

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 08.12.20

Filmmontasje

Montasje føyer sammen filmatiske deler til en helhet, slik at det oppstår mer eller mindre overraskende betydninger ut fra kombinasjonen av elementene (Niney 2012 s. 122). De ulike filmopptakene og deres lydspor bearbeides, settes sammen, deres lengde blir bestemt og kuttet osv. (Aumont, Bergala m.fl. 2004 s. 44).

Den russiske regissøren og filmteoretikeren Lev Kuleshov skrev: “Moreover, different cuts, a different construction – the montage of shots – can change the concept of an entire episode. Windows opening, people looking out, galloping cavalry, signals, running boys, water gushing through a break in a dam – these can be edited, say, either as a festival, or as the construction of a hydroelectric plant, or as the activities of hostile forces in a peaceful city” (sitert fra <ftp://84.126.211.16.dyn.user.ono.com/>; lesedato 27.08.14).

Den sovjetrussiske regissøren Dziga Vertov sammenlignet å lage filmmontasje med å ta vakre hender fra én person, slanke og raske bein fra en annen person, et vakkert og uttrykksfullt hode fra en tredje, og lage et nytt og fullkomment menneske av delene (gjengitt fra Diederichs 2004 s. 230). Gjennom montasjen viser regissøren mye av sin subjektive oppfatning om det filmen handler om (Diederichs 2004 s. 366). Og den nye måten å sette sammen filmkutt på opphevet i en viss forstand tid og rom slik det framstår “naturlig”, og endret lovene for menneskets opplevelse av et hendelsesforløp (Žmegač 1980 s. 422).

“Montasjen blir produktiv når vi gjennom den erfarer noe som slett ikke blir vist i selve bildene.” (Béla Balázs i Diederichs 2004 s. 282) Publikum ser koblinger og trekker slutninger som ikke alltid går direkte fram av filmen. Montasjer kan bidra til å skape erkjennelser, gjøre (logiske) vurderinger og felle dommer (Diederichs 2004 s. 285). Montasjer kan også ha en rytmisk, nesten musikalsk virkning (Diederichs 2004 s. 286).

“Think of *Rocky* (1976) and the now famous training montage. That whole sequence could be replaced by a title card reading “After weeks of training, Rocky improved his stamina and perfected his boxing skills.” This short sentence essentially summarizes that 3-minute montage... but which one do you think is more cinematic? Which one would make you have goose bumps? For this reason, it is often said that characters cannot fall in love during montages. The courtship and

romance would be too bland or dull. Love deserves a better treatment.” (<http://www.elementsofcinema.com/editing/montage.html>; lesedato 31.05.16)

I thrillerfilmen *The Da Vinci Code* (2006; regissør Ron Howard) er det i begynnelsen av filmen en parallellmontasje mellom hovedpersonen Robert Langdons foredrag og et mord som finner sted i Louvre i Paris (Peltzer 2011 s. 134). Montasjesekvensen slutter idet politiet like etter foredraget ber Langdon om hjelp.

“[A]ccelerated montage[:] Rapid cutting from shot to shot to increase the pacing and rhythm of action as it appears on the screen. The length of the individual shots becomes shorter as we see different views of the same action or views of different but related actions. An example of accelerated shots of the same action is the famous shower sequence in Alfred Hitchcock’s *Psycho* (1960) [...] Notable accelerated montages of related actions appear at the end of several films by D. W. Griffith to increase suspense as rescuer rushes to potential victim.” (Ira Konigsbergs *The Complete Film Dictionary* sitert fra Fuxjäger 2007 s. 42-43)

I amerikaneren Edwin S. Porters *Life of an American Fireman* (1903) skifter perspektivet fra inne i et brennende rom til utenfor bygningen der brannmennene går inn gjennom et vindu i andre etasje. Handlingen fra begge perspektivene viser en kvinne og hennes barn som reddes, og brannmennene som slukker flammene. Publikum ser den “samme” handlingen to ganger, for det brukes *ikke* montasje slik det ville blitt gjort i dag (Marcel 2009 s. 86). De to synsvinklene på hendelsene blandes altså ikke gjennom filmatisk kutt-teknikk. Antakelig ville en montasjeversjon vært ubegripelig for datidens publikum (Vincent Pinel gjengitt fra Marcel 2009 s. 86).

