



THE TENSION BETWEEN CREATED TIME AND REAL TIME IN ANDREI TARKOVSKY'S FILM *ANDREI RUBLIOV*

Jūratė BARANOVA*

Vilnius University, Faculty of Philosophy,
Institute of Philosophy, Universiteto str. 9/1, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania

Received 30 March 2019; accepted 1 November 2019

Abstract. This article starts with the presumption that Russian film director Andrei Tarkovsky (1932–1986) created a new conception of cinematic time. This impact on the theory of modern cinema was examined by philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925–1995) in his book *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (in French: *Cinéma 2, L'Image-Temps*, 1985). The article asks the question: what were the conceptual and social circumstances for everyday time to be implemented in a specific movie? As an example, it takes the film *Andrei Rubliov* (director Andrei Tarkovsky, 1969), which underwent protracted critique and compulsory shortening. The article asks the question: what is the meaning and significance of the cuts made when passing from the first version of *The Passion according to Andrei* (in Russian: *Strasti po Andreyu*, director Tarkovsky, 1966) to the final *Andrei Rubliov*? What is the meaning of the cuts made to the scenes of violence and nudity? The research conclusions are: the impatience of the critics who demanded that the long scenes in *The Passion according to Andrei* be shortened speaks not about defects in the film, nor about the inability of Tarkovsky to calculate time, but rather about the inability of observers to grasp Tarkovsky's new conception of cinematic time. According to Deleuze, in his attempt to transfer into cinema the slow speed of everyday life, Tarkovsky created a feature of modern cinema, and made a turn from movement towards time; time in this particular movie is already made visible.

Keywords: *Andrei Rubliov*, Andrei Tarkovsky, cinematic time, created time, everyday time, Gilles Deleuze, *The Passion according to Andrei*.

Introduction

Tarkovsky – Russian film director succeeded to create seven movies: five of them inside the Soviet Union (SU): *Ivan's Childhood* (in Russian: *Ivanovo detstvo*, 1962), *Andrei Rubliov*¹, *Solaris* (in Russian: *Solyaris*, 1972), *Mirror* (in Russian: *Zerkalo*, 1975), *Stalker* (1979). Two last movies were shot abroad: *Nostalgia* (Italian title, in Russian: *Nostalgia*, 1983) and *The Sacrifice* (in Sweden: *Offret*, 1986).

*Corresponding author. E-mail: jurate.rubaviciene@sf.vu.lt; jurabara@gmail.com



Figure 1. The Lithuanian philosopher Jolanta Saldukaiytė with Andrei Tarkovsky's son Andrei Tarkovsky during the visit at Tarkovsky's flat, recently museum in Florence, Italy in 23 April, 2017 (source: Jolanta Saldukaiytė's personal album)

Tarkovsky also wrote theories about film, and art in general, main of them – *Sculpting in Time* (1987, 2002) was written in collaboration with the critic Olga Surkova. The book had been gestating for many years in the SU, until it was finally published in German in 1984 and in English two years later. The creative heritage of Tarkovsky until now receives broad attention (for example, see Figure 1) (Izvestiya, 2019).

Tarkovsky's films could be approached from different perspectives. Jeremy Robinson considering Tarkovsky as one of the most fascinating of filmmakers writes:

“He is supremely romantic, an old-fashioned, traditional artist – at home in the company of Leonardo da Vinci, Pieter Brueghel, Aleksandr Pushkin, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Byzantine icon painters and Romantics such as Johann Wolfgang von Goethe Tarkovsky is a magician, no question, hut argues for demystification (even while his films celebrate mystery). He speaks endlessly of the “truth”, of “spirit”, of “faith”. He talks in Christian, Platonic, Neoplatonic, Romantic, metaphysical and religious terms. He is a purist, always aiming for the essence of things. His films are full of magical events, dreams, memory sequences, multiple viewpoints, multiple time-scales and bizare occurrences He is a marvelous filmmaker, a creator of miracles, a ‘maker’, a poet (the Greek word *poietas* means “maker”)” (2006, p. 33).

