

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

A REVIEW OF CINEMATIC STRUCTURE AND ELEMENTS OF ANDREI TARKOVSKY IN THE RUSSIAN SOCIETY

Behnam Torabi^{1*}, *Minoo Khani*², *Shams Al-Moluk Mostafavi*³

¹MA, Department of Art Research, Faculty of Humanities, University of North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

(*Corresponding author)

²Faculty member, Department of Art Research, Faculty of Humanities, University of North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

³ Faculty member, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Humanities, University of North Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Behnam Torabi, Minoo Khani, Shams Al-Moluk Mostafavi: A Review of Cinematic Structure and Elements of Andrei Tarkovsky in the Russian Society-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(7), ISSN 1567-214x

Keywords: Russian cinema, Andrei Tarkovsky, cinematic structure ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT

The cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky is indescribably linked to Russian society. His cinema arises from living in the Soviet Union's tyrannical system, which expresses sympathy for the agonies of a nation. Also, its principles and moral expression fundamentally conflict with the Soviet Union's dictated principles. This research aimed to answer the questions "What were the structure and elements of Tarkovsky's cinema? How did they develop in Russian society? And how did they affect it?" In terms of objective, this research was an applied-theoretical one, and in terms of method, it was descriptive-analytical. Data were collected by a library method. It is concluded that Tarkovsky deconstructed the governing cinematic genres to present a novel narration of the lives of the suffering people. Tarkovsky incorporated his themes into a cinematic platform to convey a narrative style. Also, he employed different elements such as music, poetic filmmaking, and playing with the concept of time to make his audience familiar with the crises originating from the Russian society. He reminds the poor people of their power and shows them a prospective Russians' glorious future that opposes the Soviet Union's rulers. So, despite its complexities, his cinema earned him wide acclamation in the Russian community.

INTRODUCTION

The cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky has had an undeniably profound impact on Russian society with an immense influence on the world. This cinematographer who only featured seven movies during his professional career, became an arch ideological foe of the Soviet Union, while his cinema earned him the acclamation of such filmmakers like Bergman and Kurosawa, and philosophers as Jean-Paul Sartre. He sought to portray the crisis of meaning in the life of contemporary man to promote the status of cinema while exploring spiritual teachings. This research aimed to answer the questions "What are the structure and elements of Tarkovsky's cinema?"

How have they developed in Russian society? And how have they affected it?" In this context, the Russian society in the Soviet Union government is first portrayed and, then the Russian filmmakers' stylistics are explored, as the context concludes with Tarkovsky's cinema structure, i.e., the artwork transformation style and genre deconstruction.

RESEARCH METHODS

In terms of purpose, this research was an applied-theoretical one, and in terms of method, it was descriptive-analytical. Data were collected by a library method. A large volume of data in this research comes from published books and cinematic and philosophical articles.

Literature Review

As research has shown, the subject of "Review of cinematic structure and relevant elements in the cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky" has not been studied in any published articles or domestic research. Results from the seminal articles and theses on this topic are as follows:

- In her M.A. thesis entitled "Failed utopia, dystopia in progress, in three movies of late Russian half-century cinema", Fatemeh Omidian presented the subject at the Soore University of Tehran in 2018 through supervision of Amir Reza Nouri Parto, describing in it the Russian society before and after the October Revolution.

- In his M.A. thesis entitled "Review of existential context in the films *The Turin Horse* and *Nostalgia* from the perspective of Maurice Merleau-Ponty on sensory perception", which was supervised by Professor Ali Rouhani at Tehran University of Arts in 2018, Pasha Dolatkah, details the phenomenological category of perception in the film *Nostalgia* by Andrei Tarkovsky and the film *the Turin Horse* by Tarr Béla.

- Maryam Safari investigates the effects of artist painters' works such as *Francesca* and *Da Vinci* on Tarkovsky's works in her M.A. thesis entitled "Review of the effects of the artist painters' works on the cinematic features of Andrei Tarkovsky" who presented it at Al-Zahra University in Tehran in 2009 with the supervision of Shahabuddin Adel.

- Reza Boroumand also investigates the religious elements of Tarkovsky's cinema in his M.A. thesis entitled "Review of religious elements of Tarkovsky's cinema" with the supervision of Mostafa Mokhtaomarai, at the Faculty of Art and Architecture, Tehran Branch, the Islamic Azad University in 2015.

- In his M.A. thesis entitled "Investigation of featuring texts of religious cinema in the works of Tarkovsky and Bergman", which was presented at the University of Tarbiat Modarres in 2002, Bahram Tavakoli examines and compares the religious issues in the cinema of these two filmmakers.

- Under the supervision of Amir Hossein Nedayi, Mohammad Hossein Mohammad Faridan published his thesis entitled "Religious concept of the symbol of a tree in the films *Sacrifice* and *the Tree of Life*" by Tarkovsky and Terrence Malick, describing their cinematic styles.

Russian Society After the Revolution of 1917

The Revolution of October 1917 not only marked the end of a bright era of csarist cinema, but was also a savage annihilation of the history of culture and art of land; a revolution that began its campaign against the

beautiful Winter Palace of St. Petersburg with the slogan of peace, land, and bread taking little time to become a totalitarian and repressive regime; a government that believed the ideals of the Soviet Socialist Republic could take precedence over those of Russia and, striving unrelentingly from the very first days of the revolution to eliminate the dissidents' voice; a revolution that called neither for peace nor bread nor land. This revolution that promised the proletariat a utopian society took only less than a decade to become a dictatorship of the proletariat. In the first decade of its rule, the Soviet government, began the mass killing of the bourgeoisie at St. Petersburg Winter Palace, perpetrating large-scale faction liquidation during the reign of the Red Terror, and setting up the Gulag forced labor camps. The proletariat's revolution had been materialized through the forced employment of intellectuals, while widespread repression had bereaved the Russian people of their faith in life, like Lenin, in one of his speeches, called on the opposition to the proletariat to pay the price for their dissent (Kar, 1992: 190). The humanitarian society featured by Tolstoy and Chekhov had taken a utopian form based on faith and a bright future while, it took less than a century, to be replaced by extreme starvation in Leningrad with people committing suicide fearing from human cannibalism (Darf, 1983: 55). The Revolution of October 1917 is a disgrace to human history, which devoured even its children through forced repression, as Leon Trotsky put it: "This government was not properly conceived only to see its death sounding the toll while staring at its gravedigger in open eyes" (Trotsky, 1981: 518). This revolution was the rule of big ethnic cleansing, sowing the seed of anti-human ideology, engulfing the charming Russian land with a decades-long abyss.