Som en pionér for filmmontasje regnes amerikaneren David Wark Griffith, med filmen *The Birth of a Nation* (1915). “*The Birth of a Nation* is a story about the consequences of the Civil War on the friendship of a northern and southern family. It expresses the effects of the war on their lives in relation to major historical and political events. This movie is directed by D.W. Griffith and is based on the story of the origins of the Ku Klux Klan. In this film, Griffith uses certain film techniques, which have become the fundamental basis of all movies today. These include the addition of a musical score, the use of natural outdoor landscapes as backgrounds, close-ups, long shots, panning, cross-cutting, the iris effect, the combination of parallel action and editing in a montage. [...] The scenes in *The Birth of a Nation* are composed of several panoramic shots cross-cut with medium shots of the individual soldiers in battle. Griffith not only cuts shots before they are ended, but also juxtaposes long, medium, and close shots in order to obtain a variety of spatial and temporal lengths.” (<http://plaza.ufl.edu/icon2480/academia/essays/potemkin.pdf>; lesedato 23.10.14)

Griffiths film *Intolerance* (1916) er en sammenkomponering av fire forskjellige historier som først presenteres atskilt fra hverandre, men som deretter sammenstilles i en stadig raskere rytme. Det dreier seg om en type parallell-montasje (Aumont, Bergala m.fl. 2004 s. 145):

“The four widely separate, yet paralleled stories are set in different ages – and in the original print, each story was tinted with a different color. Three of the four are based on factual history:

- THE ‘MODERN’ STORY (A.D. 1914): (Amber Tint) In early 20th century America during a time of labor unrest, strikes, and social change in California and ruthless employers and reformers – a young Irish Catholic boy, an exploited worker, is wrongly imprisoned for murder and sentenced to be hung on a gallows. The boy is saved from execution in a last-minute rescue by his wife’s arrival with the governor’s pardon.

- THE JUDAEAN STORY (A.D. 27): (Blue Tint) The Nazarene’s (Christ’s) Judaea at the time of his struggles with the Pharisees, his betrayal and crucifixion (told as a Passion Play in his last days) – it is the shortest of the four stories.

- THE FRENCH STORY (A.D. 1572): (Sepia Tint) Renaissance, 16th century medieval France at the time of the persecution and slaughter of the Huguenots during the regime of Catholic Catherine de Medici and her son King Charles IX of France, and the notorious atrocities of St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre (including its effects upon the planned wedding of a young innocent Huguenot couple – Brown Eyes and Prosper Latour).

- THE BABYLONIAN STORY (539 B.C.): (Gray-Green Tint) peace-loving Prince Belshazzar’s Babylon at the time of its Siege and Fall by King Cyrus the Persian, due to the treacherous High Priests – and the Mountain Girl’s vain efforts to avert the tragedy. The outdoor set for the Babylonian sequences was the largest ever created for a Hollywood film up to its time, and its crowd shots with 16,000 extras were also some of the greatest in cinematic history.

In his radically non-linear, hybrid film, Griffith simultaneously cross-cuts back and forth and interweaves the segments over great gaps of space and time – there are over 50 transitions between the segments. The villains of the four stories are mill owner Jenkins and his intolerant social reformers, the hypocritical Pharisees – opponents of Christ, the evil regime of the cunning Queen Catherine, and the treacherous High Priest of Babylon. Their powerful actions set in motion disturbing consequences for a modern-day working-class couple, for an average French Huguenot family and its soon-to-be-betrothed daughter Brown Eyes, for the Nazarene/Christ, and for the enlightened, revolutionary and benevolent Prince Belshazzar.

The symbolic bridging device that interconnects and links together the various stories is the recurring cameo shot of Lillian Gish, his greatest star, as Eternal Motherhood. She endlessly and eternally rocks a cradle, accompanied by the title from Walt Whitman's poem *Leaves of Grass*: "Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking. Uniter of Here and Hereafter – Chanter of Sorrows and Joys." Her iconic image, rocking the cradle of humanity, serves as a symbol of continuity for the entire history of the human race, and a representation of the cycle of life and death." (<http://www.filmsite.org/into.html>; lesedato 17.09.14)

Parallellmontasje er å koble sammen noe som har likhet i form, men kontrasterende innhold (Diederichs 2004 s. 380).