Thorsten Botz-Bornstein focuses on Tarkovsky's theoretic writings and juxtaposes his ideas with asome philosophical concepts created by Martin Heidegger, Walter Benjamin and Plotinus, emphasizing art as opening spiritual or transcendental spheres of experience (Betz-Bornstein, 2007, p. 98). Bird interprets Tarkovsky's films not as a primarily a narrational experience, but as an experience of the cinematic medium (2008, p. 10). Redwood, in

contrast to Bird repeatedly emphasize the narrational function of compositional elements in Tarkovsky's films. Bird concentrates on the aesthetic experience of space and time elicited by Tarkovsky's decoupage strategies. Redwood – on “the significance of spacio-temporal relations for the spectator's accurate narrative comprehension” (2010, p. 11). For much of his life, Tarkovsky was pre-occupied with the idea of the end of the world, and all of his films contain an element of apocalyptic crisis, either for the characters personally (such as Rubliov's horror at both the Tatar atrocities and his own crime, and his subsequent vow of silence and refusal to paint), or for society as a whole (the war in *Ivan's Childhood*, ecological collapse in *Stalker* or fear of nuclear war in *The Sacrifice*). Nerijus Milerius in the book *The Apocalypse in Cinema: Philosophical Presuppositions* discerns in Tarkovsky's movies repeated motive – the end of the world without end: “when the end somehow returns to the beginning or at least projects such a return as the prolonged trajectory by spectator” (Milerius, 2013, p. 190). On the other hand, Milerius notices, that Tarkovsky's non-chronological time becomes entangled with “Deleuze's time-image, but contrary to the case of Deleuze, has the inoculation of belief” (2013, p. 225). Gerard Loughlin in his article “The Long Take: Messianic Time in Andrei Tarkovsky's *Nostalghia*” (2009) reflects Tarkovsky's concept of messianic time comparing it with Giorgio Agamben's discussion of messianic time in his book *The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans* (Agamben, 2005). The aim of this article is also to investigate the long take of Tarkovsky's from Deleuzian perspective, but, in difference to the researches mentioned above the motives of messianic aspects would be suspended and the analysis would concentrate on comparison between the two versions of Tarkovsky's film *Andrei Rubliov* in order to reveal the peculiarities of created time as real time and some aspects of social time Tarkovsky lived in.

1. From *The Passion according to Andrei* towards *Andrei Rubliov*

The philosopher Deleuze approaches the phenomenon of cinema director Tarkovsky starting from two perspectives: he reads his text “On the Cinematographic Figure” (in French: “De la Figure Cinématographique”, 1981) and cites: “Time in cinema becomes the basis of bases, like sound in music, colour in painting” (cited in Deleuze 1989, p. 288); and he watches and discusses Tarkovsky's movies – *Solaris*, *Mirror* and *Stalker* (maybe also *Andrei Rubliov* but this is not mentioned) when reflecting on the concept of time-crystals. In this regard, a hint about *Andrei Rubliov* can be discerned in the question Deleuze repeats as keenly relevant to Tarkovsky's time-crystal: “What is Russia? What is Russia?” (Deleuze, 1989, p. 75).

“The dominant, all-powerful factor in the film image is *rhythm*, expressing the course of time within the frame”, says Tarkovsky (1987, p. 113), and Deleuze takes this insight very seriously citing it in his *Cinema 2*:

“The movement-image can be perfect, but it remains amorphous, indifferent and static if it is not already deeply affected by injections of time which put montage into it, and alter movement. The time in a shot must flow independently and, so to speak, as its own boss” (1989, p. 42).

Sergei Eisenstein also emphasized rhythm, but rhythm as part of the montage (1977, pp. 73-75). Tarkovsky, as opposed to Eisenstein, unites rhythm with the frame. He says that editing brings together shots that are already filled with time, and organizes the unified, living structure inherent in the film. So it happens that

“the time that pulsates through the blood vessels of the film, making it alive, is of varying rhythmic pressure. Editing a picture correctly, competently, means allowing the separate scenes and shots to come together spontaneously, for in a sense they edit themselves; they join up according to their own intrinsic pattern” (Tarkovsky, 1987, p. 115).

Tarkovsky relies on spontaneity, saying that rhythm is not thought up, not composed on an arbitrary, theoretical basis, but comes into being spontaneously in a film in response to the director's innate awareness of life, his “search for time”.

Our hypothesis is that Tarkovsky's writings on rhythm and montage in cinematic art influence Deleuze's conception of cinematic time in *Cinema 2*. Deleuze wrote:

“This identity of montage with the image itself can appear only in conditions of the direct time-image. In a text with important implications, Tarkovsky says that what is essential is the way time flows in the shot, its tension or rarefaction, ‘the pressure of time in the shot’. He appears to subscribe to the classical alternative, shot or montage, and to opt strongly for the shot (‘the cinematographic figure only exists inside the shot’). But this is only a superficial appearance, because the force or pressure of time goes outside the limits of the shot, and montage itself works and lives in time” (1989, p. 42).

