nose of 1927, an opera based on the story by the nineteenth century satirist Nikolai Gogol. Shostakovich set Gogol’s satirical work in a manner that musicalized Gogol’s ideas and words by evoking the grotesque, referencing popular culture of the time and in specific cases, using montage. The grotesque elements in the opera include: the extensive and the elaborate of color, technique and range both in the voices and in the instruments arranged in an “untraditional” orchestra; the “physicality” of certain sounds; strong contrast; and the sense of the extreme or musical depiction of the “absurdly incongruous.” The instrumentation mainly consists of woodwinds, extensive percussion and other unusual musical instruments, including the musical saw. Shostakovich exploits this orchestra in the very beginning, when the main character, Kovalyev, wakes up to find his nose missing. The first depiction of this character is

30 Fay, 60.


76
primarily through the sound of the orchestra, which produces musical gestures: it swoops, grunts and hacks its way through pitches, emulating the potential sounds of a human body in relation to the nose. This “physicality” of the sounds is part of the satirical portrait of Kovalyev, as the negative character that is revealed during the course of the opera.

Shostakovich uses instruments in this gestural fashion at other moments of the opera as well. The introduction to the opera, for example, is extremely pointillistic: the instruments do not play a melodic line, but instead contribute individual pitches or sets of pitches to create a musical whole. Shostakovich also applies this technique to the vocal writing as well. Often the range and color of the voice is pushed beyond its limits to evoke the negative qualities of a character. In the opening scene, for example, the wife of the barber “screams” at him to dispose of the recently discovered nose. Shostakovich depicts this screaming by having the performer sing extremely high pitches in a repetitive rhythm. At one point, the singer must sing so high and with such rapidity, that the voice transforms into something that resembles the swooping squawks of a seagull.\textsuperscript{32} It is in this and other various sections throughout the opera that voices are used in an untraditional manner to satirize the stereotypical qualities of the character.\textsuperscript{33}

Shostakovich also uses genre allusions and quotations throughout to satirize the action. He uses his usual dance “topoi,” such as the polka, the waltz and galop in several

\textsuperscript{32} See the recording of The Nose with Gennady Rozhdestvensky and the Leningrad Philharmonic Orchestra for this performance on compact disc.

\textsuperscript{33} In some ways, the fact that this use of the voice reveals the inner being of the character resonates well with Eisenstein’s notion of “typage,” i.e., the stereotyping of a character through appearance.
sections, including the “galop” in the beginning, to depict Kovalyev running to the police station find his nose. He also uses allusions to nineteenth century operetta in Act III, scenes seven and eight as well as folk music allusions, particularly in scene six, in which Ivan, Kovalyev’s friend, is singing a quasi-toral “folk” song while accompanying himself on the balalaika. And lastly, during the latter part of scene seven a female vendor “screams” the words, “Cracknels, Cranknels!!!,” which is a reference to the popular culture of Shostakovich’s time. Street vendors were still common in the twenties and many people, including FEKS, considered of the street vendor’s cries as a kind of new and modern music. All of these instances of allusion satirize the action and often provide an interruption to the flow of the text and the music. This interruption in itself, which is used as an aspect of the grotesque, can be characterized in terms of montage.

Throughout the opera, there are several places in which montage can be found both in the text and the music. The entire opera, for example, does not follow a logical flow of action. Instead it is choppy and involves the collision of contrasting scenes all throughout. In the beginning of the opera for example, after Kovalyev has “galloped” away from home, he walks into a cathedral, where he encounters his nose, while “sacred” sounding music figures in the background. Another example of montage occurs in the text in scene seven. The scene is situated at a Coachman’s Inn, where several characters are waiting for their coach. The textual montage is used to depict the policemen talking among themselves, while the passengers are discussing the topics of prayer and death.

---

34 See Stites, 70-71 for an example of a street vendor’s cry.

35 See page 55 of Chapter 1 for FEKS approach to the “new” art.
The lines between the policemen and the passengers alternate in a montage fashion, flashing between two different topics of conversation. These two lines of conversation work in alternation so quickly, that it resembles cinematic montage. A similar approach to using text in montage was described later by Pudovkin in reference to his film, Deserter.³⁶ In this description, Pudovkin claims that this is montage in sound, as was made possible by the advent of sound in film. It is interesting that The Nose predates Deserter by at least three years, perhaps demonstrating that Shostakovich may have been trying to address montagist sound, even before any exposure to Pudovkin’s and Eisenstein’s sound films, as well as his own experience in film the industry.

Overall, The Nose is an extremely important modernist composition in Shostakovich’s repertory. It was one of the first works to depict the grotesque and the satirical in his music, to evoke the fusion of reality and fantasy found in Gogol’s story. Many of the elements described here will continue into Shostakovich’s later film, theater, and “art” works, as we shall see with the Piano Concerto No.1.

Shostakovich’s Film and Music-Hall Works

Given the stance of the conservatory in regard to Shcherbachyov’s pedagogical approach, one can only imagine how the more traditional teachers would have felt about the popular culture of the twenties. Shostakovich however, had no difficulty immersing himself in that environment. He spent as much time at jazz concerts, music halls and (somewhat against his will) the cinema, as he did at “art” concerts. In 1924, out of the

³⁶ See page 28 of Chapter 1 for Pudovkin’s quote in regard to Deserter.
need for money to support his family, Shostakovich took his first cinema job as a “pianist-illustrator” working for the Bright Reel Cinema in Leningrad. At this job, Shostakovich was required to improvise according to the images as they appeared on the screen, as pianist generally did this early in the twenties. In 1925, after having quit the Bright Reel, Shostakovich took another cinema job at the Splendid Palace Cinema, where he was not required to improvise as much as his previous job. By that time, books and manuals on how to musically illustrate images had been in circulation and one could assume that Shostakovich may have either had access or the theater itself required him to use more standard illustrative approaches for each film. Although he had wanted to quit working for the cinema, in 1926 Shostakovich began working for the Picadilly Cinema. After 1926, pianist-illustrators started to become unnecessary and were replaced by symphony orchestras, which performed arranged versions of the “classics” of art music.37

In addition to being exposed to the cinema, Shostakovich also attended Meyerhold’s theater when he was in Moscow. During his conservatory years, Shostakovich attempted several times to leave Leningrad and attend the Moscow conservatory. Through his many visits to Moscow, he made several friends and was able to attend some performances of Meyerhold’s theater, the Moscow Art Theater and the circus. He was utterly impressed with Meyerhold’s theater and in 1928, moved to Moscow to work as the musical director of Meyerhold’s theater. During this time, Shostakovich started his opera The Nose, with Acts I and II written under Meyerhold’s supervision. After two months, Shostakovich returned to Leningrad and finished his

37 Tchaikovsky was apparently was one of the most “played” composers in the early twentieth century. See Arkadii Klimovitsky, “Tchaikovsky and the Russian ‘Silver Age’” in Tchaikovsky and His World, Leslie Kearney, ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).
opera. A year later, Shostakovich returned to work with Meyerhold on Mayakovsky’s *The Bed Bug*. After 1929, Shostakovich never wrote for Meyerhold again, but did continue to write for theater throughout his life, as well as for film.

**The New Babylon (1928-1929)**

In 1929, Kozintsev and Trauberg hired Shostakovich to write for their silent film, *The New Babylon*. This was Shostakovich’s first film commission and first opportunity to experiment with the idea of counterpoint between image and sound that had been suggested a year earlier in the famous “Statement on Sound.” *The New Babylon*, a film about the French Commune of 1871, depicts the struggle between two types of characters, the bourgeoisie and the workers, using Eisensteinian typage. The film presents a fictionalized account of the uprising and the failure of the French Commune, emphasizing the decadent, “morally rotten” lives of the bourgeoisie as the polar opposite of the oppressed and disgruntled workers. The film has many instances of montage, which bear the trace of Eisenstein and reveals the close study by Kozintsev and the FEKS group of Eisenstein’s films, particularly *Strike*. When hired to provide a musical score for the film, Shostakovich was given specific instructions on how to correlate the image and sound. Kozintsev recalls his first meetings with Shostakovich:
"After viewing the film, which was still not edited to final cut, he agreed to write the score. Our ideas coincided. In those years, music was used to strengthen the emotions of reality, or, to use the current terminology, to illustrate the frame. We immediately came to an agreement with the composer that the music would be linked to the inner meaning and not to the external action, that it should develop by cutting across events, and as the antithesis of the mood of a specific scene. Our general principle was not to illustrate, and not to complement or coincide on this point. In the score the tragic themes intrude on to vulgar can-cans, the German cavalry galloped into Paris to the accompaniment of Offenbach’s La Belle Hélène (transformed suddenly out of the “Marseillaise”); the themes interwove with great complexity, changing the mood from the farcical to the pathetic.”

The main objective for the musical score was to have music that would be the antithesis of the “inner meaning,” to create irony and comment upon the action, as opposed to merely accompanying the image on the screen. This attention to the image resonates with the 1928 “Statement on Sound,” which called for an interaction between the image and sound. This approach, as Kozintsev relates, was relatively new and required a composer who would treat the music as an integral part of the film. Shostakovich certainly complied with Kozintsev’s request and created music that provided ironic and sometimes grotesque commentary on the action that thus fulfilled the request by the authors of the “Statement” for a “contrapuntal relationship” between the image and sound.