Den franske regissøren Abel Gance brukte montasjeteknikk i sin film *Hjulet* (1923) (Brion 2005 s. 16). "*La Roue* is a powerful drama of life among the railroad workers, rich in psychological characterization and symbolic imagery. To dramatize his story of a railroad mechanic's tortured love for his adopted daughter, Gance elaborated his use of masking and superimposition and perfected his fast cutting into the rapid montage that would soon be adopted by Russian and Japanese silent filmmakers for whom *La Roue* was a seminal influence. Complex in its thematics, the film's images animate machines and the forces of nature with a life and spirit of their own while the wheel ("la roue") of the film's title becomes a metaphor for life itself." (<http://alsolikelife.com/shooting/2008/12/940-81-la-roue-the-wheel-1922-abel-gance/>; lesedato 25.03.15)

Den amerikanske regissøren John Griffith Wrays film *Her Reputation* (1923) bruker montasje til å vise de psykiske virkningene av en pressekampanje. En kvinnes rykte trues av verdenspressen, og publikum får se rotasjonsmaskiner og andre apparater som brukes til å lage aviser. Inn imellom kuttes det til bilder av kvinnens skremte ansikt og bilder der hun ligger på gulvet. Det skapes assosiasjoner til avisene som et skred som truer hennes liv; filmkritikeren Béla Balázs hevdet at denne montasjen suggererer likheten mellom avisproduksjonen og et snøskred, og at avispressene uttrykker noe fysiognomisk (gjengitt fra Diederichs 2004 s. 283). "Det finnes ingen så "død" gjenstand at den ikke i en slik assosiasjons-montasje ikke kan vekkes til å bli en levende fysiognomi." (Béla Balázs sitert fra Diederichs 2004 s. 284)

Den sovjetrussiske regissøren Sergei M. Eisenstein oppfattet filmmontasje som et kollisjonsprinsipp (Gross 1994 s. 113). Hans framgangsmåte har blitt kalt "sjokk-montasje" (Niney 2012 s. 137). "Filmens uttrykksffekt er et resultat av sammenstillingene." (Eisenstein sitert fra Diederichs 2004 s. 261) Det Eisenstein kaller "sekvensdeler" settes sammen.

Eisensteins *Panserkrysseren Potemkin* (1925) "er et høydepunkt blant de sovjetiske montasjefilmene og utforsket en ekspressiv redigeringsteknikk der klippingen eller sammenstillingen av bildene sto i sentrum for oppmerksomheten. Filmen søkte å

fremstille kollektivet som helt framfor en individualisert tradisjonell helteskikkelse i tråd med radikale ideer i det etter-revolusjonære Sovjet.” (tidsskriftet *Cinematket* nr. 1 i 2015 s. 40) Eisenstein har fortalt at *Panserkrysseren Potemkin* ble kuttet ned fra en lengde på 15.000 meter film til 1.600 meter (i Diederichs 2004 s. 260).

Eisenstein var klar over at mange seere oppfattet montasje som et “venstre-orientert” og overdrevet virkemiddel, men for han selv var det primært en effektiv måte å skape en god komposisjon av enkeltdelene i en film på (Eisenstein gjengitt fra Diederichs 2004 s. 288). Han ironiserte dessuten over “den oppfatning at vakker og passende musikk i en film er en musikk som man ikke hører; en kameraføring som man slett ikke merker; en regi som forblir skjult for tilskueren.” (sitert fra Diederichs 2004 s. 389)

“Sergei Eisenstein talks about five different methods of montage through out his work. These varieties of montage build one upon the other so the “higher” forms also include the approaches of the “simpler” varieties. These are the five:

Metric – Where the editing follows a specific number of frames, this is based purely on the physical nature of time, cutting to the next shot no matter what is happening within the image. The reason for this is to get an emotional reaction from the audience.

Rhythmic – The cutting happens for the sake of continuity. This creates visual continuity but it may also be used in order to keep with the pace of the film. A good example of this is the the legendary car/train chase scene in *The French Connection*.

Tonal – A tonal montage uses the emotional meaning of the shots. Not just manipulating the temporal length of the cuts or its rhythmical characteristics. The point of this is to elicit a reaction that is more complex than Rhythmic and Metric. An example of this is in one of Eisenstein’s films called *Battleship Potemkin* where the character ‘Vakulinchuk’ dies.

Overtonal/Associational – An accumulation of metric, rhythmic, and tonal montage to synthesise its effect on the audience for an even more abstract and complicated effect.