Post-Revolution Russian Cinema

The revolution also forced many artists to leave Russia as most renowned Russian directors and actors emigrated to the Western capitals via Odessa and Constantinople. Included in the artists were Robert Wiene, Grigori Chmara, and Dimitri Buchowetzki, who, one decade after the Bolshevik Revolution, sought to combine the cinema of the tearist era with progressive works of French symbolists or expressionist interpretations of famous Russian history writers to gain a footing in the Western European cinema (Ulrich, 2015: 133). This is while the cinema at the heart of a totalitarian government had to inevitably survive while envisaging a way down towards the future.

"Two days after the Bolshevik coup in November 1917, the Proletarian Cultural and Enlightenment Organizations¹ was established, with a division of which being tasked with producing and supervising films. In 1918, the government established the Gerasimov Institute of Cinematography (VGIK) in Moscow, where Lev Vladimirovich Kuleshov was assigned to direct an experimental workshop. In August 1919, amid the Civil War, the People's Commissariat declared the film industry national and handed it over to the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs entirely (Ahmadi, 2003: 57). All this was aimed to impose a mechanism of censorship and a kind of cultural cleansing over the Russian society, and it was clear that the Soviet government sought to use cinema as leverage to

¹ "Proletarskie kulturno-prosvetitelnye organizatsii"

influence people in the community. "The emerging Moscow-Petrograd Committee initiated its first work in 1918 named "Siren", which was essentially the first Soviet film, followed by a comedy-political film, the "Pressure", from a screenplay by Anatoli Lunatscharsk" (Ulrich, 2015: 134).

Another Soviet Union filmmaking institution that launched its propaganda campaign in the very early years of the revolution and fully seized the cinema was the so-called Attack Train. This train had printing equipment wagons along with full filmmaking instruments, and was tasked with working among revolutionary groups, while offering low-level, slogan-like films in line with revolutionary goals, such as the film "Workers of the world, unite!"² (1919), expressing the deplorable state of the Russian cinema in the 1920s. Zhigaortov, one of the early Russian directors and an advocate of the Party, stated: "Death to the legendary bourgeois screenplays". This quotation portrays the abject state of the Soviet Union's cinema in the early years of the Revolution when nothing was left for myth, nor cinema, except for blood, ashes, and death (Ibid: 133-135).

The State Committee for Cinematography, or Goskino for short, was the first USSR Broadcasting Organization, established in 1924. Its two directors, Alexei Romanov followed by Philip Yermash sent many films to Goskino's archives as they imposed strict censorship. The films directed by Alexei German, Elem Klimov, Andrei Konchalovsky, and Marlene Khostiyev were archived for over two decades and then destroyed. Directors like Sergei Parajanov served many years in prison for their thinking and political artistic attitudes, while directors like Andrei Tarkovsky had to censor and re-edit their films during their careers, eventually preferring self-exile over living in the Soviet Union (Ahmadi, 2003: 55-56).

Leading Russian Cinematographers

In 1921, when the new USSR's economic policy was declared, restricted permission was issued for non-state cinematic institutions. Thus, several talented directors found their way into Russian cinema using this situation. Artists such as Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Dziga Vertov, and Alexander Dovzhenko, each created notable works for the next generation of Russian cinema, using their impressive experiences of visual effects to introduce a representation of the Russian cinema to the world anew. Dziga Vertov, for instance, used long shots and musical as well as rhythmic shots as a means, creating a color composition of red, yellow, orange, and blue to underscore some shots in the film. Vertov can be seen as one of the pioneers of Russian documentary cinema. Accompanying his brother Mikhail Kaufmann, he wandered the alleyways of Moscow, seeking to capture novel moments. His cinema was rich in ideological and political views and can be considered a mixture of cinematic formalism and cinematic invasion. Vertov's films such as *The Death of Lenin* (1924), *The Sixth Part of the World* (1926), *A Man with a Movie Camera* (1929), *Simfoniya Donbassa* (1931), as well as *Three Songs About Lenin* (1934) were characterized by notably cinematic elements (Ibid, 135-137).

² (Workers of the world, unite) was one of the most notorious and rallying cries of the communist slogans which is also the finale sentence of the Communist Manifesto, written in 1848 by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. This has also been stated fully: "Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains."

It is practically impossible to study Russian cinema without considering two directors. The first was Sergei Eisenstein, who represents the Russian art cinema to the world in the 1920s, and the other was Alexander Dovzhenko. Eisenstein's cinema was under the influence of two factors; first, theater, and second some editing styles, which he called Montage of Attractions. His interest in theater and instigating the audience led him to found the Soviet Montage Theory. Speaking to Mayowski's LEF magazine, he referred to the Montage of Attractions as the expression of every theatrically aggressive moment or every element that overshadowed the thinking and spirits of the audience. For Eisenstein, a clash of shots is critical; as another new and shocking understanding appears from a clash of two shots (ibid: 146). Eisenstein's use of the masses as heroes, of metaphorical expressions and figures of speech, exact montages, as well as instinctual innovation are what constitute the Eisenstein cinema as great works of art.

Just as Sergei Eisenstein was considered to be a prominent playwright of the 1920 Russian cinema, Dovzhenko was also regarded as the first poet of the Russian cinema. He was the first director to pay special attention to his hometown. He understood the concept of poverty due to his impoverished life and that's why he took many shots of his homeland and offered the world real images of the suffering of the people of his homeland; for this, he employed a poetic language to depict the miseries of the people. The utilization of novel images of the nature and expression of a thoughtful view of life and death and the final victory of life over the agonies from death constitute the very essence of Dovzhenko's cinema, embodying in his masterpiece work called Earth. As regards Dovzhenko, Andrei Tarkovsky remarked: "If someone encourages me to compare myself with another one, that person will be Dovzhenko. He was the first director to attach importance to space, as he had a passionate love for his homeland and made his films that way. He used to direct his movies as if he was setting up a garden or an orchard. He irrigated it and planted seedlings with his own hands. Love of the land and people helped his character develop out of his works. This sounded as if these characters rose from the heart of the earth. They were original and perfect. I would rather serve in his side" (Ibid: 59). The Russian cinema of the 1920s may have encountered politicization, restriction, censorship, and self-censorship, it has by no means been influential on the Russian artistic cinema.

Cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky

Andrei Arsenyevich Tarkovsky was born on 4 April 1932 in the village of Zavrazhie in the Yurievets region, not far from the confluence of the two Volga rivers in the Ivanovo region; He was a Soviet Russian filmmaker, theater director, writer, and film theorist. (Martin, 2010: 19). In 1954, he applied for the Soviet Film School (VGIK) and was admitted to the school from among 500 applications where only 15 people were allowed. He then began to study under Michail Romm, Irina Zhiealko, Nina Sokhtskaya and Anatoly stabilini.

In 1961, Tarkovsky made the highly acclaimed film *The Steamroller and The Violin*. In the same year, the debut film was the recipient of the Golden Lion Award from the Venice Film Festival and the [Grand Prix Spécial du Jury](#) of the San Francisco International Film Festival.