The aim of this article is to reveal how the concept of time was implemented in this particular movie *Andrei Rubliov*, and what seems at first sight as technical problems of montage concerning the length of the film reveal the social and conceptual problems lurking behind the image. Why was this film suspended for five years after production? And what is the significance of all the cuts? Tarkovsky's film *The Passion according to Andrei* (the original title of *Andrei Rubliov* was *The Beginning and the Ways*, in Russian: *Nachalo... i puti*, 1966) was renamed *Andrei Rubliov* three years after its first presentation. These two versions differ by time duration. As Tarkovsky mentions, the first version titled *The Passion according to Andrei* was three hours and twenty minutes long and was completed in July 1966. The second version of the film lasted three hours and fifteen minutes. The final version was reduced to three hours and six minutes (Tarkovsky, 2006, p. 29), and at first sight concerns the life of a specific painter, the 15th century icon master and monk Andrei Rubliov, author of the famous *The Trinity* (in Russian: *Troitsa*, 1411 or 1425–1427). On the other hand, this film is the perfect example of a time-crystal.

The co-screenwriter was Andrei Konchalovsky² (in the first version he is presented by the name *Andron Michalkov*, in the last as Andrei Michalkov-Konchalovsky), and in documentary *Andrei Tarkovsky's Way of Cross* (in Russian: *Krestnyj put' Andrey'a Tarkovskovo*, 2007) speaking about the creative life of Russian film director Tarkovsky, his former friend and co-author, when asked why their cooperation collapsed after the film *Andrei Rubliov*, explained:

² Konchalovsky (b. 1937) is a Russian film director, film producer and screenwriter.

“A long, over-long process, and alcoholic. We separated for the reason that I started to see his mistakes and disagreed with him about the shooting of particular scenes in Rubliov. And I told him so. He became more reserved towards me because I scolded him, attacked, and told him: “You are not shooting the right things”. I said: “It has to be shortened. It is too long”. I consider even now that Rubliov is too long”.

Both Konchalovsky and Tarkovsky knew they were creating a long movie, and they had a conceptual approach of how to manage the long duration. Their script was published in the journal *The Art of Cinema* (in Russian: *Iskusstvo kino*) before the film came out; when Tarkovsky began working on it (in April, 1964), the film contained 12 episodes and two prologues, for two parts. In an interview before shooting Tarkovsky reflected:

“The film will consist of several episodes that are not directly logically connected to one another. Rather, they are connected internally through ideas. We do not yet know in which sequential order the novellas will be joined: maybe chronologically, maybe not. We want to organize the episodes according to their implications for the evolution of Roublev’s personality, so that they build on each other dramatically during the birth of his idea for the magnificent icon of the Troitsa (Trinity). At the same time, we want to avoid any traditional dramaturgy, with its canonical isolation, its logical, formal schematism, because it often prevents full expression of the richness and complexity of life” (2006, p. 9).

This long film was ultimately divided into eight parts – novellas: 1. “The Jester” (in Russian: *Skomoroh*) (summer 1400) or “The Buffoon” (summer 1400); 2. “Theophanes the Greek” (in Russian: *Feofan Grek*) (1405–1406); 3. “The Passion” (in Russian: *Strasti po Andreyu*) (1406); 4. “The Holiday” (in Russian: *Prazdnik*) (1408); 5. “The Last Judgment” (in Russian: *Strashnyj sud*) (summer 1408); 6. “The Raid” (in Russian: *Nabeg*) (autumn 1408); 7. “Silence” (in Russian: *Molchanie*) (winter 1412); 8. “The Bell” (in Russian: *Kolokol*) (1423–1424). As Skakov remarks, this twenty-year chronology is deceptive: “the characters appear to exist and act within an atemporal reality, where past, present and future are not clearly divided” (2012, p. 44). Different sections sometimes seem to be different stories with nothing in common, and Andrei Rubliov does not necessarily appear as the main hero in all of them. Sometimes he is excluded, as in the introduction about a man who dares to fly despite all the circumstances and falls. In the last part, “The Bell”, he appears only at the end. But the film was planned to be even longer. As Robinson remarks:

“One of the major scenes cut from Andrei Roublyov was the Kulikovo Field Battle scene depicting the Russian victory over the Tatars. This was an expensive scene, costed at over 200 000 roubles (the Kulikovo Battle sequence had to be cut due to the cost before the Mosfilm authorities would give a green light to Andrei Roublyov). “The Hunt”, the hunting of swans by the Duke’s brother, was also dropped. “Indian Summer” in which the fool gives birth to a half-Tatar, half-Russian child, was dropped. “The Field of Virgins”, the story of Russian women selling their long hair to save Moscow from the Tatars, which interested Roublyov, was left out. Roublyov’s memories of his childhood were cut; another vision of the Crucifixion seen by Theophanes was dropped (it was situated in a desert-like setting, to contrast with Roublyov’s vision of a snowy, Russian Cavalry)” (2006, p. 338).