Through working with Kozintsev and Trauberg on The New Babylon, Shostakovich was directly exposed to film editing techniques. In order to work with Kozintsev’s ideas and create an active musical commentary on the action, Shostakovich needed to correlate the music with the pacing and the rhythm of the edited images. The result was a musical score that resembled the montage editing of the film itself: a montage score. Although this “montage score” was not the same kind of montage as the

---

sound editing found in films such as Vertov’s *Enthusiasm* (1930), the score does exhibit the traits of montage editing. As one commentator has noted:

“In the score for *New Babylon* Dmitri Shostakovich used the editing of the film as a part of his composition. The kaleidoscopic structure of his music (which consists of unexpected transitions, breaks and contrasts, irregular bars and a rapidly changing expression in the motifs) enabled him to respond very sensitively to the montage and editing of the film.”

This “kaleidoscopic structure” involves abrupt shifts in key, melodic material, and instrumentation as well as the quick juxtaposition of quotations representing both personas: revolutionary songs for the workers (Ça ira and the Marseillaise) and Offenbach, Tchaikovsky and operetta (Offenbach’s *Le belle Hélène* and Tchaikovsky’s *Old French Song*) for the bourgeoisie. When first introduced, Shostakovich quotes most of the quotations in full. However, as the score progressed, the tunes were taken and fragmented and reworked in a montage fashion. Montage “shifts” of melodic material, instrumentation and key can be found throughout the score, but some of the more provocative shifts occur in the first few sections. The second section for example, is basically a waltz, with several interpolations (or very quick “shifts”) between particular instruments in the orchestra. There are string and woodwind solos that interrupt the waltz in the orchestra, as well as trombone slides, acting as an answer to the orchestra’s waltz at

---

39 In his *Enthusiasm*, Vertov produced a soundtrack that presented musical ideas edited in a montage fashion, creating a “montage score.” To my knowledge, this soundtrack is the closest thing to montage in sound in the early thirties. Vertov took pieces of various types of music, including folk song, Russian orthodox chant, and fragments of symphonies. He cut and pasted these musical pieces in the same rhythm as the visual montage. Compared to Shostakovich, this is a far more extreme to aural montage and is generally less symphonic than Shostakovich.

certain points throughout the section.\textsuperscript{41} There are also several interruptions by the trumpet, either with galop-like rhythms, which actually resemble the last section of the finale of the \textit{Piano Concerto No. 1}; or with complete tunes, such as the Can-Can, which makes it first appearance in this section.\textsuperscript{42} All throughout the score these “shifts” are therefore fragmentations of earlier themes or ideas that are juxtaposed to contribute to a montage score. Thus, the fragments juxtaposed and interwoven in a linear manner, create a horizontal montage fashion, (i.e., the aforementioned “shifts”).

Vertical montage, themes or fragments presented in counterpoint, reflect the montage editing of the film as well. An example of the vertical layering of themes occurs in the fifth section, involving the Marseillaise and the Can-Can. After the Marseillaise was introduced in full by the orchestra,\textsuperscript{43} the Can-Can slowly seeps into the texture, layered over the top of the Marseillaise. For the rest of the fifth section, the Marseillaise is continually fragmented and reworked in counterpoint with itself. Towards the end of the fifth section and into the sixth, the Marseillaise becomes distorted atonally, fragmented even more until, after several interruptions (such as the quotation in full of the \textit{Old French Song}), it returns as an Offenbach-esque waltz. In the film, the fifth and sixth sections show what Kozintsev described in the previous quote: a momentary victory of the workers (Marseillaise), who are then invaded by the German cavalry who fight the

\textsuperscript{41} For my analysis, I have listened to the suite of the score without having access to the written form of the music. Therefore, my indications as to where events occur in the music will be in time units. The compact disc that I have referred to is listed in footnote 27. The times for the trombone slides are 1 minute, 32 seconds and 2 minutes, 35 seconds. In some ways, these slides remind me of similar slides in \textit{Lady MacBeth of Mtsensk District} (1934).

\textsuperscript{42} The rhythms in the trumpet that bear resemblance to the \textit{Piano Concerto No. 1} occurs around 6 minutes, 15 seconds. The Can-Can appears at 6 minutes, 40 seconds.

\textsuperscript{43} This occurs at 7 minutes, 45 seconds.
workers on behalf of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie win, as characterized by the transformation of the Marseillaise into a waltz.

"While it [Marseillaise] serves as raw material for the music of the revolution, in the sixth movement (Versaille) it is embedded in a waltz and takes on almost courtly traits. The ancient revolutionary chant 'assimilates into its surroundings into which the representatives of the old society take refuge.'"44

What is apparent is not only a vertical layering of themes, but also a transformation of these themes to change the mood, "from the farcical to the pathetic."

In all, the musical score reflects the montage editing of the images, becoming its own kind of montage. Although the aural montage is dependent upon the montage of the image, this approach to formal design is one that Shostakovich will used in the Piano Concerto No. 1.

Other Films Before 1933

Shostakovich continued to write for Kozintsev and Trauberg through the thirties, until the two parted to make their own films. For the Kozintsev and Trauberg team he wrote music for Alone (1931), and the Maxim Trilogy, which includes the Youth of Maxim (1934), The Return of Maxim (1937) and The Vyborg Side (1938). In these films, Kozintsev and Trauberg began to change their approach to filmmaking, becoming less eccentric and more socialist realist. Elements of Eccentrism were certainly present, but not to the same extent as in their earlier films. As a result of the demand for more realistic use of music in their films, Shostakovich wrote less original music and instead compiled popular songs of the time to create a score. In the Youth of Maxim for example,

44 Johnson, 14. In latter part of quote Johnson is quoting Dietrich Stern.
Shostakovich mainly compiled older songs that seemed appropriate, as opposed to composing original music that correlated with the image.

Shostakovich also wrote music for another member of the FEKS group in Moscow, Yutkevich. In 1931, Yutkevich hired Shostakovich to write for his film *The Golden Mountains*, which has been described as one of the earliest examples of the true realization of the main points of the “Statement on Sound.” Having supposedly placed himself on a five-year hiatus from film and theater composition, Shostakovich wrote music for another Yutkevich film, *The Counterplan* in 1932. Unlike his first experience with film where he composed music after seeing a nearly complete film, Shostakovich composed the music scene by scene, on the set of the film. He was also specifically asked to compose a song that would typify the spirit of the film, which eventually became the famous “Song of the Counterplan.” This song became the “first hit song of the Soviet talkies” and was constantly played throughout the country. It would become the United Nations anthem in the forties.

**Hypothetically Murdered (1931)**

Shostakovich’s involvement in theater and the music-hall continued alongside his film composition throughout the late twenties and the thirties. As early as 1926, Shostakovich was frequenting “jazz” concerts. One of the first American jazz concerts in Russia was a “negro operetta” performed by Sam Wooding and the Chocolate Kiddies in

---

45 Zorkaya, 21-23.

46 Zorkaya, 107.
1926. At this time in Russia, “jazz” was either dance hall music where young people went to dance or vaudevillian jazz concerts (or operettas) that were accompanied by jazz-influenced music. Many jazz concerts were therefore similar to the music-hall, except that they strove to absorb the most recent trends in American jazz. In 1930, while working on Alone in Odessa, Shostakovich met the famed vaudeville and jazz performer Leonid Utyosov, leader of the Tea-Jazz Ensemble in Leningrad. Evidently, Utyosov was remarkably talented and was known in Russia for many decades as a musician, actor, stuntman and bandleader. He greatly impressed Shostakovich, who claimed that, “[Utyosov] is without a doubt the best performer in the USSR that I’ve seen.”

Utyosov’s Tea-Jazz Ensemble, founded in 1929, performed at the Leningrad Music Hall, which had opened only a year earlier. After working with Dunaevsky on a show in 1930, Utyosov decided to commission a more “serious” composer to compose for a music-revue. Given Shostakovich’s recent experience with the theater and with cinema, Utyosov asked him to collaborate on the music-hall revue, Hypothetically Murdered in 1931.

47 Jazz had already appeared in Russia as early as 1921, when Parnakh performed in a style resembling the jazz concert in Paris. It was only in 1926 however, that the first American jazz group came to Russia and gave the audiences a more “authentic” form of jazz. See S. Frederick Starr, Red and Hot: the Fate of Jazz in the Soviet Union 1917-1991 (New York: Limelight Editions, 1994) for a more detailed discussion of Russian jazz in the twenties.

48 Tea-Jazz is short for Teatral’nyi Jazz or theatrical jazz. See McBurney, 2.


50 There are several titles circulating in English for this music-hall work. Among them are Declared Dead and Hypothetically Murdered. I will be using Hypothetically Murdered in this document.
Hypothetically Murdered was a music-hall show, that included popular song, dance, circus acts and theatrical effects. Utyosov’s Tea-Jazz group performed on the same stage as the actors and sometimes participated in the action. Shostakovich’s music for Hypothetically Murdered is full of irony, satire and grotesque. It uses dance rhythms and styles of the time, particularly the waltz, the polka and the galop, which Shostakovich also employed in many of his theatrical and film works. It also uses a technique that resembles Eisenstein’s “montage of attractions,” where scenes, which are loosely connected by a general plot, are considerably disparate and are thrown together in a montage manner. Eisenstein has described the music-hall as inherently montagist.

“...the programmatic arrangement...was restructured into the type of composition know as the ‘montage of attractions,’ which turned each episode of the play into a separate ‘number’ and gathered them into a unified ‘montage’ on the pattern of a music-hall programme.”