The film would later become popular for its anti-war approach and depiction of its devastation in the Soviet Union, leading the way for the production of Andrei Tarkovsky's second feature film, *Andrei Rublev*; this film entirely opposed the Communist's Party thinking. The film *Andrei Rublev* is said to be a representation of the Russian resistance cinema, fully negating the artistic and aesthetic expression of socialist realism" (Ahmadi, 2003: 87). Following the film *Andrei Rublev*, Tarkovsky decided to make the film *Mirror*, with its script co-written with Alexander Misharin. This film was strongly rejected by Goskino. Therefore, Tarkovsky had no choice but to abandon it and to make a film with different themes. He decided to produce *Solaris* with a science fiction genre written by Stanisław Herman Lem. The film earned him the acclamation of the judges of the Cannes Film Festival and won the Ecumenical Jury Award (Ibid: 151-152).

Following *Solaris*, Tarkovsky finally began shooting the *Mirror* in July 1973, after a five-year hiatus. The film was met with harsh opposition from the Party's leaders. Misharin was quoted as saying: "The reaction by the State Cinema Committee was unexpected and even absurd. Yermash remained silent for a long time after watching the movie. Then, the minister slapped his hand on his leg, saying" "Of course we have freedom in the art cinema, but not as to this level". No change was made to the film; however, what Yermash said revealed the perspective of the film. The film was featured only in several Moscow theaters with long queues of enthusiasts waiting (Misharin, 192:70). Tarkovsky said of *Mirror*: "No one perceives its meaning; upon perception, no permission will be issued" (Tarkovsky, 2014:59).

Following the *Mirror*, Tarkovsky sought to produce films from stories by Thomas Mann, the *Master and Margarita* by Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov, and the *Death of Ivan Ilyich* by Tolstoy. But none of these proposals were accepted. Then Andre set out to shoot the film *Stalker*. The film, taken from a novel by the Strugatsky brothers called *Roadside Picnic*, reached the pre-production stage, though, at this stage, the project was called *Dream Machine*. The film was finished in February 1977. However, during the development of the film, the film device malfunctioned and most of the film was lost. Mikhalkov Konchalovsky's film *Siberiade* (1977) was also damaged. However, the damage to the film was not significant with the budget, and the deadline for the film completion was compensated. But Tarkovsky's film was practically lost. Tarkovsky then raised a limited budget for *Stalker*, this time around shooting the film based on new screenplays. One year after the film was produced, it was featured as a debut film at the Cannes Film Festival and met with great admiration. This is while, inside Russia, film distributors and party leaders were not happy about the film. "The distributors reproduced the film in only 196 copies for nearly a quarter of a billion Soviet people. Moscow received only 3 copies. In the first few months when the film was being featured in Moscow, as many as 2 million people watched it" (Strugatsky, 1992: 313).

In self-exile, Andrei Tarkovsky shot the film *Nostalgia* in the 1983 Fall with the budget of Italian Radio and Television and debuted it at the 1983 Cannes Film Festival. *Nostalgia* is Tarkovsky's most minimalist work. Upon watching the film, Tarkovsky himself stated that the film portrays a

perspective of endless nostalgia. The Nostalgia script, formerly known as *The End of the World*, was co-written by the renowned Italian scriptwriter Tonino Guerra.

Tarkovsky filmed the last project of life, *The Sacrifice*, in 1980. This film was about human faith and sacrifice for the sake of salvation; it was a sermon on life and devotion; a personal will from the director to the son. Despite all its ambiguities, *The Sacrifice* is an impressive movie concerning the faith. In an interview with Charnovac de Branton in his final years of life, Tarkovsky said: "Man only possess faith. Faith is the only way a man can find salvation. I have a strong and deep faith in this. Otherwise, what can I do? This is a belief attributed to mankind. Anything beyond it is unreal" (Tarkovsky, 2014: 287). The film *Sacrifice* once again earned Tarkovsky international acclamation. The film won four awards at the Cannes Film Festival; Special Jury Prize, Best Arts and Business Partnership Award, International FIPRESCI Critics Award, and World Church Association Jury Prize. In the year the film was released, Andrei's physical condition deteriorated. His cancer, already diagnosed, was spreading quickly throughout his body. In the same year, he wrote: "It is now summer, I am living only this summer" (Alexander, 1992: 375). Andrei Tarkovsky died of cancer on 29 December 1986 at a Paris Hospital. His funeral ceremony was held at the Alexander Nevsky Cathedral. He was buried on 3 January 1987 in the Russian Cemetery in Sainte-Geneviève-des-Bois in France.

Andrei Tarkovsky's artistic career is an embodiment of an overt and covert struggle with the Soviet Union; two adversaries, being aware of the latter's power, one with the weapon of mass destruction and the other with the weapon of art and a universal expressive language. However, Tarkovsky, like many of his contemporaries, such as Sergei Parajanov, was rejected by the leaders of the Socialist Party. While spending the last years of his life in self-imposed exile outside Russia, he unrelentingly pursued his interest in living in his hometown. living in his homeland never faded for him. Once he said he was a Russian but never considered himself a citizen of the Soviet Union. Tarkovsky knew he would have to return to the deep roots of thought in Russia to find meaning for himself and his fellow citizens. He strongly desired the Russian qualities. He was quoted as saying: "I would like to give a speech on the regrets of being a Russian; about a very exemplary and characteristic state of mind of our nation; when left out from our homeland, we the Russians are taken control of. I just want to speak about the fate of the Russian national origins, their past and culture, land and their loved ones" (Ibid: 147). Tarkovsky's films, e.g., the film *Ivan's Childhood*, the small hero who fought despotism and fell a victim of wars, and the film *Andrei Rublev*, the character who remained silent while watching the destruction of land as well as the film *Chris Solaris*, looking at his land from a different perspective, all tell of anti-socialist inspirations, all representing agonies and suffering, memories, tragedy and faith that, like a beacon, seek to get the Russian people through a deadly passage, called Communism, within the context of cinematic sequences.

Tarkovsky's Cinematic Structure and its Components

For Tarkovsky, cinema is a noble art, not an entertainment. His cinema is a collection of countless cinematic elements, taking various forms which convey series of meanings, ranging from the role of the cinema curtain to various paintings and shots, from the elements of time and space to that of natural elements in the cinema, all of which constituting strong analytical theories by artists and theorists such as Robert Bird, Chris Marker, Slavoj Žižek, and Fredric Jameson. Vadim Yusuf, the cameraman of Tarkovsky's first four films, is quoted as saying: "Scientific and technological progress for the first time helped develop man's spiritual activities in Tarkovsky's cinema" (Iusov, 1989: 235), and that's why form and meaning are on the same par in terms of importance and quality in his cinema.