Intellectual – Uses a combination of shots from outside the film in order to create a meaning. A good example of this would be the scene from [Francis Ford Coppolas] *Apocalypse now* where Kurtz is being executed. They mix in shots of a water buffalo being slaughtered.” (Billy M. Stoneking i <http://veracity24.tumblr.com/post/39686928799#.VYgBk00w-70>; lesedato 22.06.15)

“I kunsten er M[ontasje] især utviklet i filmen af pionerer som de russiske instruktører Vsevolod Pudovkin og Eisenstein. Sideløbende arbejdede Eisenstein

med M i teatret, bl.a. lanceret som attraksjonsmontage 1923. Hensigten var at sette sceneelementer som lyd, farver, ord og gestus effektivt og målrettet sammen, således at tilskueren utsattes for 'bestemte emotionelle chok', der skulle føre til forestillingens 'ideologiske konklusjon'. M som 'konfliktfylt sammenstød' mellom elementer blev en viktig teknikk i avantgardekunsten, jf. de tyske billedkunstnere John Heartfield og George Grosz' fotomontager. I Erwin Piscators politiske revyer monteredes overraskende autentiske taler, krigsfilm m.m. ind i fiktive scenehandlinger som i *Trotz alledem!* 1925." (http://www.denstoredanske.dk/Gyldendals_Teaterleksikon/Begreber/montage; lesedato 25.10.14)

Russeren Semjon Timosjenko stilte i 1926 opp en liste over 15 framgangsmåter å lage filmmontasje på:

1. Veksling mellom steder
 2. Veksling mellom kameraets plassering og dermed perspektiv
 3. Veksling mellom innstillingsstørrelser (f.eks. mellom oversiktsbilder og nærbilder)
 4. Framheving av en visuell detalj
 5. Analytisk montasje (sammensetning av ulike montasjeformer)
 6. Tilbakeblikk i tid
 7. Frampek i tid
 8. Parallellmontasje (parallelle handlinger)
 9. Framheving av kontraster
 10. Assosiasjon
 11. Konsentrasjon (f.eks. fra total innstilling til detalj)
 12. Utvidelse (f.eks. fra detalj til total)
 13. Monodramatisk montasje (monodrama bruker kun én skuespiller)
 14. Refreng
 15. Montasje inne i et bilde (innstillingsintern montasje)
- (gjengitt fra Diederichs 2004 s. 22) Noen av kategoriene er undergrupper av andre kategorier. F.eks. er punkt 4 en undergruppe av punkt 3.

“Everyone who has had in his hands a piece of film to be edited knows by experience how neutral it remains, even though a part of a planned sequence, until it is joined with another piece, when it suddenly acquires and conveys a sharper and quite different meaning than that planned for it at the time of filming.” (Eisenstein sitert fra Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 454) For Eisenstein og for andre russiske regissører var kamerainnstillinger sentrale faktorer i montasjer, f.eks. ved at brå overganger lagde “konfliktmontasje” som skulle frambringe en ny, dialektisk sammenheng (Diederichs 2004 s. 23).

“Eisenstein, a filmmaker and theorist, thinks of montage as collision. To him, shots are used to manipulate the emotions of the audience and he uses fast editing and juxtaposition to create maximum impact. His philosophy is that montage is dialectical, serving as a method of intellectual investigation, and is therefore a

representation of Marxism. According to Eisenstein, elements are not perceived as appearing next to each other, but rather, appear on top of one another. Since he thinks of shots in this way, he uses spatial and temporal dislocation within his films, thus jarring his viewers. This method contrasts with standard Hollywood practices, which employ montage as a way of creating understanding. Eisenstein's approach involves a sort of violence of cinema, which is exemplified through his statement, "it is not a 'Cine-Eye' that we need but a 'Cine-Fist.'" He explains that that fist should "cut through to the skulls," so that rather than contemplations, he evokes something in viewers that will lead to action (Eisenstein 59). The term 'cine-eye' was coined by Dziga Vertov, another Soviet filmmaker, and refers to the perfection of the camera eye. Vertov explains that the world is seen more clearly through the eye of the camera than through the human eye. He feels that the cine-eye has the capacity to help man evolve into a more precise form (Vertov 37). In keeping with this notion, he believes that cinema should only be real and truthful and therefore embraces the documentary form of filmmaking, depicting life as it is. Eisenstein refutes this theory, explaining that cinema should be used for a greater purpose than attempting to capture reality, which can only be accomplished through the manipulation of images, often in the form of montage." (Jessica Hershatter i <https://jhershaemory.wordpress.com/2010/12/10/montage-eisenstein-vs-pudovkin/>; lesedato 24.06.15)