The shooting was long, taking about two years. The duration of the film was also long. And in addition to these two long moments, a third long aspect was associated with this film:

it took the long way to reach the Soviet public. For five years its presentation was prohibited in the SU. In December, 1966 it was presented in the White Hall of the Cinematographic Union before a limited public. A rumour circulated that Tarkovsky was a genius, but numerous cuts were officially suggested by State Committee for Cinematography (SCC). Some of Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) documents stated:

“The ideological conception is false, directed against the people. The people did not suffer patiently and did not keep silence as the film reveals, the revolts followed one after the other. The film humiliates the dignity of the Russian man, transforms him into a savage, almost an animal [...]. The film works against us, against the people, history and Party politics in the field of culture” (Gordon, 2007, pp. 172-173).

Tarkovsky was blamed for presenting violence and nudity as propaganda. The ministry's demands for cuts first resulted in a 190-minute version. Despite Tarkovsky's objections expressed in a letter to Alexei Romanov, the chairman of SCC, the ministry demanded further cuts, and Tarkovsky trimmed the length to 186 minutes. Tarkovsky made cuts and a new montage, taking some suggestions into account and ignoring others. He changed some material and used some from the first ignored version. He also added a new sound track with music and new sounds. He even changed the title to *Andrei Rublev* and in May, 1969 the new version of film was presented at the Cannes Film Festival without authorization to receive a possible award. *Andrei Rubliov* screened at the festival out of competition, just once at 4 a.m. on the final day of the festival, and won the FIPRESCI Award. The film reached the Soviet audience only in 1971. In 1973, the film was shown on Soviet television in a 101-minute version that Tarkovsky did not authorize. This version lacked two parts: “The Holiday” and “The Raid”. The first was cut because of the screened nudity, and the second because of violence shown as the reality of the war. Notable scenes cut from this version were the raid of the Tatars and the scene showing naked Pagans. When the film was released in the United States (US) and other countries in 1973, the distributor *Columbia Pictures* cut it by an additional 20 minutes. According to Tarkovsky's sister, Marina Tarkovskaya, one of the editors of the film, Lyudmila Feiginova, secretly kept a print of the 205-minute cut under her bed. Criterion's producer of the project stated that the video transfer was sourced from a film print that filmmaker Martin Scorsese had acquired while visiting Russia. In 1987, the original version *The Passion according to Andrei* was restored and presented to the public. In the mid-1990s, Criterion Collection released the original 205-minute version of *Andrei Rubliov* on laserdisc, and re-issued it as a DVD in 1999. There are also prints of *Andrei Rubliov* of varying lengths, from a US 146-minute version, to an “original” cut* of 180 minutes shown in the SU in 1989. Turovskaya said that Tarkovsky cut the film down from 5642 to 5250 metres, and later pruned it by another 174 metres; the Russian release print was 5076 metres (Robinson, 2006, p. 336).

2. Violence and reality

Tarkovsky, however, despite his long fight for the original version of 205 minutes in his interviews, later authorized only the last, the shorter 186-minute version from 1971. It was not his idea to shorten the film, but when the cuts were done and 19 minutes were lost, Tarkovsky concluded:

“I am convinced the latest version is the best, the most successful. And I only cut certain overly long scenes. The viewer doesn’t even notice their absence. The cuts have in no way changed either the subject matter or what was for us important in the film. In other words, we removed overly long scenes which had no significance” (2006, p. 29).

It seems that this experience of compulsive shortening of the film led Tarkovsky to a new insight: shortening could increase the esthetic value of the film, which in any case remained quite long, lasting 186 minutes.

Was Tarkovsky sincere, or did he just wish to end the discussion? The fight and the discussion, which had been going on for five years after two years of very careful and lengthy shooting, started to appear tiresome. What did *Andrei Rubliov* gain as an advantage when shortened in comparison to *The Passion according to Andrei*, and what was lost?