Transformation of the Work

The role of the text and script in Andrei Tarkovsky's cinema is highly critical and serves as the poetic cornerstone of his cinematography. As Misharin states: "The Andrei Rublev's script was so rich that it could be released in form of an artwork" (Misharin, 1992: 71). Andrei Tarkovsky, however, used to write the scripts quite diligently. He put them aside when practically shooting the scenes. In fact, for him, the script was an instrument for creating some sort of subjective imagery and a kind of pervasive picture of each scene, rather than a reference for shooting a film. He maintained that every director should write the script by himself. Taking the benefit of other writers and filmmakers, he used to write the screenplays in collaboration with them. This is while, he was the final decision maker, and it was he who wrote some of his seminal works, such as Andrei Rublev, Nostalgia, Sacrifice, and the Mirror, though he adopted the three screenplays of Ivan's Childhood, Solaris and Stalker from literary works. Filming Ivan's Childhood, directed by Eduard Abalov co-written by Vladimir Bogomolov, had begun before Tarkovsky joined the production team. Vladimir Bogomolov himself wrote the Ivan novel; however, the script was largely changed as direct collaboration with Abalov ceased, and Tarkovsky joined the production team, thereby, changing the film in its entirety. He removed all the simplistic scenes Abalov had included in the script, e.g., the scenes that showed Ivan returning from the war safe and getting married; he incorporated dreamlike scenes into the film, though this was met with Bogomolov's opposition, fearing the romantic nature of his story would be lost (Martin, 2010: 93). Mikhail Konchalovsky, a famous Russian filmmaker, co-wrote the script with Tarkovsky, though they constantly disagreed on the details. For example, the ending section of the film showing the burnt bodies of the Goebbels girls was too disgusting for Konchalovsky, causing verbal conflicts between the two in the editing room.

Tarkovsky's second movie, Andrei Rublev, also did not make Kunchalovsky feel at peace with the screenplay, calling it a bad and horrible memory. The very original idea behind the film was raised by Tarkovsky's actor's friend named Vasily Livanov. It was mainly indicative of the sufferings of the Russian artist's life. The artist they quickly selected was Andrei Rublev who shared little information about his life. He was the creator of the Trinity held in the Tretyakov Gallery Museum in Moscow. This painter lived in a turbulent period of Russian history, i.e., the era of the

Tatars and the Civil Wars. The depicted Rublev's life as shown in the film is imaginary and based on a few historically authenticated works. Tarkovsky co-wrote the script with Konchalovsky. The original plot of the screenplay was approved as Andrew's Suffering, generating a literary text that would show some details of the script. The script had consisted of 2 parts and 14 chapters. The preface of the first part comes when the *Battle of Kulikovo*³ ends, leading to Dmitry Donsky's victory, but stopped short of budgets. The preface to the second part, *Falling from the Balloon*, was transferred to the beginning of the film. The text of the original screenplay was accepted by Mosfilm in 1963. In the meantime, Tarkovsky left the original text in a taxi. He did not have another copy and while desperately searching the streets, he found the taxi driver who gave him back the papers. As usual, he considered this a gift from God, writing in his diary on April 6, 1973: "It was a miracle". Filming began in April 1965 and ended in April 1966, becoming one of the longest-filmmaking in the history of cinema. The film was first edited in July 1966. Mosfilm authorities did not like the outcomes. The main problem was that the film entailed a religious and opposing character never concealed; however, the bureaucratic officials made an excuse by alleging the film was too lengthy" (Ahmadi, 2003: 147).

Tarkovsky then began co-writing the script for *The Mirror* with Alexander Misharin. Interestingly, the *Mirror* is Andrei Tarkovsky's fourth film following *Solaris*, though its script was written before *Solaris*. Tarkovsky and Misharin sought to write a screenplay about the present reality in Russia, using Andrei Tarkovsky's childhood sentiments and the impacts of his divorce. Alexander Misharin is quoted as saying: "The script was mainly founded on Andrei's divorce". The issue of family breakdown was quite catastrophic, especially for him, because he had tasted the suffering of his parental separation, and this unfolded when his theoretical beliefs were taking shape. He argued that the film should be depicted in time and that the artist has to collect the scenes together" (Misharin, 2014: 79). They finished writing the script quickly in just 14 days. The script saw extensive changes when available, causing disturbance for both Misharin and Tarkovsky. The film comprised plenty of brilliant scenes, making its compilation a thorny task; this is while *The Mirror* starred as a bright work of art.

Solaris was Tarkovsky's next screenplay. It was adapted from the science fiction novel named *Solaris* by Stanisław Herman Lem. Tarkovsky chose the screenplay because its science fiction content could not entail opposition from the Soviet censorship system. Tarkovsky put aside Lem's book completely and wrote a very different screenplay from the original book. Years later, Stanisław Herman Lem stated that *Solaris* by Tarkovsky had no relation with his book and expressed deep concerns for some of his parts completely discarded by Tarkovsky. Critics have maintained that: "The film pursues the novel plot very accurately, though as we have noted, Tarkovsky has added scenes previously put aside. The introductory part of this film concerns the family, and, as it stands, it is a return to Dacha. There is no trace of this in the novel, which has upset Lem. The main

³ The battle unfolded in September 1380 between the Army of the Golden Horde and the Russian territories. The battle took place in Kulikovo Square near the Don River, with Prince Dmitry declaring as victorious.

disagreement between Tarkovsky and Lem was the way the issue of Kelvin and Hari was narrated. For Lem, this relationship was mainly a vehicle for investigating what befalls man, when he struggles to remain a human under inhuman conditions. Tarkovsky, on the other hand, considers these values to be essential to our existence either under human or under inhuman conditions (Martin, 2010: 145).

"Tarkovsky's next film, i.e., *The Stalker*, based on *Roadside Picnic* by the Strugatsky brothers, met with the same fate. In his daily memoirs, Tarkovsky wrote: "An excellent screenplay can be created out of this novel". It is unclear whether he wanted to make the film himself or not, but when the mirror was finished, Tarkovsky's application to produce a film based on Dostoevsky's *The Idiot* novel was dismissed, then he turned to the Strugatsky brothers' novel" (Ibid: 218-219).

When the screenplay was being written, Strugatsky admired Tarkovsky for his perseverance and patiently assisted him in writing it, but writing the script was not easy for them. Andrei Tarkovsky and Arkady Strugatsky rewrote the script 10 times, with some of the included science fiction parts removed entirely.

Nostalgia is Tarkovsky's first film outside Russia. *Nostalgia* is a Russian word for being away from one's country. The *Nostalgia* screenplay was written outside the Russian territories in collaboration with Italian screenwriter Tonino Guerra. *Nostalgia* was written when the director was going through some turbulent periods of his time; self-exile, the death of his mother in October 1979, and the diagnosis of the popular actor Anatoly Alekseyevich Solonitsyn with cancer, all affecting the film episodes. Although the writing of the first version of the script was completed in 1979 in just two months, its filming began in 1982, with some episodes added to it. *Nostalgia* is a personal film in many respects. It is a film about searching for homeland and, more broadly, about looking for attachment and solace. On *Nostalgia*, Tarkovsky said: "For the first time, during my filmmaking career, I feel that the film has, per se, the capacity to show the psychological condition of its creator. The protagonist of the film plays the other self of the director" (Tarkovsky, 2014: 151).