"In order to most effectively alter images, Eisenstein developed different methods of montage broken down into metric, rhythmic, tonal, overtone, and intellectual. Metric montage employs cuts based on how many frames are in each shot. Using this technique, the filmmaker inserts a cut after a certain number of frames, regardless of what is occurring in the shot. Rhythmic montage is similar to metric montage in that it uses cuts based on time, but it also uses what is contained within the shot to create more complex meanings. For instance, music can be used to create rhythm and form a forward moving trajectory. Tonal montage uses the emotional meaning of shots to obtain an audience reaction and is based largely on content. Overtone montage, also referred to as associational montage, combines the aforementioned metric, rhythmic, and tonal montage. Eisenstein placed the greatest emphasis on the final category, intellectual montage. This method creates a juxtaposition of shots, placed in such a way as to extract intellectual meaning, something that cannot be achieved through individual shots. Intellectual montage developed out of his desire to have a cinema that functioned "through the abstract word that leads to a concrete concept" (Goodwin 82)." (Jessica Hershatter i <https://jhershaemory.wordpress.com/2010/12/10/montage-eisenstein-vs-pudovkin/>; lesedato 24.06.15)

Eisenstein prøvde på 1930-tallet å la montasjene uttrykke et "indre språk", f.eks. slik det kan forekomme hos barn, "primitive" folk og psykotiske personer, med en slags "kortslutninger" mellom tanker og bilder (Aumont 2005 s. 69).

Eisenstein's *Streik* (1925) "was considered the first major film of the Montage movement and it is a political film with strong statements about collectivism. Soviet Montage theory has a basic underlying philosophy that Montage directors (Vertov, Pudovkin and Eisenstein) all seem to agree upon – that Montage was the basis of revolutionary films that would inspire audiences. Moreover, they believed that theory and filmmaking should be closely linked as the revolution was aimed to bring worker and peasant classes to power. [...] Montage film theory can be seen as a way to be inclusive of the Russian people and as a method to comprehend and create cinema that depends completely on editing. Eisenstein as a theorist goes further than this by arguing that shots should be seen as conflicting with one another. This conflict between shots will influence the spectators in such a way that a new concept will be created in their minds." (<http://mattrux.blogspot.no/2012/05/eisensteins-strike-1925-and-montage.html>; lesedato 25.09.14)

"Montage was used to create metaphors and to make rhetorical points. [...] Eisenstein believed that when two strips of film are joined together, they become more than two strips of film because of what the spectator make from the two strips of film. [...] A very significant scene in *Strike* part 2 that creates a third meaning: "Reason to strike". Yakov, a worker discovers that a micrometer has been stolen and reports it to administration. The administration accuses Yakov of stealing the micrometer – Yakov hangs himself but leaves a letter telling his co-workers of the injustice he faced. This then sets off a massive fight between the manager and the strikers. Montage in this scene is effectively used to demonize the administration. Yakov reports the lost and is met by laughter towards him by the administration. Then the manager appears. This is where it cuts consistently between a close-up of Yakov and a close-up of the manager. The two characters are looking directly into the camera in these close-ups, and the two shots strongly juxtapose each other. Yakov's close-ups are for the spectator to become sympathetic with his side and share his frustration at the manager. The manager's close-ups are so the spectator feels as though the manager was accusing the spectator directly, this shot strives for the spectator to feel more in Yakov's position. The summary of the third meaning out of this would be that the manager isn't just accusing Yakov of being a thief, but indirectly accusing spectators who have identified themselves with Yakov from the beginning. This scene can demonstrate how montage is used to force the spectator to create a third meaning to the two shots." (<http://mattrux.blogspot.no/2012/05/eisensteins-strike-1925-and-montage.html>; lesedato 25.09.14)

"Eisenstein edited conflicting shot to achieve the maximum power of persuasion, and puts forward the notion of collectivism in *Strike* as one of the most important themes. The workers of the factory in the film should be seen as one individual. [...] Eisenstein's theory of "collision montage" is that cinema never speaks through a single image, and the juxtaposition of several images act like words in a sentence. [...] the ending of the film where the putting down of the strike by the army is cross-cut with the footage of a cattle being slaughtered. This scene is often quoted

as the early example of “an early montage conception [that] has never been seen on American or English scenes.” (Pg. 233, Eisenstein)

“33. The soldiers’ feet walk away from the camera (seen at a further distance than previously).