It appeared that some episodes of very intensive significance were also rejected, namely those portraying violence or disaster.

Notwithstanding his conviction about the necessity of violence in this particular movie, Tarkovsky under compulsion reduced some scenes of violence and even reflected on the reason:

“We shortened certain scenes of brutality in order to induce psychological shock in viewers, as opposed to a mere unpleasant impression which would only destroy our intent. All my friends and colleagues who during long discussions were advising me to make those cuts turned out right in the end. It took me some time to understand it. At first I got the impression they were attempting to pressure my creative individuality. Later I understood that this final version of the film more than fulfils my requirements for it. And I do not regret at all that the film has been shortened to its present length” (2006, p. 29).

In the interview, Tarkovsky was asked what particular scenes were cut. He refused to name them in detail, but emphasized that he did it himself and was satisfied with the result.

At the beginning of the film, a character called Yefim prepares to take off from a belfry on his home-made hot-air balloon. Some people are trying to prevent this experiment for some unknown reason, quite possibly because it is blasphemous. Yefim in a hurry rushes up the stairs of a little Orthodox Church mumbling: “Oh, Lord, how to manage in time” (in Russian: *Gospodi, uspietj bi*). He succeeds in managing in time, and escapes pursuit while his helpers on the ground are assaulted. The peasant-inventor Yefim once in the air is happily astonished to contemplate the earth from above. He shouts to his friend on the ground: “Archipushka. Archip, I am flying”. But the flight does not last very long. Suddenly the balloon starts to lose air, the peasant slumps into a swamp and before perishing succeeds only in murmuring: “Oh, Lord... What is going on?”. In the final episodes, the spectator sees in slow motion a graceful horse rolling in the grass, rising and leaving the image. In the reduced 186 version of *Andrei Rubliov*, Tarkovsky cut out the short scene with the man’s prostrate body. His possible death is left outside the image, and an association is created in the viewer’s mind between the deflation of the balloon and the contrasting vivacity of the young horse. “[...] For me the horse symbolizes life”, Tarkovsky mentioned in one of his interviews (Tarkovsky, 2006, p. 25). Death and life somehow contrast even without the image of the motionless body. In the long 205-minute version *The Passion according to Andrei*, at the end of the episode the spectator sees Yefim’s unconscious body lying on the ground and the slowly deflating hot-air balloon.

A similar shortening is made in the section “Theophanes the Greek”. In this part, there is an episode about Andrei Rubliov’s associate monk Kirill who desperately envied Andrei Rubliov his talent for painting icons and suffered from his own lack of talent. He visited a famous painter of icons, Theophanes the Greek, and after their conversation the old master was intrigued and suggested Kirill join his group of apprentices and help him paint the interior of Orthodox churches. But eventually Theophanes the Greek preferred a more talented apprentice and invited Andrei Rubliov, who agreed. Kirill desperately leaves the cloister calling down curses on the communion of monks who were former friends he has left behind. His dog breaks loose and follows him with devotion, but Kirill concentrates all his anger on the innocent animal and beats him to death with a stick in a fit of irrational rage. In the 186-minute reduced version, the spectator sees the man who is dispensing the execution and hears the yelping voice of the dog. The image of the dead dog is not visible in the final 186-minute version, as Tarkovsky cut it out. But in the first 205-minute version the execution ends with the prostrate dying dog. Are these two cuts significant or insignificant? Do the images of the motionless Yefim and the motionless dog increase the brutality of the episode, or do they have no influence, since in any case the spectator understands what is going on from the movements of the man and the yelping of the dog?

But Tarkovsky definitely knew why he needed these violent scenes. He tried to respect historical reality, especially Russian history, of which every page “literally oozes blood”. In order to construct a realistic narrative, real historical atrocities were indispensable in order to expose the real, and not only spiritual, source of Rubliov’s sufferings. However, in addition to these two points, Tarkovsky also followed the conception of shock provided by Eisenstein:

“I always count on the effect shock produces on the spectator: no evasions, no long explanations about the horrors of war, because a short naturalistic scene suffices to put the spectator in a traumatic state, after which he will absolutely believe everything we show him” (Tarkovsky, 2006, pp. 27–28).