Like *Nostalgia*, *Sacrifice* was a reflection of Tarkovsky's life. The script of *The Witch*, later to be known as *Sacrifice*, was written by Tarkovsky in 1980 in collaboration with Arkady Strugatsky. It was supposed to be about a wealthy man diagnosed with cancer who would be healed after spending a night with a witch. But later, the protagonist's cancer became a nuclear war, though Maria the witch retained its character. Tarkovsky's *Sacrifice* is a personal work, with few changes made to the script. It narrated the devotion of a man sacrificing himself for an end; that of salvation. "Many argue that Tarkovsky knew he had cancer when shooting this movie. This theory probably explains that the film was a moment of reckoning with the West while the beginning of the film involves a pre-death sermon. However, notes are showing Tarkovsky's illness not been diagnosed until December 1985, albeit Tarkovsky may have unknowingly recognized that the film would be his last one. This feeling is represented in a note on December 13: "Pasternak was right," referring to the prediction that he would make only seven movies. Unlike Alexander in *The Witch*, Tarkovsky was not supposed to receive a cure for

his cancer as he died on December 29, 1989, exactly one year after his diagnosis. *Sacrifice* conceals a picture of the director's family and life conditions behind a thin curtain. Alexander's family, especially the characters of Adelaide, Marta, and the little man formed based on his family model. Adelaide is certainly the least empathetic among the women characters in Tarkovsky's films. He is also a person who is greatly similar to his second wife, Larissa. Numerous other episodes tell the story of Tarkovsky himself. Alexander's monologues for Maria, when he visits her overnight, were based on Tarkovsky's note on December 31, 1978; here, in this note, he refers to organizing a garden, only to become a dirty and nasty scene after a while" (Martin, 2010: 285-286). *Sacrifice* calls for courage and self-devotion.

Genre Deconstruction

Fighting the bourgeois expressive stylistics as well as the Western filmmaking mainstream in the Soviet cinema is not strange. In every respect, the Soviet Union sought to reinvent meanings, functions, and images to add to its unique socialistic expression. Thus, the output of standard filmmaking structures in the Soviet Union could not be considered a new feature. This is while, Tarkovsky's approach is not following a particular genre cannot be attributed to political and partisan thought, as his struggle to liberate the cinema from stereotypical formalities of genres can be seen to promote the modern cinema and deconstruct the genres (Ahmadi, 2003: 164). Tarkovsky does not believe in cinema genres. For him, cinema per se is a genre. He refers to cinema as an excellent art to create a personal worldview. He is quoted as saying: "I do not believe in different genres in cinema. Cinema itself is a genre. Just as we speak of a genre, we see cinema as a profitable business unit and determine its rules based on this approach; however, cinema is a transcendental art. It is a deep poetic art. Cinema does not need a model. All of these models deconstruct its potential essence and analyze the main concern of the filmmaker with a deep dependence on profitability" (Tarkovsky, 2014: 115). Tarkovsky is an author-director who represents his unmatched expression of the cinema. Tarkovsky's cinema is not a path to continue dreaming or a mirror to reflect reality or a path toward changing life or molding an image on it. Rather, the cinema of Tarkovsky is an original technique to construct a new world, a difficult but poetic one as he's seen to be a poet of the cinema. He remarks: "Critics argue that I am a poet. Each artistic form can be poetry. All musicians, writers, painters, as well as great poets, are all creators of poetry. Poetry does not transform reality, but rather creates it: (Ibid: 162).

Resistance Against Interpretation

Tarkovsky has always disapproved of interpreting symbols in his works. He used to oppose any sort of intellectual interpretation of his films. Films in general and his films, in particular, were, first and foremost, of sensory experiences. The audience should not have to grasp all Tarkovsky's references to enjoy them. One would say that he showed more respect to the audience who watched his works with a personal feeling, than the ones who, having an experience of watching a film, sought to find undue intellectual meanings and interpretations for it" (Martin, 2010: 45). He explains: "Images in my films are nothing but what they show. Today we have forgotten about the relationship between sensory communication and

art. Our behavior resembles that of editors, and always look for things the artist has deliberately hidden. The issue is much simpler than this, otherwise, art will not produce any sense. One should act like children for they understand my films better. I have never seen a serious critic to have perceived my films as much as one-third of a child has. We always desire for complex and sublime meanings and concepts out of a work. However, art must directly affect hearts" (Tarkovsky, 2014: 121).

Tarkovsky was over and over asked about the meanings in his films, often replying "they have no meaning except for what they are". He has stated: "People ask me about the meanings of things in my films. This is formidable. An artist does not have to explain the meanings he has intended. I do not think much about my work. I do not know what the symbols in my films stand for or the meaning imply. What is significant for me is to stir emotions; i.e., whatever emotion crossing your mind. If you look for meaning, you will lose what is currently unfolding. Contemplation during watching a movie causes some basic disturbance with the experience of watching it. The same holds for a work of art. Analyzing a work of art is only possible by destroying it. It should be stated however that a personal reaction to works of art is much more valuable than the attempt to explain them" (Ibid: 129).

Filming as a Dream

Tarkovsky is quoted as saying "give me a film script and a camera to impress the world." This is what Andrei Tarkovsky did with his cinema. He surprised the world. He eagerly attended the filming scene while wearing a patched oily jacket and a pair of boots, or often a tarpaulin, with his knees sinking into the mud and water while sweating constantly, yet he passionately followed what he desired. Tarkovsky was rarely seen confining his scenes to conventional methods while proposing the instructions of the common language of cinema as a starting point for an introductory filming shot, followed by close-ups, dialogue scenes, shots of people from above each other's shoulders. Tarkovsky usually employed his special camera to produce a film. Tarkovsky used shots that were increasingly too long, with the camera capturing a movie character, usually in the middle of the frame, while horizontally moving around a room, as used in the films *Andrei Rublev*, *Solaris*, and *the Mirror*. In *Stalker*, *Nostalgia*, and *the Sacrifice*, the horizontal movement of the camera turns into soft and intangible zooms. Moving shots along with shot lengths can be seen in all of his films. These moving shots became longer in recent films" (Martin, 2010: 192).

Tarkovsky crossed all boundaries when employing his camera. Vadim Yousef describes him: "Andrey's imagination was beyond all boundaries and I would usually take him back to the real world and say, Andrei, this scene cannot be shot. We must look for a fully real-time situation" (Yousef, 1992: 79). "Tarkovsky's use of the scene was not just restricted to shooting the existing trends via the camera. He was highly focused on how to get the audience to react to the special scenes wherein there was no actor so that s/he did not divert his/her attention; he meant the creation of a new thing out of nothing" (Bird, 2014: 68).