34. The bull’s skin is stripped off.

35. 1,500 bodies at the foot of the cliff.

36. Two skinned bulls’ heads.

37. A hand lying in a pool of blood.”

(Pg. 235, Eisenstein)

The bull doesn’t exist in the narrative but it is used to make a point about the killing of the laborers at the hands of the army. Perhaps the scene is Eisenstein attempting illustrate the brutality of the army towards the people, the army is supposed to serve the people but it only serves the bourgeois, the elite minority. The film undoubtedly ends in a tragic bloody tone as the laborers are slaughtered like the bull instead of being listened to or reasoned with properly.” (<http://mattrux.blogspot.no/2012/05/eisensteins-strike-1925-and-montage.html>; lesedato 25.09.14) Men Eisenstein måtte konstatere at slaktingen av dyrene ikke gjorde noe merkbart inntrykk på folk fra landsbygda, som ikke ble skremt av blod som spruter fra dyr (Aumont 2005 s. 67). Den allegoriske slaktingen skapte ønsket effekt i byene (Ferro 1993 s. 25), men bøndene kunne ikke skjønne at det skulle være noe galt i at blodet fløt fra dyr (i det som Eisenstein ville gjøre til et sjokkerende uttrykk for tsarens nedslakting av folket), og noen bønder forlot kinoen fordi de trodde at en annen film hadde begynt (Ferro 1993 s. 200).

Den russiske filmregissøren Vsevolod Pudovkin hevdet: “Grunnlaget for filmkunsten er montasjen” (sitert fra Diederichs 2004 s. 23), og han oppfattet alle kamerainnstillinger som montasjelementer og som bidrag til montasjenes rytme og kontinuitet.

Pudovkins film *Sankt Petersburgs siste dager* (1927) viser bilder fra en krig og en børs etter hverandre: børs – krigsslagmark – børs – krigsslagmark – børsкурser stiger – soldater faller – børsкурser stiger – soldater faller. Koblingen gjøres både “sosiologisk”, emosjonelt og agiterende (Diederichs 2004 s. 285).

“Especially through the context of montage, Pudovkin feels strongly that cinema is a completely unique art form and should not borrow elements from theater, painting, or other arts. Contrastingly, Eisenstein is keen on incorporating ideas from other established arts, although he accepts that “the future undoubtedly lies with the plot-less actor-less form of exposition” (Eisenstein 43). Though Pudovkin has styles and theories that vary from those of Eisenstein, he creates some works that employ techniques resembling those used in most of Eisenstein’s creations. For instance, Pudovkin’s *Storm Over Asia* (1928) could have easily been directed by Eisenstein. It contains quick cuts of collision and a definite pro-Soviet political

message. At the beginning of the film, a Mongol herdsman, Bair, played by Valeri Inkishanov, takes a silver fox fur pelt from his family, which is their most prized possession, to sell at the fur market. A western capitalist fur trader cheats him. The two men fight and Bair proceeds to escape. He later aids the Soviet partisans in their fight against the British army occupying their land, but he is captured and shot by the army. They soon discover that he is a direct descendant of Genghis Khan. Upon gaining this knowledge, they restore his health and attempt to use him as the leader of a Mongolian puppet regime.” (Jessica Hershatter i <https://jhershaemory.wordpress.com/2010/12/10/montage-eisenstein-vs-pudovkin/>; lesedato 25.06.15)