Hypothetically Murdered is a work that combines scenes that are self-contained and highly repetitive. These scenes act as the building blocks of montage. Often the character of each scene contrasts with its surrounding scenes, creating the effect of shock. Examples of this can be seen throughout the work, especially in Act III, where the wild and abrupt “Bacchanalia of John von Kronstadt and Paraskeva Pianitsa” follows two quiet scenes of paradise as well as an “Adagio.” This sharp contrast is a trademark of

51 My discussion of Hypothetically Murdered is based on information from Fay and McBurney.


53 The order of scenes is as follows: “Paradise I: The Flight of the Cherubim”; “Paradise II: The Flight of the Angels”; “Adagio”; and “Bacchanalia of John von Kronstadt and Paraskeva Pianitsa.” I am using the order of McBurney’s suite of Hypothetically Murdered as my basis for this discussion. In the score, as it exists in the collected works, the order is somewhat different in some sections of the work. However, this is possibly due to the fact that the score is based on sketches, since all of the components (including the final score) are lost. See McBurney, 2.
the "montage of attractions," and is, at least according to Eisenstein, an element of the music-hall as well.

Another element featured in Eisenstein's discussion of the music-hall as the "montage of attractions" is the circus. The title of the piece as Shostakovich presented it, is "Music for the Stage-Circus Performance Hypothetically Murdered in the Leningrad Music Hall."\(^{54}\) The music-hall as a genre was defined as a type of performance that included the circus, "jazz" and "light" music and theater.\(^{55}\) It is generally agreed that the music-hall inherently includes the elements of the circus (in the case of Hypothetically Murdered, it includes the acting dog "Alpha") and in the title Shostakovich directly calls Hypothetically Murdered a circus piece. The circus musically can be described in terms of the Eccentrism of the FEKS group. They, like many youth of their time, believed in the spectacle of the circus as means of rousing excitement in the viewer and as a symbol of the fast pace of the new, modern era. In Hypothetically Murdered, this fast paced Eccentrism is evident in the galops and the "wild" sections, such as the aforementioned "Bacchanalia." These galops as well as other sections such as "The Archangel Gabriel's Number," use a similar range and an abrupt approach to melody also found in Shostakovich's grotesque work, The Nose. The idea that this work is potentially grotesque is further supported by the absurd titles of the numbers of the work, such as "Bacchanalia" and "Paradise." Also, portions of Hypothetically Murdered were used for later operas and ballets, as well as the Piano Concerto No.1. The "Bacchanalia" of Act

\(^{54}\) It reads as follows in Russian: "Muzika k estradno-tsirkovomy predstavlenuyu "Uslovno Ubiti" v Leningradskom Muzik-Holle."

\(^{55}\) Estrada, which I translated here as "Stage" was generally "light" music for the stage.
III and the “Transition to the Kitchen” and the “Waitresses” of Act II, for example, were excerpted and used in acts of Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District. The “Waitresses” and “Transition to the Kitchen” were also used for Shostakovich’s unfinished comic opera, The Great Lightning, while the “March” from Act I was used in the theatrical production, Hamlet. The only work that included excerpts from Hypothetically Murdered that was not an opera or theater work was the Piano Concerto No. 1. Thus, Hypothetically Murdered, labeled as a music-hall piece by Shostakovich, exhibits the traits of a music-hall piece of the twenties: it uses the “montage of attractions,” elements of the circus and Eccentrism as well as popular dance genres and the grotesque and provided musical material for later works. These traits were not only limited to the music-hall genre however, which I will discuss in my analysis of the finale Piano Concerto No. 1.

Although Shostakovich encountered difficulty with RAPM and their attitude towards light music he nevertheless continued to employ light music and jazz into his later compositions. In the mid-late thirties, Shostakovich wrote two jazz suites, that one could assume would have been performed by a group like Utyosov’s Tea-Jazz Ensemble. These suites used waltzes, polkas, and foxtrots, three dance types that Shostakovich had experimented with various works throughout the twenties. He also wrote theatrical music for Hamlet (1932) and The Human Comedy (1934), both of which use dance music, including the waltz as well as the gavotte and marches. These dances and marches, appearing in his works starting in the mid-twenties, almost start to act as “topoi” in his

---

56 See McBurney, 4.
These dances are treated in a grotesque and satirical manner, similar to *Hypothetically Murdered*, appeared very often in his theatrical and film works. Their appearance in his "art" works however, was less common.

As seen here, Shostakovich’s movement between seemingly different genres and styles of music of his time was quite fluid. It seems that even as early as the mid-twenties, his genre bending, i.e., the incorporation of jazz, music-hall or theatrical elements into his “art” music, was a two-way venture that led to a completely unique redefinition of genre. The commentary on the definition of genre in pieces like *The Nose*, *The Golden Age* and his film music, for example, exemplifies this idea. Shostakovich regarded *The Nose* as a “theater symphony,” implying that the music was not necessarily subservient to the dramatic action, but an equally important component of the work. *The Golden Age* was similar: the music was not just an “illustrative backdrop” for the ballet, but instead was designed “to dramatize the very musical essence, to give the music real symphonic tension and dramatic development.”58 The film score to the *The New Babylon* was approached in a similar manner: the music was regarded not as mere accompaniment, but as ironic commentary on the action. One could also argue that *Hypothetically Murdered*, although not considered an “art” music piece, is well constructed and “artiﬁcial” in approach. In other words, this piece has the depth and development that one could ﬁnd in an “art” composition, which is probably why Utyosov wanted a “serious” composer, instead of Dunaevsky for his music-hall shows.

---


58 Fay, 60. Quoted by Fay from Dmitri Shostakovich, “Avtor – o muzike baleta, Zolotoy vek” (Leningrad, 1931), 4.
Shostakovich also approached his film music similarly. For him, it was a serious job, something that required the respect and the discipline of a professional composer of "art" music. As long as the music conformed to standard of what was "good" in Shostakovich's mind, the genre or type of music mattered very little. In a printed recollection of the twenties and thirties, he said:

"I used to wonder how a serious musician could admire the music of Johann Strauss or Offenbach... but Sollertinsky helped me to overcome this snobbish attitude. Now I like music of all genres, provided it is good music." (italics mine)\(^5^9\)

Who could possibly disagree?

**Shostakovich's Attitude Towards Film and Theater**

Unlike most composers of his time, Shostakovich embraced theater, film and "light" music. As we have seen, Shostakovich involved himself in various musical activities and wrote for ballet, the music-hall, film as well as symphonies and concerti. During the late twenties and into the thirties and forties, Shostakovich made several comments about "light music," jazz and the importance of film music composition. In the twenties and thirties, Shostakovich was one of the first film composers, alongside Prokofiev, to write music for film that was engaged with the image and attentive to the drama. Shostakovich was also one of the few art music trained composers to write for the music-hall as well. In the thirties, Shostakovich also helped to found a jazz commission in Leningrad and wrote several jazz suites. It is not surprising that, even

\(^{59}\) Dmitri Shostakovich, "Dum’o prodyomnom puti" [Thinking about the Road Traversed], *Sovetskaya Muzyka* [Soviet Music], (Moscow: Muzgiz, 1956) 9: 11-12, quoted in Yakubov, *Collected Works in Forty-Two Volumes*, (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Muzyka, 1979-1987), Volume 25, editor’s note.
after the RAPM attacks on “light” music, Shostakovich held jazz, film and other popular music in high regard and expected composers to train as diligently in these musics as they would in art music composition. Comparing the cinema to traditional composition, he said:

“The composer must work on his music for films in the same way as he does on his major compositions -- only with still greater concentration and application.”

In regard to his work on The New Babylon, Shostakovich wrote articles on how film composition should be approached. Instead of simply combining excerpts from art music of the past (i.e., Tchaikovsky, etc.), new music should be composed in relation to the action on the screen. Shostakovich was one of the first advocates of film composition and complained bitterly about the lack of talent and the poor attitude towards film music.

In his articles on The New Babylon, he complains:

“Something should be done about music in the cinema, musicians should put an end to the unartistic, primitivist practices there, in a word, cleanse the Augean stable. The only way to do this is by composing special music.”

This “special music” is music that pays attention to the images themselves and does not try to simply characterize them on a superficial level. Shostakovich wants to go beyond a simple interpretation of the image, into a realm where the music intelligently and


consciously provides a commentary on the image, either as a complement or perhaps in an ironic fashion, as seen in his score of *The New Babylon*. For him, “Music in film is a powerful agent and cannot be regarded as mere illustration.”

Shostakovich saw the practices in film music of the 1920s as “unartistic” and therefore began to praise the benefits and potential growth that a composer could receive by writing music for film. In a book on Soviet cinematography, Shostakovich comments on the advantages of writing for film and how it should be incorporated into the curricula of teaching music composition. In regard to the problem of rhythm and pacing in film music composition, he states:

“Compressing music within a strictly defined temporal framework is not a technical problem though it may seem such at first glance. Just as it is much more difficult to write concisely in literature, so a composer must possess a greater skill and spend more effort to give an adequate expression to his idea in a laconic form. The cinema proves an excellent teacher in this respect: the composer develops an inner discipline which acts beneficially upon his musical idiom.”