He was looking for a poetic situation that would subconsciously lead to stirring the emotions of the audience. "One of the Tarkovsky's popular measures was to place a character in two logically impossible places at one single scene such as a moving scene in *Nostalgia* showing Maria and the children twice in one scene, i.e. when the actors were running from behind the camera as the camera passed them and their deployment in another place before being seen again in the frame. Tarkovsky was also interested in shooting his characters from behind them, as well as their oblique shots, such as the *Mirror* post-tilting shot which showed Maria sitting on wooden railings or a scene in *Nostalgia* of a Gordjakov-Eugenia talk in the lobby of a hotel" (Martin, 2010: 62). Tarkovsky's camera develops during the shooting of the films, and as his cinema becomes poetic and philosophical, his camera movements become more precise. The scenes he depicts reflect his childhood memories and emotions. The image of Maria sitting on the railings is exactly the image of Andrei's mother's youth. Countless scenes in the film represent subjective portraits of his childhood.

Time in Tarkovsky's Cinema

In one of his speeches to young directors, Tarkovsky said: "Reality cannot be shot, only an image of it can be reconstructed" (quoted by Bird, 2013: 83). Tarkovsky well understood that cinema was only an image of reality; an image bound to the cinema curtain. "It was this perception that led filmmakers such as Antonioni and Kieślowski to meta-cinematic narratives. However, Tarkovsky would rather directly engage the audience with the image he sees on the curtain. He compels them to question the boundaries between the cinema and the media" (Ibid: 84). For Tarkovsky, cinema and its curtains are a place of personal doxology. To him, it was a pantheon that encounters a man with his innermost emotions and memories; a place to see, not to think, to feel, and to learn. "On the Bresson's cinema, Tarkovsky stated: "Everything is cleansed to the level it appears to be inexpressive". In fact, his cinema has reached a level of richness that cannot be expressive any longer" (Tarkovsky, 1933: 47). This description may amount to his cinema; a cinema wholly free from artificiality and insignificance; a cinema as clear as a disinterested and real soul. Tarkovsky's cinema is in a constant struggle with time. He deliberately exposes the film to time. On Nikolay Zhukovskys' setting for the film *Mirror*, Tarkovsky remarks: "This setting was a building in which time itself was living"(Bird, 2013: 191). Time is said to live throughout the *Mirror* and his other films. Time, as stated, belongs to him in specific ways, such as the finale of the *Mirror* where the mother is shown to have stood afar while being youth, staring at her old age, with children seen left behind in their small age, walking towards a future while taking their mother's hands, going through the unknowns and suffering, and it is not even clear whether it is the future or the past, whether it is a dream or a nightmare as if the man has remained a child in the Tarkovsky cinema. The *Mirror* is an elegy to say farewell to the mother, a struggle to stay in childhood, an attempt to live in dreams and return to memories, an inter-mixture of life and death and immortality. Tarkovsky desperately strives to record time, to challenge it, to seal it, and to distill the frozen time forever in the frame of his cinema. This may be the reason why he wrote a book called *Sculpting in*

Time. He struggles to form his exclusive time. Eternal and immortal time, and eternal and poetic time. "What constitutes the essence of a director's work? Sculpting the time. A sculptor, knowing of the outcome of his work, carves a piece of the marble not part of the body, just as the cinematographer who does the same thing on the plot of time" (Tarkovsky, 2017: 63-64). Tarkovsky's cinema is one of fixing time, as even the pause of time in Tarkovsky's view is like a mosaic made of time.

Sequence and Shots

Tarkovsky masterly transforms poetic shots. Each of his shots is a pure painting of the game of lights and shades, man and nature. He is a highly skillful person in standard framing, designing shots, and coloring them; he is unrivaled in long shots. His works are noted for their slow pacing and long shots, dreamlike visual imagery, and preoccupation with nature and memory. "If one wants to analyze Tarkovsky's interest in long shots and takes, he would say that such shots are parts of the film that depicts an abyss of the experience and engage the audience to see more. These experiences are beyond their perception, and while constantly approaching the end, they do not cause any fear of this end in the heart of the audience. In the *Stalker*, Tarkovsky wanted no time gap to exist between the cuts to embody the time and fluidity inside each shot as if the whole film was filmed in a single shot" (Bird, 2014: 210). Like Yasujirō Ozu, Tarkovsky does not hesitate to lengthen a shot too much and to take a seemingly endless sequence; he lengthens a shot to the extent that the audience will find the opportunity to think and travels through the film to comprehend the details. However, his camera constantly shows off its presence, and in long shots, this presence is more concrete. "His camera does not tend to reduce its presence as if the camera's view is the only thing that prevents the world from collapsing, and it is only the cinematic elements that can retain the natural elements constituting the world; however, in a long shot, the real symbolic elements come together in a shot, causing reality to crystalize through the elements and essence of time" (Ibid: 211). Tarkovsky uses long shots to create a setting that would lead to a new environment, stirring the audience's attention.

Painting and Icons

Andrei Tarkovsky's interest in painting dates back to his youth, i.e., when he was a student and had a pantheon of his favorite painters. Mikhail Romadin is quoted as saying: "We used to watch the paintings with Tarkovsky for hours, and both tried to recognize the names of artists from their painting styles. Andrei Tarkovsky was highly enthusiastic in painting, including Russian icons as well as the works of Giuseppe Arcimboldo, Georges de La Tour, those of the Surrealists, and even the cartoons by Saul Steinberg. He preferred classical styles over romantic ones and liked from among contemporary artists those whose works would promote a kind of dialogue with old painters, such as Salvador Felipe Jacinto Dalí Domènech and René Magritte" (Romadin, 1992: 179).

Tarkovsky's cinema has always benefited from painting, while carefully avoiding placing art forms on the same par. His interest in painting is represented in all his films, as it always serves to explain the scenes and characters. He extends the perspective of a painting and broadens its meanings in his films. He has highly been influenced by the

Italian painter Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio. One point of interest in Tarkovsky's encounter with Caravaggio's painting is his use of viewpoint he has used quite specifically after his second feature film onwards. In indoor paintings, Caravaggio frames people with a lot of space around them, e.g., his painting of St. Augustine or St. Ursula, the technique used frequently by Tarkovsky, especially from the film *Stalker* onwards. Tarkovsky defines Caravaggio's works as humane and visually links himself to the Venetian school, intricately telling us that his cinema was based on some of those values. As Romadin remarks, Tarkovsky suggested creating a space similar to that of Caravaggio's early Renaissance paintings for the film *Solaris*. He considers a painting by Caravaggio depicting the beaches of Venice with masses of people, i.e., people who are desperate, looking at each other, and having no relationship with each other. Tarkovsky set to create such a scene in a shot from *Solaris*, where Donatas Banionis is seen sitting on a desk in the garden; an unrealistic shot of a man who does not care about the raining nor the torrential rainfall nor the cup of tea as if he is immersed in another world. He's living in an unrealistic perspective. In all Tarkovsky's films, there is a tableau that briefly demonstrates the general idea of the film, as in *Apocalypse* by Albrecht Dürer in *Ivan's Childhood*, Rublev's icons in *Andrei Rublev*, Pieter Bruegel the Elder's tableau in *Solaris*, Madonna's tableau by Piero Della Francesca in *Nostalgia*, and paintings from Leonardo da Vinci and Russian icons in *Sacrifice*. Tarkovsky's cinema is a mixture of arts such as painting and its transformation into the language of cinema