“Pudovkin intentionally [i *Storm over Asia*] paces the narrative so that it gains momentum as the story evolves. Throughout the film, Bair becomes more and more distraught as he realizes how abusive and manipulative the foreigners are who are trying to take over Mongolia. By the end of the film, the narrative has built up so much energy that the final scene is immensely powerful, employing rapid cuts within a montage to create the fierce imagery of battle. The final sequence begins with Bair’s escape, fighting all of his captors on his way out. The first image shows a chair falling over. The action is repeated several times. The pace quickens and Pudovkin implements canted angles to create a feeling of chaos. As Bair fights his captors, shots of feet scuffling are inter-cut with shots of grown men falling down stairs. This sequence contains many close-ups of faces that illuminate the dichotomy of emotions between Bair, whose face demonstrates his anger, and his captors, who upon realizing the danger of the situation, reveal their fear and anguish. This part of the montage ends with words superimposed over Bair’s face, in a strobe light effect, which say “down bandits” and “down thieves.” These sequences by Pudovkin would be characterized in Eisenstein’s terminology as dialectic montage, defined as shots that contain conflicts within a single frame composed of dynamic elements. The shot that begins the final montage of *Storm Over Asia* is an explosion shown three times, the last time in close-up. The montage continues with shots of the Mongol horsemen, who have taken up arms against the invaders, and are interspersed with a violent windstorm, rigorously shaking the trees. This montage creates a tension between the forward, steady movement of the advancing Mongols and the frenzied, canted angle shots of the windstorm. Eventually the enemy is bowled over by the fierce winds. The montage equates the wind with the native men who blow through, removing the tyrannical foreigners from their homeland. Though this film is now revered as one of Pudovkin’s best works, at the time of its initial release in 1927, both American and Soviet critics criticized its lack of realism and dismissed its symbolic devices, saying they were overdone.” (Jessica Hershatter i <https://jhershaemory.wordpress.com/2010/12/10/montage-eisenstein-vs-pudovkin/>; lesedato 03.08.15)

Pudovkin “had his own theories about montage and editing, many of which he explains in *Film Technique and Film Acting*. He describes film as something that is not shot, but rather, built. In other words, each separate shot is a building block of film and the raw material can be put together to create a certain desired effect. He

experiments with shortening and lengthening shots, and with choosing their positions to effectively join all of the elements together. Pudovkin states that through editing, every object goes from photographic to cinematographic, meaning that it is the construction and placement of shots that make images come alive and form a story. In the words of Pudovkin, “to show something as everyone sees it is to have accomplished nothing” (Pudovkin 63). Pudovkin initially learned the importance of editing from his teacher, the famous Soviet filmmaker Lev Kuleshov. Kuleshov demonstrated the idea of associative montage through his discovery that by placing shots in a certain order, audiences would form specific conclusions about what they saw. As an example, he put a shot of an actor’s face before three different shots. Based on the combination that was shown to separate audiences, they all perceived the actor’s emotion in a different way. One shot was coupled with a bowl of soup and, in this case, the audience claimed that the man was hungry. The same shot of the man was placed next to a dead woman, and viewers claimed that he looked mournful. The last combination included the shot of a man and a girl at play. In this last instance, the audience claimed the man was happy. Though the shot of the man was exactly the same in all three cases, he was perceived as having different emotions in each one because of the associations that people made from the juxtaposition. Through this experiment, Kuleshov demonstrated the immense power of montage.” (Jessica Hershatter i <https://jhershaemory.wordpress.com/2010/12/10/montage-eisenstein-vs-pudovkin/>; lesedato 24.06.15)

“Both Eisenstein and Pudovkin built on Kuleshov’s pioneering work, demonstrating the effect montage can have on the audience if used thoughtfully. For instance, one of Eisenstein’s most well known films, *The Battleship Potempkin* (1925), implements montage to create an intense psychological experience for the viewer. Cuts within the film are structured through tonal and rhythmic montage and Eisenstein avoids allowing any one character to have too much screen time. In so doing, he creates a larger, more collective experience to represent the plight of the masses and the film can consequently be categorized as class conscience social propaganda. In one of the most brutally violent scenes in any film made at the time, Czar soldiers viciously massacre innocent civilians as they march down the Odessa steps in southern Ukraine. The sequence begins with close ups of civilians as they all wave cheerfully at the returning sailors, who have taken over their own ship and hurled their commanding officers overboard. Suddenly, the first person is shot and a mass panic begins. Long shots of crowds running from the soldiers are interspersed with medium shots and close-ups of individual people as they hide, run, or fall to their deaths. The calm, cruel control of the soldiers is juxtaposed with shots of panicked citizens, running for their lives. Eisenstein cuts to a mother, shocked and horrified, as she helplessly watches a soldier crush her child under his boot. Towards the end of the sequence, the mother takes the dead child in her arms and carries him towards the soldiers, in an attempt to evoke some emotion from them and stop the annihilation. Others rally behind her and consider reasoning with the soldiers. The mother’s efforts are futile as they mercilessly gun her down as

well. To add to the horror, Eisenstein includes the image of a baby carriage rolling down the steps after its mother is killed.” (Jessica Hershatter i <https://jhershaemory.wordpress.com/2010/12/10/montage-eisenstein-vs-pudovkin/>; lesedato 25.06.15)