This “inner discipline,” reminiscent of the vigor and structure of the Korsakovian tradition, seems to be part of what constitutes “good” music for Shostakovich, regardless of its genre or category. I interpret the implications of “good” music in Shostakovich’s output as being a great effort put towards organization, form and other musical elements that communicate to an audience on more than just a superficial level. Film music could be “good” music, only if, as he said, attention is paid to image. He also notes that this attention to the action and the matching of music to movement is something that has been

---


63 Shostakovich, “The Cinema as Composer’s School.”
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found in previous art music forms. He therefore justified film music in another way: by comparing it to the past and more “elevated” arts:  

“The organic fusion of words and sound, of sound and action, the possibility to utilize novel and fresh orchestral combinations - all this sets film music the problems that have long been successfully tackled in “music in general,” that is, in the music drama, the opera and the symphony. Film music must, first of all, take an active part in the action on the screen, so music in films must meet the same requirements as the screenplay, the actors’ performance and the direction.” 64

Shostakovich attempted to raise the standards in and elevate the status of film music composition. This attempt was not unlike that of contemporaneous filmmakers, who strove to validate film as a serious art. In essence, film music composition was an extension of his previous types of composition, ranging from ballet, the music-hall, and opera.

In addition to being an advocate of “good” film music composition, Shostakovich shared rather “eccentric” tastes with his contemporaries, such as FEKS and Eisenstein. In various writings, Shostakovich commented on the use of popular music in his compositions and alluding to music that was considered in his time to be “low” or associated with youth. He believed that laughter and the comic was as essential to music as any other emotion. This carries the implication of status in certain genres of music; that laughter or comedy, often associated with the music-hall, popular society, or the Eccentric ideals of the FEKS, is as important and equal to any other emotional ideal found in art music. His intention, some of the time, was to make his audience laugh and communicate with the broadest audience possible. In reference to his works from circa 1935 he said:

64 Dmitri Shostakovich, “Muzyka v kino. Zametki kompozitora” [Music and Films, a Composer’s Notes], Literaturnaya Gazeta (Moscow, 1939).
"I think that laughter in music is as humanly necessary as lyricism, tragedy, pathos and other "exalted" genres...I hope that the comrades who find much that is comic and excites laughter in my new ballet and dances written for jazz will not get angry and scold me for it."65

FEKS, as I have discussed earlier, believed in the importance of popular culture, specifically that which was borrowed from American culture of the teens and twenties. From Charlie Chaplin, to Pinkerton, from the advertising poster as the new trend in the visual arts, to the jazz band, popular culture was FEKS' Eccentrism: the culture that rebelled entirely against past "art" traditions and believed in "excitement" in opposition to the seriousness of art culture. Phrases such as, "We prefer Charlie's arse to Elenora Duse's hands!" and "We prefer the double soles of the American dancer to the five hundred instruments of the Marinsky Theater," emphasize their disdain for "high art" and their embrace of popular American culture. Eccentrism was their freedom from the high art tyrannies of their past and their prediction for the future of culture. Art, through the eyes of the Eccentrics, was thus newly defined for the new epoch.

Shostakovich had similar responses to the culture of his epoch. As discussed earlier, Shostakovich fully embraced popular culture of the twenties, even before his contact with the FEKS group. His experimentation with various genres of music, from ballet to the music-hall, demonstrates an interest in music outside of the fine art tradition. Shostakovich's music-hall composition, film scores, and jazz suites from the thirties and his Piano Concerto No. 1 all exhibit a dialogue with popular culture. In a defense of "light" or popular music, he said:

65 Dmitri Shostakovich, "God posle "Ledi Makbet"" [The Year After Lady Macbeth], Krasnaya Gazeta, (Moscow, 1935).
“It should be admitted that not all composers were quick to realize and that some do not realize even now, the vital importance of this kind of music, a music that is very thankful to the composers and worthy of their best efforts...I never could understand those who treated the so-called ‘light’ music in this way, for I know how difficult it is to compose. I wonder why nobody asks the writers of satirical essays when, they are going to write ‘serious’ novels and dramatists why they write plays instead of producing ‘real’ literature. But to this day ‘serious’ musicians – and some listeners and critics as well – look down their noses at the perfectly respectable art of popular music, which is needed by the broadest masses of the people. Is this because someone has lightheartedly dubbed this music ‘light?’” 66

Similar to FEKS, Shostakovich also wanted to entertain his audiences, to communicate with and excite the masses. These intentions resonate well with the revolutionary tendencies of the time, in the sense that he wanted to address and entertain his listeners with both popular and art music. In essence, Shostakovich wanted his music to be accessible. In response to criticism for his use of popular music in his compositions, he has said:

“At first I agreed that I was to blame for using frivolous ‘underworld’ – or rather ‘street’ – ditties in my music. Perhaps I had failed in my intentions, but they were good – I just aimed at good entertainment, I wanted to write a kind of music that would give pleasure and provoke a smile even in sophisticated listeners. When the public laughs or just smiles during the performance of my works, I am pleased...” 67

It can be assumed that behavioral standards in the concert-going public in Shostakovich’s time required the audience to remain serious and rather calm during a performance.

Shostakovich invites the opposite: he wants his audience to engage with his music on a “popular” level, which could be potentially humorous or shocking for a “sophisticated audience.” Shostakovich’s merging of the popular world with the art world of music not


only underlies Shostakovitch’s love for the popular realm of culture, but also his desire to entertain in a fashion that would normally be considered “lowbrow.” This desire to entertain reflects Shostakovitch’s desire to become more intimately involved with his audience; the break down the barrier of seriousness expected in the art music tradition.

In this chapter, I have attempted to reveal Shostakovitch’s cultural and musical environment in the early years of his musical life. As we have seen, Shostakovitch immersed himself in various aspects of culture, including the popular culture of the time, film culture as well as the art music tradition. Shostakovitch developed a multi-faceted musical personality that did not discriminate between “high” and “low” culture. He was aware however, that his audience did distinguish between these two levels of culture, and used this distinction to create humor and surprise, which allowed him to uniquely communicate with his audience.
CHAPTER 3

Analysis of the Finale of the Piano Concerto No. 1

This chapter presents an analysis of the finale of the Piano Concerto No. 1 and focuses on such elements as quotations and stylistic allusions in light of their organization in a cinematic manner. This chapter is therefore concerned with two essential points: 1) the finale uses narrative formal devices that are found in cinema and not necessarily found in musical genres of the past and 2) derivation of the musical material from the 1920s jazz and music-hall environment in Russia, as well as art music from the past.

By examining basic formal elements such as instrumentation, theme, rhythm and pace, and key, I will show how the finale resonates with Eisenstein’s “montage of attractions,” Eccentrism and FEKS, the grotesque, dance genres of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and popular music from the early twentieth century. After discussing the finale and the context of the composition as a whole, I will conclude by questioning how the broader cultural and sociological context allows for the possibility of multiple meanings. It is my hope that this chapter will illuminate a more playful, yet important side of Shostakovich’s musical personality that remained with him throughout his life.
I have chosen to focus specifically on the finale of this concerto for several reasons. First, this is the only movement that features the trumpet in a significant soloistic role and is constructed as a dialogue between two soloists, the trumpet and the piano. Often this dialogue is analogous to certain narrative devices found in film, such as montage, allowing for a possible interpretation of the soloists as "characters." The finale also exhibits formal traits that resemble film devices and borrows musical material from popular music. Although the other movements of the Piano Concerto No.1 may be analyzed as filmic, the finale reflects the spirit of Eccentricism particularly associated with the 1920s. The use of montage, the frenetic pace and the musical material all mirror popular culture and the youthful spirit of the 1920s. The finale therefore is particularly significant because of its potential to embody not only film and popular culture, but the spirit of the 1920s.

Many young artists of the time were turning towards popular culture in search of a new form of expression. As Yutkevich, a representative of the Moscow branch of FEKS and Eisenstein's early collaborator, said:

"The reason is that in its search for new directions, the whole young generation of Soviet artists had turned towards minor genres, the kind of popular art which the aristocracy and bourgeoisie had scorned. To be precise: the music-hall, the circus and the cinema. To all these genres, hitherto considered 'in poor taste,' the Revolution had opened up entirely new possibilities; and they became particularly influential." ¹

Shostakovich's natural affinity and love for these popular aspects of culture led him to be responsive to this general direction and specifically, collaborate with the main proponents of Eccentricism and early montage. By examining the New Babylon and the music-hall

production *Hypothetically Murdered*, I have already demonstrated how Shostakovich had internalized influences from the music-hall, the circus, theater, Eccentrisism and film. These works testify that Shostakovich absorbed montage as a formal construct and reveal the influence of jazz-style music, dance genres and popular music found in the music-hall. From the twenties forward, his music bore the influence of his experiences with the music-hall and film. It is not surprising that his *Piano Concerto No.1* bore the trace of these influences as well.

**Overall Form**

Of all the traditional forms characteristic of a finale in a concerto, such as ritornello, double-exposition, sonata and sonata-rondo, this movement most closely resembles sonata-rondo form. The movement can be divided into roughly seven sections that follow the following pattern: A-B-C-A^1- (cadenza)-B^1-(coda). The A section contains what I call Theme 1 in the key of c minor, while section B contains Theme 2 in the key of G major. A full quotation from another work replaces the development of section C leading directly into a restatement of sections A and B with modifications, with the latter in c minor. The coda finishes off the work in C major, with interjections of brief solo moments in the piano part. When viewed on this large scale, the movement appears to be a straightforward sonata-rondo. The problem is however, the abundance of fragments, motivic ideas, gestures and an overall approach imply a greater complexity than can be expressed in an interpretation of the finale as a straight sonata-rondo form. A closer look at the relationship between the themes, instrumentation, key, pacing and
rhythm reveals the possibility of a different approach to form building that complements
the overall sonata-rondo framework.