Scene and Mise-en-scène

However, Tarkovsky can be considered a filmmaker of open spaces, and with the sky in his cinema being the scale of measurement and the center of gravity of the stage, mise-en-scène and the stage design constitute Tarkovsky's poetic understanding of cinema. However, for him, the scene has a broad meaning. For Tarkovsky, the stage is not limited to a specific and ready setting, as he always seeks to create a unique scene to draw the audience's attention to a specific direction. Many images of inanimate nature, such as a cup of tea on a desk in the rain in *Solaris*, a comb and a Gospel in *Nostalgia*, a cup, and audio equipment in *Sacrifice*, are included in this category. "All Tarkovsky's films are comprised of three scenes: nature, the house, the church, or a pilgrimage site. Each of these scenes is characterized by some visual features; the characteristics formed by the camera, the actor, and the audience meeting each other. Nature is a stream that draws the human's attention and, in some cases, seems to return this attention in a formidable way. The house has windows used by occupants to see outside with strangers seeing through the same windows. The church also has vertical columns having its geometric order disturbed by other elements (Bird, 2014: 83). However, one would argue that mise-en-scène in Tarkovsky's cinema has not always met the objective of the stage. Tarkovsky always tries to generate something very simple and natural.

Actors

Many actors have spoken and written about Tarkovsky; including Nikolai Petrovich Burlyayev, Nikolai Grinko including, as well as Alexei Solonitsyn, Tarkovsky's favorite actor, and Yuri Nazarov all admiring the great director. The way Tarkovsky worked with actors was unconventional and beyond the ordinary cinema. He never provided his actors with a

rational analysis of the role they were about to play, rather, he asked the actors to feel the very deep human awareness within the roles and live their inner life on the cinema stage. On Tarkovsky's work with the actors, Allan Edwall, the actor in *The Sacrifice*, is quoted as saying: "I never went into a rational analysis of the role I was about to play. I'm a follower of the Konstantin Stanislavski school. I never worked for the role of psychology and one's psychology or sociology of the role and understanding of one's realm of work. I was accustomed to adjusting my movements around other actors. However, Tarkovsky worked the opposite. He starts from movements, making you suddenly find yourself playing in front of curtains and windows. This technique was very strange but at the same time quite appealing to me. As an actor, you'll constitute the material shot of the scene. He stirs your primary instincts, i.e., the affections you have never experienced at least consciously since childhood. In his cinema, we naturally find our way into supernatural phenomena. Life and death have no boundaries" (Allan Edwall, 2014: 391). He argues that cinema does not need the actors who play, rather, needs actors who can smoothly represent their inner spirit and feelings.

He insisted on the absolute awareness of the actors on the stage. He explained to the actors how to work through the dialogues, how to utter their voices, showing them how to act in front of the camera. Burluyayev is quoted as saying: "I suppose I was not the one to go through the physical ordeals of Tarkovsky's films. He attached importance, not to the game, but the entire truth. You had to lie down on the cold clay of March to play his scenes, sink through the cold autumn swamps up until your neck, and cross over the icy Dnieper in November. Nevertheless, I remember collaborating with Tarkovsky as a happy and pleasant experience. His sense of humor lessened the pressure. He used to charm everyone. Tarkovsky was wholly distinguished from others" (Burluyayev, 2014: 91). Anatoly Solontsin, one of Tarkovsky's favorite actors, described his director: "The truth about Tarkovsky is that one couldn't play in the cinema. Tarkovsky took away from me my theatrical acting style. He constantly advised me that things had to protrude from within, from within the soul, and from the apparent expression to be as concise as possible" (Solontsin, 2014: 118). Tarkovsky made his actors face with human agonies and go through the deepest inner desires, then portraying their innermost human states on the curtain.

Music

Tarkovsky never considered conventional music a necessity for his films, constantly seeking salient, distinctive, distinctive, and emotionally expressive sounds. "Tarkovsky wanted the streams to sing, the invisible birds to tweet, the musical frost drops to fall to the ground, and the musical rustle of the grass to be heard" (Artemyev, 1992: 251). Throughout his career, Tarkovsky only collaborated with two composers for his films: Vyacheslav Ovchinnikov and Eduard Artemyev. Tarkovsky collaborated with Ovchinnikov in his first two films, *The Ivan's Childhood*, and *Andrei Rublev*, and later stopped working with him for personal reasons and never worked with him again. Tarkovsky was very fond of Ovchinnikov's music and always remembered him as the best composer of all times. Ovchinnikov's influence was evident in the works of Edward Artemyev.

Artemyev was greatly influenced by Ovchinnikov as he sought to create the atmosphere in Tarkovsky's films.

Tarkovsky's interest in the use of musical pieces, especially Bach's musical pieces, is highly represented in his third film, *Solaris*, marking his first collaboration with Edward Artemyev. However, Artemyev was greatly interested in using synthesizers and electronic music, binding a deep metaphysical space with scenes from Tarkovsky's films. He introduced such pieces as *I call you*, *Lord Jesus Christ*, the booklet of Johann Sebastian Bach's *citadel* in *Solaris*, etc. In the meantime, *The Sufferings of St. John*, *O Lord*, where the curtain of the temple is torn by Bach, *Mother Still Standing* by Giovanni Battista Pergolesi, *The Red Queen* by Henry Purcell in the *Mirror*, *Beethoven Symphony No. 9*, *Joseph Maurice Ravel*, *Master of Sings* by Wilhelm Richard Wagner are examples Tarkovsky used in his classical music. "The more Tarkovsky gained skills in his work, the more he closed in on active collaboration with the composer, there, turning more to classical sounds and music, just as he invited no composer for his last film, *the Sacrifice*" (Ibid: 253). He had developed his musical maturity in the latest film to the point he did not need to consult with any musicians, considering Johann Sebastian Bach's music, along with some local Swedish and Japanese music as sufficient for the film.

CONCLUSION

The cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky is a well-established Russian stylistic that is indescribably linked to Russian society. This article sought to determine the structure and elements of Tarkovsky's cinematographic characteristics to answer the following questions?