De sovjet-russiske myndighetene “strongly discouraged the use of the Montage style. By the late 1920s, Vertov, Eisenstein, and Dovzhenko were being criticized for their excessively formal and esoteric approaches. [...] Soviet authorities, under Stalin’s direction, encouraged filmmakers to create simple films that would be readily understandable to all audiences. Stylistic experimentation or nonrealistic subject matter was often criticized or censored.” (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 455)

Den sovjetiske dokumentarfilm-regissøren Dziga Vertov utviklet en eksentrisk type montasje basert på intervaller og gjentakelser (Niney 2012 s. 136). Denne typen filmmontasje minner om et stykke musikk eller en kjedereaksjon. Den armenske regissøren Artavazd Peleshyan har tatt i bruk en lignende type montasje som Vertov.

“Unlike Eisenstein, who wrote voluminously on montage and comparatively little on its antithesis, Bazin [den franske filmteoretikeren André Bazin] wrote substantially on montage. Bazin describes editing as a “series of either logical or subjective points of view of an event.” Dealing with sound films, he lists three motives for cutting: 1) As a purely logical descriptive analysis of the narrative 2) As a psychological analysis from a character’s point of view and 3) As a psychological analysis from the audience’s point of view. (Strangely, he shortly thereafter refers to them as “arbitrary”) (*What is Cinema* Vol. 1, 92). Bazin opposes classical and expressive editing on the following counts. The simple geographically and psychologically logical (dramatic) cutting within a scene does not add anything to the intent of a scene, only adding emphasis. So why bother? If the scene has only one simple meaning why insult the audience’s intelligence with needless and obvious close-ups? Contrarily, if the scene is complex why presuppose only one meaning? Expressive editing invents meaning through juxtaposition of the images and not through the images themselves. This is trickery; it removes the freedom on the part of the spectator to select for him or herself and removes whatever existential ambiguity may be present in the scene. Therefore it is not faithful to reality, either spatially, temporally, or morally. Bazin is not against editing which forms the basis of film structure, that is cutting necessary to join unconnected scenes/sequences, but is against optical illusions (superimpositions, dissolves, process shots), needless pedestrian editing within a single scene, and expressive editing that adds meaning through the juxtaposition rather than content of each image. Bazin employs a simple aesthetic criteria for deciding when to edit: anytime two or more objects/subjects are necessary to the construction of meaning in a scene, depth of field is preferable over editing.” (Donato Totaro i <http://offscreen.com/view/bazin4>; lesedato 19.09.14)

“The essay “The Virtues and Limitations of Montage” presents, in the strongest possible sense, Bazin’s mistrust for montage and discloses the essence of his preference for the *mise-en-scène* style. Bazin denounces the “trickery” of montage, evident in the animal film by Jean Tourane. Here montage becomes emblematic of its untruthfulness – by relating the human qualities of animals by virtue of off-screen guidance and editing. Later in the essay he discusses the process shot, an equally deceiving effect, and says that the point is not whether or not the trickery is noticeable, but whether or not it is used (a question of integrity). Thus far Bazin’s reasoning implies that the artist has a moral obligation to the audience and the faithful rendition of the event/space. He then uses an example from the film *Where No Vultures Fly* to demonstrate how much more effective depth of field is than parallel montage. (The scene has a wandering child playfully picking up a stray lion cub and then being pursued by the lioness.) The fact that the lion is tame is unimportant; this deceit is made “morally” correct because it occurs in a homogenous space. Bazin sees no deceit in the proceedings behind a long take/depth of field shot (numerous takes, removal of walls, props, etc.) but instead wants us to neglect the causal events and consider only the final results. (Contradictorily, Bazin supports his contention that photography is superior to painting by referring to their causal means – mechanical intervention vs. human intervention. Though ‘mechanical’ must be considered relatively, since all ‘tools’ (pen, brush, needle, etc) used in art are a form, lesser perhaps, of mechanical intervention.) Through these contradictions we can decipher Bazin’s true motives for his disliking montage and upholding *mise-en-scène*. Montage is untruthful to spatial integrity and also deceives the audience through its juxtapositioning; therefore montage is of secondary importance, morally and aesthetically, to the *mise-en-scène* style. The integrity of spatial unity is of the utmost importance and supercedes all else – deceit included.” (Donato Totaro i <http://offscreen.com/view/bazin4>; lesedato 03.10.14)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>