I have developed the following analytic system to approach the structural analysis
of this movement. In Diagram 1 (Appendix A, Figure A.1), all musical ideas that are
labeled “T” are themes and are followed by numbers (i.e., Theme 1 is T1). Themes
contain specific characteristics, such as balance, symmetry, antecedent-consequent phrase
structure and final cadences. All musical ideas labeled “S” are fragments that are very
brief, incomplete, without final cadence and generally do not contain the characteristics
of a theme. These “S” fragments are always followed by a letter in Diagram 1 (i.e., S(a)).
All musical themes and fragments have been excerpted and placed in Appendix D, Figure
D.1.

Rhythmic motives are marked as “R.” These are also followed by a letter, which
is usually the first letter of the type of rhythm (i.e., R(g) stands for Rhythm, gallop).
Sections labeled with “F” indicate an analogy to filmic devices, such as fade or
crosscutting and are labeled similarly rhythm, with “F” indicating “Film,” followed by
the type of device (i.e., F(fade) stands for film device, specifically “fade.”) Sections
labeled “Tr” indicate a transition and are followed by letters (i.e., TrA). Lastly, sections
labeled “E” indicate an “Episode,” borrowed directly from another work. The
abbreviated name of the work is given in parenthesis following the “E” (i.e., E(HM) for
Hypothetically Murdered).2 Other indications in the Diagram are self-explanatory, such
as “silent” meaning that the instrument is silent,” “C+R” indicating call and response, and

2 The use of the term episode here is not to be confused with its use in analyses of ritorio form in
Baroque concerti.
"accompaniment" or "acpt." indicating general accompaniment. The Diagram has three levels, representing the parts of the piano soloist, the trumpet soloist and the string orchestra. Beneath the three lines, key is indicated, as well as "shots." "Shots" are numbered at the bottom of the Diagram and delineated by lines within each major section. Measure numbers are provided, along with key indications at important points throughout, if the reader chooses to follow the analysis with a score.³

Having described the overall form of the finale as a broadly defined sonata-rondo form, I will concentrate on addressing the movement as a work that uses cinematic language, specifically montage, as a formal construction and means of organizing quotations from Shostakovich's contemporaneous musical culture. I will also focus on what is filmic about the movement by discussing other cinematic techniques.

Montage and Musical Themes

Given that this composition is not accompanied by any sort of image as in film or theater, the "content" of a "shot" in a montage sequence must be defined differently in regard to sound. Instead of discussing how a set of images could be associated with the finale, I will focus on themes or melodic fragments that constitute the various sections (as analogous to "shots") that can be regarded as part of a montage sequence. It is the relationship between the themes, their order of presentation, and the roles of the instruments that will contribute to this discussion of montage.

One of the factors that supports the interpretation of this movement as a montage construct within a traditional musical form, is the appearance of at least fifteen separate

³ The score I have consulted is from Yakubov, Collected Works, Volume 12.
melodic ideas in the span of approximately 6 minutes. Only two of these ideas could qualify as themes, since they have the prescribed symmetry, contour and balance. The remaining “ideas” usually appear as fragments of themes, or unfinished thoughts, ending abruptly and incompletely, and usually interrupting the musical flow. (See Diagram 1, Appendix A, Figure A.1) The fragments continually reappear throughout, while the themes reappear in full or in fragments, distorted and mutated from their previous appearances. This technique of taking a theme and reworking it as a fragment and slightly altering its contour, rhythm or range, is a technique Shostakovich has already practiced in his film music, notably The New Babylon, as discussed in Chapter 2. In that film, Shostakovich’s reasons for distorting the main themes of the work are driven by the story and are often presented in distortion to create an ironic commentary on the filmic action. As part of his “reworking” of fragments, he often set the fragments or partial themes in counterpoint with each other, layering them to present a compound set of ideas simultaneously, as a polyphonic “vertical montage,” akin to the technique of superimposition. Although this counterpoint could be traditionally explained in musical terms as “polyphony” or a linear stacking of melodic ideas, it also can be seen as a type of montage, on vertical level, as a complement to the horizontal, or usual sort of montage.

These themes or fragmented melodic ideas are part of the overall montage fabric of the finale for at least two reasons. First, the fact that there are more fragments than complete themes within the movement contributes to a sense of incompleteness and constant shifting between ideas. Second, the fact that the themes and especially the

---

4 This time is based on the performance of the Piano Concerto No. 1 by Dmitri Shostakovich. See Composers in Person: Dmitri Shostakovich, (EMI Limited, 1993), compact disc.
fragments, are presented in rapid juxtaposition to each other reinforces the abrupt shifting between incomplete thoughts that parallels the rapidity and juxtaposition of diverse content often found in montage film editing. One of several examples of this musical “editing” is found at the beginning of the movement, where TrA is immediately followed by a completely different melodic idea, designated as T1 (See Appendix D, Figure D.1). Although TrA descends (from E♭M-cm) into T1 to prepare the key of the work (cm), the appearance of T1 is still a “shock,” given its entirely different character and mood. Instead of continuing the angular descent of TrA, T1 immediately jumps in with sixteenth-note rhythms in a galop-like fashion, and propels the theme into momentum that will then continue throughout the movement. This kind of montage is therefore an immediate juxtaposition of ideas, back to back, or perhaps, “brick by brick,” to use Kuleshov’s term.⁵ There is no interruption of ideas, but instead a quick and abrupt shift in character from one theme to another.

Other examples that can be associated with “montage editing” and involve “interruption” on the part of certain instruments can be found throughout the movement as well. Focusing on the first 145 measures (section A of the sonata-rondo form), right before the next major theme appears for the first time (T2), one can see that the main melodic material involves T1, and other fragmented ideas that I have labeled “S” followed by a letter (S(a), S(b), etc.). In addition to Theme 1, section A contains four “S” fragments, as well as T1, that are reworked, varied and exchanged between the instruments. The following description of section A demonstrates how a montagist narrative can be constructed using the musical themes and fragments as analogies to

⁵ See page 16 of Chapter 1 for a discussion of Kuleshov’s approach to montage as “brick by brick.”
“shots” within a montage sequence and therefore as metaphors of “characters” acting within a film.

The A section therefore reveals two types of montage. One type is the “back to back” juxtaposition analogous to horizontal montage: a set of disparate musical ideas that collide against one another rhythmically, usually interrupting the main instrument. The second type is analogous to vertical montage, where the ideas are stacked upon each other in a polyphonic fashion, akin to the film technique of superimposition.\(^6\) The first instance of horizontal montage is when the orchestra “interrupts” the piano’s variation of T1 (m.41) with a different melodic fragment, S(a). At that moment, the listener’s attention is temporarily distracted from the piano to hear the upper strings. The strings therefore are competing for the listener’s attention from that point forward, until there is a restatement of a fragment of T1. These three “blocks” or “shots” of music (variation of T1—interrupted by S(a) – followed by a fragment of T1) are juxtaposed quickly, leaving the listener without a sense of periodicity or feeling of closure between these ideas and therefore can be construed as part of a montage sequence.

This horizontal montage pattern continues, picking up from measure 55, with a call and response between the orchestra and the piano. This ultimately leads to the first trumpet entrance of the movement (S(b), m.59), with a melodic fragment distantly related to TrA, over a gallop derived rhythmic accompaniment in the strings. Similar to other fragments, S(b) is in two parts, with the second part being distinct enough, yet related to the first. Immediately after the trumpet finishes with S(b), the orchestra picks up, with an

\(^{6}\) These distinctions of horizontal and vertical montage are my own and are designed for the purposes of this analysis. They are not intended to reference any other types of montage unless otherwise noted.
inverted variation of S(a), building in rhythm and ascending scale into the next recognizable fragment, labeled as S(c). A cascading call and response again appears between the orchestra and the piano, leading into the next fragment in the trumpet line (S(d)). At this point, all attention is focused on the trumpet, with the orchestra and piano in supportive roles, in a new key (F♯M). Again, the call and response, S(a), S(b), S(c) and S(d) are disparate ideas that are juxtaposed back to back, this time without overlap (i.e., C&R – S(a) – S(b) – S(c) – S(d)). They function like “blocks” or “shots” in a montage sequence and resemble Eisenstein’s “montage of attractions,” because of the shocking juxtaposition of their considerably different qualities of character.

The next series of “shots” is contained within a brief solo piano passage, where a variation of S(b) is grotesquely elaborated upon. At one point in this brief piano interlude, the S(b) idea is interrupted within the piano line, with a variation of S(c), which then is immediately dropped and followed by the continuation of S(b). It is almost as if Shostakovich cut and pasted this musical idea and placed it randomly in the middle of this variation of S(b). Again, this is another instance of horizontal montage, where instead of a juxtaposition of disparate ideas within a sequence, a stylistic allusion is dropped in the middle of a statement of another idea, briefly drawing attention away from the main subject (in this case S(b)). Thus, horizontal montage can be analyzed as either several segments of ideas strung together to create a whole or as a single idea that is briefly interrupted by an insertion of another idea.

The horizontal montage pattern of the shocking juxtaposition of different musical ideas continues through measure 145 as I have discussed above. However, there is one instance in the A section where Shostakovich employs a kind of vertical montage. This
instance of vertical montage is found immediately after the piano statement of S(b) (m.109), the trumpet restates S(b) as a variation. What is interesting about this variation is that the trumpet does not contain the S(c) fragment previously discussed in the piano part. Instead, the S(c) fragment appears in the orchestra in counterpoint with the trumpet part (mm.114-115). Therefore a superimposition of different musical ideas occurs, creating a kind of montage that is vertically aligned, as opposed to horizontal.