"What were the structure and elements of Tarkovsky's movie?
How did they develop in Russian society? And
How did they affect it?"

Tarkovsky incorporated his themes into a cinematic platform to convey a narration style. Also, he employed different elements such as music, poetic filmmaking, and playing with the concept of time to make his audience familiar with the crises originating from the Russian society. He was a filmmaker rising from within people, standing against Soviet tyranny.

Tarkovsky is well acquainted with the cultural roots of his people, and his cinema develops through this acquaintance as he has the backing of the rich history of Russian filmmaking, which includes great men such as Dozhenko and Eisenstein. Tarkovsky's influence on Russian society is undeniable. He reminds the poor people of their power and shows them a prospective Russians' glorious future. That is why his cinema, despite its many complexities, is widely popular in Russian society.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, B. (2003). *Reconstructed hope*. Second edition. Tehran: Markaz Publishing
- Arthur, K. (2003). *History of cinema*. Translated by Najaf Daryabandari. Ninth edition. Tehran: Amirkabir Publications
- Azizian, H. (2005). *The Mirror*. First Edition. Tehran: Basirat

- Bird, R. (2013). *Elements of cinema*. Translated by Touraj Selahshour. First Edition. Tehran: Ketab-e-Aban
- Bold, M. (2017). *Solaris*. Translated by Ghasem Momeni. First Edition. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications
- Darf, A. (1982). *Cannibalism in Leningrad*. Translated by Zabihullah Mansouri. First Edition. Tehran: Scientific-cultural
- Kar, E. (1992). *History of Soviet Russia Bolshevik Revolution*. Volume 1. Translated by Najaf Daryabandari. First Edition. Tehran: Zende Roud
- Reed, H. (1973). *Meaning of art*. Translated by Najaf Daryabandari. Third edition. Tehran: Habibi Books Stock Company Co.
- Reed, H. (1973). *Art and Society*. Translated by Soroush Habibi. First Edition. Tehran: Amirkabir Publications
- Schroeder, P. (2004). *Transcendental style in cinema*. Translated by Mohammad Gozarabadi. Second edition. Tehran: Farabi Cinematic Foundation Publications
- Sanati, M. (2003). *Psychological analysis of time and immortality in Tarkovsky's cinema*. Second edition. Tehran: Markaz Publishing
- Tarkovsky, A. (2014). *Interview with Andrei Tarkovsky*, Compiled by John Giannito. Translated by Arman Salehi. First Edition. Tehran: Shoorafarin
- Martin, S. (2010). *A small book for directors*. Volume 6. Translated by Fardin Saheb Al-Zamani. Second Edition. Tehran: Avand Danesh Publishing
- Nabokov, V. (2013). *Courses on European Literature*. Translated by Farzaneh Taheri. Second edition. Tehran: Niloufar
- Ulrich, G. (2015). *History of Art Cinema*. Translated by Houshang Taheri. Fourth edition. Tehran: Mahour
- Yazdani, S. (2010). *A discourse on loneliness*. First Edition. Tehran: Manzoumeh Kherad Publications
- Yousef, V. (2010). *Envisaging time*. Translated by Mehran Sepehran. Tehran: Cheshmeh Publishing
- Articles:**
- Strugatsky, A. (1992). "This is how I saw Tarkovsky". Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky. Edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by: Robert Safarian. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 306-315
- Alexander, L. (1992). "Tarkovsky's mystery and rituals". Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky. Edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by Robert Saffarian. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 375-381
- Artimov, E. (1992). "In my opinion, he was a creator and will always remain a creator." Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky. Edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by Mohammad Atebbaei. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 244-261
- Bazen, A. (2018). "The Monster of Boris Godunov". Translated by Reza Molaei. Monthly of Cinema and Literature.
- Bandarchuk, N. (1992). "Confrontation in Solaris". Published in the book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya.

- Translated by: Ladan Zahed. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 151-178
- Brown, S. "Optimism and Hope and their dual Relationship" published in the book titled: Exploring the Theology of Cinema. Edited by Klive Marsh. Translated by Nima Malek Mohammadi. First Edition. Tehran: Farabi Cinema Foundation Publications, pp. 257-272
- Dzik, S. (2017). "The Absolute Object in the Inner Space". Translated by: Saleh Najafi. Monthly of Cinema and Literature. No. 73, p. 16
- Gordon, A. (1992). "Student years". Published in the book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by: Majid Sabzevari. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 35-55
- Konchalovsky, A. (1992). "I dream of Andrei". Published in the book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. First Edition. Translated by: Nasser Barkpour. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 227-24
- Misharin, A. (1992). "Blood, culture and history". Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovsky. Translated by: Ahmad Hojjati. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 61-74
- Riley, J. (2017). "The multi-faceted Moscow image". Translated by: Shahriar Khalfi. Cinema and Literature Monthly. No. 73. p. 46
- Romadin. M. (1992). "Cinema and Painting". Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovsky. Translated by: Robert Safarian. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 179-185
- Tarkovskaya, M. (1992) "Andre's Birth". Published in the book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by Robert Safarian. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 7-23
- Tarkosky, A.(1986), Sculpting In Time, trans Kitty Hunter
- Tarkosky, A.,(1991), Time Within Time, Reflections on the -cinema, trans.k.hunter-blaire,seagull,calcuta
- Turovskaya, M.(1989). Tarkosky: Cinema as Poetry, Feber and Feber,londrn
- Tarkhova. M. (1992). "With Andrei Tarkovsky". Published in the book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. First Edition. Translated by: Kazem Berg Nisi. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 217-227
- Solonitsyn, A. (1992). "Film like magic". Published in the book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by: Nasser Barkpour. First Edition Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 117-131
- Yanovsky, O. (1992). "A true Russian artist." Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky. Edited by Mariana Tarkovskaya. Translated by Kazem Barg Nisi. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 269-307
- Yousef, V. (1992). "A speech about a friend". Published in a book about Andrei Tarkovsky, edited by Mariana Tarkovsky. Translated by: Majid Sabzevari. First Edition. Tehran: Besharat Publishing, pp. 7-85
- Tarkovsky, Andrei. (1962). Ivan's childhood. Moscow: Mosfilm

- Tarkovsky, Andrei. (1966). *Andrei Rublev*. Moscow: Mosfilm
- Tarkovsky, Andrei (1972). *Solaris*. Moscow: Mosfilm
- Tarkovsky, Andrei. (1974). *Mirror*. Moscow: Mosfilm, Unit 4
- Tarkovsky, Andrei. (1979). *Stalker*. Moscow: Mosfilm, Unit 2
- Tarkovsky, Andrei (1983). *Nostalgia*. Rome: Opera Film with Rome and Swine Film
- Tarkovsky, Andrei. (1986). *Sacrifice*. Sweden: Swedish-Stockholm Film Institute with Argus Films, Paris in collaboration with Four International and Sandro Film & Title