Of the two montage types discussed above, the horizontal montage is most common throughout the rest of the movement. In the B section for example, “S” fragments are juxtaposed with T2 (mm.145-182) as well as variations of T1 juxtaposed with new “S” fragments (mm.197-232). Similar to the A section, the themes are analogous to “shots,” and thus can be divided into at least nine “shots.” These shots contain T2, F(fade in), S(g), F(crosscutting), variation of S(b), F(fade out), T1, S(h), variation of F(fade) and S(i). The C section, which begins after TrB and a brief pause, is a quotation from Hypothetically Murdered (E(HM)). This section, unlike the previous two, has a tripartite form, (resembling ABA), where the first and last are almost exactly the same, and the second part is contrasting. This evaluation of the form is also confirmed by the key, which moves from EM-EbM-EM, reflecting the key relationship in the original work. Following the C section is the repeat of the first two sections (A^1 and B^1), which briefly restate the main themes (T1 and T2). The last section of the movement

---

7 See Diagram 1 for shot numbers as they correspond to the musical ideas.

8 In this part of Hypothetically Murdered, the key sequence is BbM-AM-BbM, a half step relationship found here, except up a tritone (EM-EbM-EM).
is the Coda, which resembles the same pattern of “shots” as the first two sections. Two new fragments are introduced, alongside glissando flourishes in the piano part.

It has now been established that both horizontal and vertical montage between themes is apparent throughout the movement. The themes themselves function as “shots,” analogous to frames or “shots” in a film. In film, “shots” are the smaller parts that build into sequences and finally larger sections or sometimes “acts.” In Shostakovich’s film music, specifically *The New Babylon*, themes and fragments combine to create both horizontal and vertical montage sequences. In order to illustrate the “shots” visually I have drawn a vertical line in the Diagram each time a shift to a new musical fragment or idea occurs, thereby dividing the appearance of themes into “shots” (see Diagram 1). What results in the A section for example, is at least fifteen different blocks or “shots” that demonstrate a dialogue between the piano, the orchestra and the trumpet. These “shots” are encapsulated by the overall structure of the 145 measures, which is the first A section of a sonata-rondo form. In essence then, the A section, similar to the B section and the Coda, provides a backdrop and functions as a large “sequence” in the filmic sense of the word, that contains disparate, colliding themes that are analogous to film frames or “shots” on a micro-level. The “shots” therefore are the smaller components that make up the “sequences” known as the A, B and Coda sections. Thus, Shostakovich has succeeded in combining a traditional musical form with a cinematic approach to development and theme, creating “film-like” music governed by the bare frame of a traditional musical form.

---

9 Refer to Chapter 2, pages 82-85 for a detailed discussion of horizontal and vertical montage in *The New Babylon*. 109
Other Cinematic Devices

Aside from montage, other film techniques manifest themselves musically in the finale. These techniques include crosscutting, overlap and fade.\(^{10}\) An example of crosscutting is found in section B for example, where a sparse question and answer between the trumpet and piano is accompanied by gallop derived rhythms in the orchestra. The piano plays two pitches, \(B^b\) and \(D\) in the lower register of the piano, while the trumpet answers in its upper range with a half step swell starting on \(E\). (See \(F(\text{crosscutting})\) in Diagram 1). These two parts are distinctly different in character and seem to chase each other, until the trumpet fades away. Crosscutting is a technique in film that often describes a set of shots that involve two characters or actions between which the camera cuts back and forth. This exchange between the trumpet and piano seems to evoke a crosscutting sequence, with the cuts between the different musical parts of the trumpet and the piano.

Another example of a musical rendering of a film device, in this case the “overlap,” is found in sections A and B. The \(E^b\) pedal in the trumpet leading up to the first appearance of \(T2\), for example, can be discussed as a cinematic “overlap.”\(^{11}\) (See Diagram 1, mm.145-147.) Instead of just having the trumpet enter with the second theme, Shostakovich has the trumpet break through the texture, playing an \(E^b\) two measures before \(T2\). This can be read as a “overlap,” which in film is, “the extension of action, dialogue, music or sound effects from one scene into the next to allow smooth

---

\(^{10}\) For definitions of these terms, refer the *Film Terminology Dictionary* in Appendix C, Figure C.1.

\(^{11}\) See Appendix C, Figure C.1 for the definition of “overlap.”
transition and uninterrupted continuity.”12 Here, the trumpet continues the continuity of the orchestra and uses the $E^b$ as a transition to lead into a new idea. Thus, the $E^b$ pedal can be a cinematic overlap into T2.

A similar example of “overlap” occurs as a lead into $S(g)$ (see mm. 170-176). At this point the same approach is used: the trumpet stays on an $E^b$ pedal for six measures transitioning to the entrance of $S(g)$ and hence overlapping into the next section.

The third cinematic device used by Shostakovich is a “fade,” which occurs at the end of the crosscutting section previously discussed between the trumpet and piano.13 The fade is a, “transitional device that usually signifies a distinct break in the film’s continuity, indicating a change in time, location or subject matter.” The fade can also be described in musical terms as “fade-in” or “fade-out” as well. The trumpet’s second response to the piano, described earlier as a half note swell, can be read as a “fade-out,” as it descends from $G^b$ to $C^#$, introducing the new key and fading out before the piano enters with T1. The reading of this as a “fade-out” is also supported by the diminuendo from forte to pianissimo written beneath the trumpet line. Thus, this instance of cinematic fade signifies a break in the musical mood and material, and provides a transition to a new section.

Musical Material: Quotations and Allusions

Apart from the formal organization, there are other factors that support the interpretation of this movement as montagist. The themes and musical fragments have

---

12 Katz, Ephraim, 884.

13 Fade can be used to describe the fading in or out of both music and image. See Appendix C, Figure C.1 for the definition of “fade.”
individual “personalities,” that are defined by their original context in past musical works. The obvious and most commonly identified quotation in several discussions of the finale is the episode from the music-hall production *Hypothetically Murdered* (see Diagram 1, E(HM)).14 This episode is from the last act of Part One entitled “The Archangel Gabriel’s Number,” with the setting as an, “atheist cabaret set somewhere in heaven, with dancing angels and saucy cherubim.”15 This episode is the only verbatim quotation in the work and does not exhibit the same montagist tendencies of the previous sections. Instead, based on its placement and its key (E Major), it appears to be the centerpiece of the work.

As discussed in Chapter 2, *Hypothetically Murdered* is a music-hall work that was influenced by vaudeville, the circus and the “light” music of its time. The particular segment quoted in the finale indeed reveals some of these influences, which is evident in the rhythmic accompaniment, the syncopated rhythms in the solo trumpet line and the overall “comic” character. The rhythms in the orchestral accompaniment resemble the galop, a popular dance of the time and one of Shostakovich’s favorite dance genres. The solo trumpet line uses a syncopated shuffle rhythm, often associated with ragtime and jazz.16 Thus, it is apparent that Shostakovich chose this segment for the finale to demonstrate a clear connection to the popular music used in *Hypothetically Murdered*.

Another prominent reference appears in the brief piano solo in the Coda (See Diagram 1, S(l)). Although this fragment is not an exact quotation, it does resemble the

14 See McBurney, 4 and Yakubov, editor’s note of Volume 12.

15 McBurney, 3.

16 I will discuss these two rhythms in later subsection.
refrain songs in the style of *California, Here I Come*, a Broadway song originally performed by the American entertainer Al Jolson in the 1920s.

Shostakovich, mm. 461-469

Refain from *California Here I Come*

Figure 3.1: Comparison of S(I) with *California Here I Come*

The two excerpts share certain melodic and rhythmic traits. The melodies, for example, are both eight measures in length, with a melodic idea (four measures long) that is sequenced either up (in the case of Shostakovich) or down (in the case of *California*) a fourth. Although the melodies are not exactly the same between these two excerpts, the essence of the 1920s style of popular song is captured in Shostakovich’s piano solo. In Shostakovich’s example, the piano technique entails a constant eighth note pattern in the left hand that accompanies the melody in the right hand, which eventually moves into
more complicated syncopated motion between the two hands (see mm.469-470). This rhythmic motion between the two hands is consistent with stride technique derived from ragtime piano playing in the teens and twenties.¹⁷ The use of syncopation specifically in the melodic line is another part of ragtime (usually referred to as “ragging” the rhythms) and is commonly found throughout ragtime piano pieces in the U.S. and Europe. Thus, this allusion refers to both ragtime piano performance and American popular song of the 1920s, further reinforcing Shostakovich's connections to popular culture.

The other quotations and allusions in the movement are not as complete as E(HM). Most of these fragments tend to be allusions rather than exact quotations.

Rossini, Barber of Seville, sinfonia  
Shostakovich mm. 65-67

Figure 3.2: Comparison of S(b) and Barber of Seville

A few of the “S” fragments for example, can be heard as references to Rossini, Tchaikovsky and J.S. Bach. The second half of S(b), for example, could resemble several pieces, including Rossini’s Barber of Seville (mm.65-67). As seen in Figure 3.2, the melodic contour between the two excerpts is the same, while the rhythms are slightly different. Shostakovich’s fragment starts with a much faster rhythm, while the original Rossini fragment is presented in a slower rhythm.

Another fragment, S(c), can be heard as an excerpt from Tchaikovsky’s Romeo and Juliet. Both of these fragments share the same melodic contour and whole and half step motion (if beginning on the second beat in the Shostakovich example in the first violins and on the third beat of the Tchaikovsky example). They also share a similar, yet not exact harmonic pattern. In the Tchaikovsky example, the harmonic motion is from E minor to a secondary dominant (GMM), while the Shostakovich fragment moves from G major to D minor and is generally more chromatic.

![Image of musical notation]

Shostakovich, mm. 74-75

Tchaikovsky, mm. 111-112

Figure 3.3: Comparison of S(c) and Romeo and Juliet
Another fragment that alludes to a past work is S(i), which bears some resemblance to the opening of the first movement of J.S. Bach's Brandenburg Concerto in No. 5 in D Major. Similar to the other fragments, S(i), as presented in the celli, is very brief and follows the melodic contour and in this specific case, the key of the potentially original source.

![Musical notation]

Shostakovich, mm. 225-228

Bach, mm. 1-2

Figure 3.4: Comparison of S(i) and the Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 in D Major

The melodic contour is similar, since they both ascend in thirds, yet the rhythms are different, given the contexts of the works. The Shostakovich excerpt, however, uses the original key of Bach's Concerto. Thus, although there is some difference, the basic melodic contour and the key allow the Shostakovich fragment to be heard as a fleeting and ephemeral reference to Bach's Concerto.

All of the “art” music fragments, as well as the ragtime allusion (S(I)), are incomplete, ambiguous and are therefore difficult to definitively analyze as true quotations. However, the similarities of these “S” fragments to certain past “art” or
popular works are striking. The ambiguous presentation of these fragments nonetheless, contribute to the overall montagist construction of the movement, because of the quick juxtaposition of their extremely distinct personalities and histories.

**Pacing and Tempo**

Aspects of this work that contribute significantly to the montage patterning are rhythm, tempo and pacing. As previously discussed in the first two chapters, film directors of the 1920s were concerned with musical analogies of filmmaking as well as rhythm, tone, character and shot content. Kuleshov and Eisenstein for example, edited film using musical terminology and ideas, such as "waltz time" or "2/4 time" to evoke a specific pace or meter between the final edited images. Directors such as Eisenstein attempted to reflect the pace of the content of the image in the film editing, as seen in the case of the lezginka dance from *Strike*. In writings by Kozintsev and the FEKS' manifesto, the idea of the "rhythm of a new epoch" is stressed as an aspect of the new and modern art. And lastly, as stated in the famous "Statement on Sound," the idea of coordinating sound and image in a contrapuntal fashion involves the coordination of rhythm and "content." Shostakovich would have been aware of the importance of this statement and the relationship between the image and sound in regard to rhythm, pacing, and tempo while working on *The New Babylon* with FEKS in 1928. Thus, since the finale of the *Piano Concerto No.1* has been established as montagist, these elements deserve attention in regard to the formal design of the finale.

---

18 See Chapter I, page 52, footnote 95.
In the finale, frequent and abrupt shifts between the musical ideas in the work happen without any deviation from tempo. There is a constant pace or momentum that never ceases despite these shifts. This sense of momentum in fact contributes to the overall effect of colliding melodic ideas. Fragments or quotations are rarely “prepared” or anticipated, and begin and end quickly without warning. Rhythmically speaking, they “hit” the listener, almost akin to watching a boxing match. During the course of the movement, as fragments quickly enter and exit the soundscape, the listener psychologically accumulates these ideas. Eisenstein addressed this notion of psychological accumulation in his discussion of the “montage of attractions:”

“actually occurring fact, the cinema 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.”

Although Eisenstein is referring to the image and the role of the image to persuade the audience towards a specific ideological notion, the idea of psychological accumulation is particularly relevant to Shostakovich’s finale of the Piano Concerto No.1. Combining the momentum of the movement and the “buildup” of the various musical montage sequences, it seems as if Shostakovich is producing a musical version of the “montage of attractions.” Many of these often disparate musical ideas juxtapose and accumulate in the listener’s mind throughout the movement, moving between the foreground and the background of the musical stage. This treatment of musical ideas can also be found in his score of The New Babylon, as discussed in Chapter 2. In this suite, multiple themes and

---

19 Eisenstein, S.M. Eisenstein: Selected Works, 41.
fragment of themes compete for the listener's attention either in vertical or horizontal montage, similar to the finale. It is possible therefore that he transferred this montagist approach to rhythmic and melodic juxtaposition of ideas from his film music experience to the finale, and that his approach was therefore specifically influenced by the montage technique practiced by FEKS. Since FEKS was directly influenced by Eisenstein and his theories of montage, Shostakovich therefore has a possible lineage to montage construction through FEKS, to Eisenstein.

Rhythm

Aside from the pacing and tempo involved in montage, there are certain rhythmic motifs throughout the movement that show a link to popular culture, specifically the music-hall. As I have mentioned earlier, Shostakovich began using at least three different types of dances, beginning with his piece *Aphorisms* in 1925. These dances are the galop, the foxtrot and the waltz. The second movement of the concerto, for example, is essentially a slow waltz, while the finale is rhythmically akin to a galop. Shostakovich wrote several galops, as well as waltzes and polkas, as movements in his earlier works, including *Hypothetically Murdered*, *The New Babylon* and *The Nose*. These galops shared certain traits: a quick, brisk pace, a specific rhythmic pattern and duple meter. This galop rhythmic pattern is similar to the patterns found throughout the finale of the concerto as well. In Appendix B, Figure B.1, I have listed a series of rhythmic motifs and their variations found throughout the movement that resemble the generic galop rhythm. These rhythms are found in many of the main musical ideas, including T1, T2,
and E(HM). These rhythms also permeate the orchestral accompaniment (See Diagram 1). Thus, the finale is a continuous galop.

Another rhythm that is prominent throughout the movement is a shuffle, or syncopated rhythm, (see Appendix B, Figure B.1) found throughout the orchestra and trumpet parts, but most prominently in the “ragtime” stylistic allusion (S(l), mm. 461-474). Although not as pervasive as the galop motif, the shuffle rhythm appears consistently throughout the movement in all parts. It first appears in the trumpet line in the initial statement of S(b) (specifically m.63), and appears again as part of S(g), when the meter shifts from duple to triple, creating an instant syncopated feel and re-articulation of the beat (mm.176-182). There are several more instances where this motif appears (see Diagram 1), but the last appearance is in the ragtime allusion. Essentially, the galop and this shuffle rhythm function as “themes” in themselves. Similar to the melodic fragments and themes, they make appearances throughout the movement in key places, as aspects of the themes, or as fragments in the accompaniment. Their prevalence, either as individual motifs or as essential aspects of themes, lend them a more distinctive role. This individual distinction, combined with their referentiality to previous works by Shostakovich that are affiliated with the music-hall and film, contributes to the “popular” sensibility of the work.

**Eccentrism, Montage and the Finale**

The montage construction, the musical ideas, their pacing and rhythm all contribute to a sense of the Eccentric. Eccentrism, as defined by FEKS, embraces

---

popular genres and popular art of the twenties, or in Yutkevich’s words, “the music-hall, the circus and the cinema.” Music-hall productions and theater, which were often home to the Eccentric aesthetic, were often organized in a seemingly chaotic manner and incorporated acrobatic stunts and circus animals. In their manifesto, and under the category of the new art of today, the FEKS group cites the music-hall as the new theater alongside cinema. They also claim American jazz and circus marches to be the “new music.” In his writings, Eisenstein refers to the music-hall program as inherently montagist, given its organization of episodes by number as opposed to acts and scenes. In a later article, he states:

“...the programmatic arrangement...was restructured into the type of composition known as the ‘montage of attractions,’ which turned each episode of the play into a separate ‘number’ and gathered them into a unified ‘montage’ on the pattern of a music-hall programme.” 21

FEKS also emphasizes the fast pace and the new rhythm of the modern epoch:

“...the novelty of things (in this case, things ‘eccentric’) was initially felt not in themes nor in characters, but in rhythm. Art changed rhythm. The new epoch had found its first expression in rhythm.” 22

The perceived lack of symphonic fluidity in the finale is a result of the montage construction of form and the rapid, “Eccentric” pace of this montage. Echoing Shostakovich’s film music and his music-hall production, Hypothetically Murdered, the finale contains traits of the “Eccentric” throughout. The seemingly chaotic mass of sound, that in reality is formally organized in montage under the sonata-rondo


framework, for example, parallels the circus. Many events and stunts are happening all at once as though in a circus performance, yet there is an underlying sense of organization. The fast pace and tempo of the finale, as indicated by tempo markings such as “Presto=120,” echo the ideals of the FEKS’ group and their call for a fast paced, modern world. The abrupt shifts between tempi also echoes FEKS appreciation of the “exciting” in popular culture. “American” references, such as ragtime and syncopated rhythms, parallel the trends of time, when audiences were flooding the cinema houses to see Charlie Chaplin as FEKS praised American culture as the new and young art. No less significantly for the present discussion is the use of instruments (piano and trumpet), that have a home both in the art music and jazz orchestra, and contribute to the new “Eccentric” sensibility of the finale. With the finale’s roots in the “music-hall program,” coupled with the desire to shock and excite the audience as FEKS so emphatically encouraged, the use of montage as a formal construct therefore celebrates the values of Eccentrism.

Given the context of the 1920s, the “Eccentric” and the concept of the “montage of attractions” are intertwined. Both of these ideas embrace the new, popular art and things that were constructed as “American” in the Soviet arts. The creators of each of these ideas valued: the music-hall and its montagist tendencies; the circus and its multiplicity in action and sense of chaos; the notion of excitement and crude action; shock produced by the collision of crude and/or disparate ideas or actions; and fast, frenetic rhythms and pacing, as part of the definition of their new and modern aesthetic. In essence, the “montage of attractions” is a montage of popular references juxtaposed
quickly to produce shock and excitement and hence, Eccentrism, in the finale of the
*Piano Concerto No. 1*.

This "montage of attractions," could be used to describe the formal approach to
the finale. The finale uses montage to organize "Eccentric" material that is evoked as
quotations, allusions or rhythmic patterns that reflect popular culture under the overall
rubric of sonata-rondo form. The musical material combined with the montage approach
to form building simultaneously alludes to both the category of "Eccentric" and the
"montage of attractions." In essence, the finale of *Piano Concerto No. 1* is reflective of
film theory, social, artistic and musical trends, as well as the overall appreciation for
popular and cinematic culture in the 1920s.
CHAPTER 4

Conclusions

The finale of the *Piano Concerto No.1* of 1933 has been discussed in the present thesis as an exuberant work that adopts the concepts and techniques of Russian film and popular culture from the 1920s. Shostakovich approached the formal design of the finale as he did his earlier film scores, using montage and other filmic techniques, such as superimposition, overlap and crosscutting, to construct the movement within the frame of sonata-rondo form. For his musical material, he borrowed from his music-hall work, *Hypothetically Murdered* and saturated the finale with musical allusions to popular genres (such as ragtime and the galop). This particular combination of “popular” and filmic references is not surprising, since Shostakovich frequented the main venues for popular music in the 1920, worked as a “pianist-illustrator” for silent films and later worked with innovative and talented film directors, composing film scores. Thus, the finale was the product of the playful and lighthearted aspects of Shostakovich’s character that developed and flourished in the 1920s.

In recent years, this ebullient side of Shostakovich’s personality has been generally ignored by some scholars who have concentrated on Shostakovich and his
music as bearers of ideological and political ideas. Yet it is quite evident that this facet of his personality had existed, as unambiguously expressed here in the Piano Concerto No. 1. This work, written in 1933, embodies a twenties-era Shostakovich that grins mischievously beneath the surface and is not overly concerned with politics and drama, as the Shostakovich of the thirties has been generally portrayed. Although he wrote this work at a time when the political environment in Russia was on the way to becoming oppressive, particularly in regard to the arts, it is composed in the spirit of the filmic and “popular” Shostakovich of the 1920s.

Did this vivacious Shostakovich, however, continue to compose music that bears the influence of film and popular culture in the 1920s? We know that he wrote popular music and music for film throughout his life. Did he continue to write popular music and music for film that may have influenced his other works? Is it reasonable to assume that Shostakovich eradicated the twenties-era facet of his personality as the political environment changed or did the popular traits explored in this thesis survive into his later works? Did he specifically use montage or any other filmic devices as formal constructs in later compositions, or did it end with the concerto? Did he have any “Eccentric” content in his later works?

It is very likely that Shostakovich would have continued these approaches to composition in his later works. In the 1930s, he wrote two jazz suites and continued to write for film up until 1970. He composed 37 film scores in his lifetime, alongside other

---

traditional genres such as symphonies, string quartets chamber music, operas, ballets and concerti. Genre transgression between film, popular music and art music – the issue that constituted the main focus of the present thesis – is a topic yet to be explored in music studies of Shostakovich. Although some scholars have discussed Shostakovich’s film music, very little scholarship has even begun to address filmic device, specifically montage, as an analogous manner of constructing form in other non-film musical genres. Further exploration into this subject could deepen our understanding of Shostakovich’s music, as well as continue to illuminate other facets of his multivalent personality. This exploration may also lead to new theories of the relationship between music and film, and may inform compositions by other composers who have worked in both spheres of music composition in the twentieth century.

---

2 See Tatiana Egorova *Soviet Film Music* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers), 1997, as an example of newer research in Soviet film music study and Richard Burke “Shostakovich, Film and Narrative,” *Musical Quarterly* 83 (1999): 413-429 as one of the first examples of application of film music techniques to Shostakovich’s art music.
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APPENDIX A

DIAGRAM 1

Abbreviations:

accept = accompaniment           C+R = call and response          E = episode           F = film device
R(g) = rhythm (gallop)            R(sh) = rhythm (shuffle)           S = fragment           Tr = transition           T = theme

Note: Key is marked only when it changes and remains stable. Shots are marked within each section.

Figure A.1: Diagram 1
Figure A.1: Diagram 1 (continued)
DIAGRAM 1 (continued)

Figure A.1: Diagram 1 (continued)
APPENDIX B
RHYTHMIC PATTERNS

1. \( \frac{3}{4} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \)

2. \( \frac{7}{4} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \)

3. \( \frac{3}{4} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \)

4. \( \frac{3}{4} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \) \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{or}} \end{array} \)

Figure B.1: Rhythmic Patterns

Staves 1 and 2: galop rhythms and their variations

Staves 3 and 4: shuffle rhythms
APPENDIX C

FILM TERMINOLOGY DICTIONARY

All of these definitions are taken from either Bordwell’s Film Art or Katz’s Film Encyclopedia. See footnotes on this page and bibliography for more details.

Close up A shot taken from a close distance or through a telephoto lens which brings to the screen a magnified, detailed part of a person or an object.¹

Crosscutting The technique of intercutting two independent sequences to and fro in the course of editing so that a relationship is established between the parallel actions. Crosscutting is the key to tension building in chase scenes, with emphasis shifting back and forth from pursuer to pursued. The technique was elevated to an art by D.W. Griffith in The Birth of a Nation (1915) and Intolerance (1916) but appeared as early as 1903 in Porter’s The Great Train Robbery.²

Figure C.1: Film Terminology Dictionary

² Katz, 288.
Cut Abrupt transition from one scene to another without using an optical effect such as
dissolve, a wipe or a fade. It is achieved by splicing the last frame of one scene with the
first frame of the next.³

Diegetic sound Any voice, musical passage, or sound effect presented as originating
from a source within the film’s world.⁴

Editing The process of selecting, assembling and arranging motion picture shots and
corresponding sound tracks in coherent sequence and flowing continuity.⁵

Fade 1. An optical effect that causes a scene to emerge gradually on the screen from
complete blackness (fade in) or a bright image to dim gradually into blackness (fade out).
The fade is a transitional device that usually signifies a distinct break in the film’s
continuity, indicating a change in time, location or subject matter. Most films begin with
a fade-in and end with a fade-out. The use of a fade-in/fade-out between sequences
within a film is similar to the function of the beginning or end of a chapter in a book or of
an act in a play. The length of the fade should be in keeping with the film’s tempo and
mood…⁶

Figure C.1: Film Terminology Dictionary (continued)

³ Katz, 295.

⁴ David Bordwell and Kristen Thompson, Film Art: An Introduction, (New York: McGraw Hill Companies,

⁵ Katz, 374.

⁶ Katz, 398.
2. The gradual increase of decrease in the level of sound in film is similarly known as a fade-in or fade-out. Thus, typically, a motion picture script would start with the instruction “fade in” on the picture side and “fade in music” (or sound effects) on the sound side.  

**Intercutting** An editing technique by which two different sequence of action are alternated to suggest simultaneous action. This method allows an editor to enrich the narrative continuity of a film and also to manipulate time by accelerating or retarding the main action.

**Long shot** A broad view of objects or action of principal interest.

**Medium shot** A shot intermediate between a close up and a long shot.

**Mise en scène** French term – literally, the placing of a scene – for the act of staging or directing a play or a film.

**Montage** A term derived from the French word for hoisting, setting up, mounting or assembling – hence, staging in theater usage and editing in film terminology.

---

7 Katz, 398.

8 Katz, 601.

9 Katz, 731.

10 Katz, 794.

11 Katz, 813.

12 Katz, 820.
**Nondiegetic sound** Sound, such as mood music or a narrator's commentary, represented as coming from a source outside the space of the narrative.\(^{13}\)

**Overlap** 1. The extension of action, dialogue, music or sound effects from one scene into the next to allow smooth transition and uninterrupted continuity. 2. The overlapping of two ends of film for splicing. 3. Extra length of a shot allowed for superimposition in the preparation of a dissolve, a fade or a wipe.\(^{14}\)

**Split screen** An effect shot in which two or more different images appear on the same frame.\(^{15}\)

**Stop-motion cinematography** (pixillation): A form of single-frame animation in which three-dimensional objects, often people, are made to move in staccato bursts through the use of stop-action cinematography.\(^{16}\)

---

13 Bordwell, 480.

14 Katz, 884.

15 Katz, 1081.

16 Bordwell, 480.
**Superimposition** The technique of photographing or printing one (or more) image(s) on top of another so that both (all) may be seen simultaneously in screening. The effect may be achieved in any of several ways, including by the exposure of the same piece of film more than once in the camera, by a glass shot, or by double or multiple printing. Sequences composed of a succession of superimpositions are known in Hollywood as montage sequences, but the meaning of the term “montage” is quite different in the theories and films of Eisenstein and other Soviet directors in which it is used to describe a dynamic style of editing.17

---

17 Katz, 1110.
APPENDIX D

THEMES AND FRAGMENTS

Figure D.1: Theme A

Figure D.2: Theme 1

Figure D.3: Theme 1 variation
Figure D.4: S(a)

Figure D.5: Theme 1 (fragment)

Figure D.6: S(b)

Figure D.7: S(c)
Figure D.8: S(d)

Figure D.9: S(c) in piano solo

Figure 10: S(b) variation
Figure D.15: S(h)

Figure D.16: S(i)

Figure D.17: E(HM)