The violence in this film is the integral part of reality time. Kristina Karvelytė by detailed and precise reading discerned in it the various forms of violence. The most visible is the violence towards the human body, but also one can discern the violence of the soul towards the body (Karvelytė, 2011a). There is also the violence of touch represented by the violence of pagan woman’s kiss of helpless Rubliov (Karvelytė, 2011b). The most cruel form of violence is the violence of war scenes from “The Raid” part when Rubliov kills the violator and rapist and experiences a shock from the violence he committed himself. But these various form of violence are included into the feature not for the violence sake. As Karvelytė concludes,

“the feature is composed as the rising up spiral, when every fragment of the spiral is divided into different oppositions: quantitative (individual – crowd), qualitative (earth – air; water – earth, church – village, Russians – Tatars), intensive (light – dark), epistemological (touch – gaze) or moral (Christianity – Paganism). All oppositions here indicate the unity of contradictions – Tarkovsky reveals the transition from doubt to belief, from sexual aggression to obedience, from indifference to belief. The final transition from the one quality to another is the change of the cinefilm from the dark/white to the coloured one. This transition not only abstractly indicates the leap of consciousness of Andrei Rubliov, but also compels to *experience* it together with

him. So the last ten minutes of the feature are experienced as a miracle, as the recovery of the sight because of comprehended truth” (2011c).

We doubt that Tarkovsky would ever have cut out these scenes if it had not been for outside pressure.

3. Significant or insignificant cuts?

There are also some other aspects Tarkovsky discerned as a result of the shortening of the movie. First of all, it seems that he maintains autonomy as a creator: he is not prepared to admit that he was forced to curtail the film, and puts emphasis on his own decisions, suggesting that he discarded only insignificant parts of the material. On the other hand, at that time neither *The Passion according to Andrei*, nor *Andrei Rubliov*, were openly a subject of discussion or reflection in the Soviet press. In this interview, he is speaking with a foreign journalist, and after five years of fighting for the long movie version, he knew perfectly well how his every word would be interpreted in his own native country. The consequences were too obvious: obstruction and prevention of filming. He just wanted to continue filming, and had in mind among his future projects Fyodor Dostoyevsky’s *The Idiot* (2004)³ and *Hoffmanniana: Szenario Fur Einen Nicht Realisierten Film* (Tarkovskij, 1987)⁴, which he never achieved.

Are these relinquished scenes really insignificant?

The spectator sees the character of Andrei Rubliov (Anatoly Solonitsyn) not in the introduction of the film, but only at the beginning of the first part leaving Andronikov Monastery with his friends also painters and monks Daniil Chorniy (Nikolai Grinko) and Kirill (Ivan Lapikov). In the long version, *The Passion according to Andrei*, Tarkovsky step by step reveals the situation. The three monks are already outside the cloister. The young monk calls them to return; the senior of the cloister (father) asks them to return: much work is to be done. But the monks already on the road angrily reject the call, telling the young monk to go back and not to interfere in an affair he cannot understand (in Russian: *Nie tvojego uma eto delo*). It was Kirill who replied. He is very intelligent and aggressive. Andrei Rubliov is not very happy about the moral consequences of their departure from the place where they were taught to paint and received the first lessons in their craft. He says regretfully: “It is not good” (in Russian: *Nechorošo eto*). He cannot clearly articulate why their departure is not morally good, loses his train of thought and is not able, or not willing, to finish the sentence, but he feels that leaving the *Trinity* is not good. At the same time, he is not going to return. They leave rather decisively. In this way, with a few sentences in the introduction, the characters of the three monks, the three different types of artists and three personalities are perfectly revealed. But, as Tarkovsky was under the necessity to shorten the film, he cut this scene. In the reduced version of *Andrei Rubliov*, this part starts with the following scene: the three

³ In 1981 in interview Tarkovsky said: “I am writing a screenplay based on *The Idiot* and it’s very hard work” (2006, p. 68).

⁴ In 1986 published interview when asked why Tarkovsky had abandoned the filming of the life of E. T. A. Hoffman he answered:

“I haven’t abandoned this film. I am postponing it until later” (Tarkovsky, 2006, p. 176). In 1986 he died.

monks are already on the road and pursue the discussion about the length of time they stayed in Andronikov Monastery. Danill Chorniy with some short remarks tenderly agrees with Andrei Rubliov that it is a pity to leave the Andronikov Monastery, starting the discussion with reference to the birch they were passing: it remains unnoticed when seen every day, but if one knows it is for the last time, one sees it with new eyes, and feels pity. Their discussion reveals that they are going to Moscow, Russia to look for a job. They are not sure they will be needed, because in Moscow there are a lot of icon painters, but they will take the risk (in Russian: *Podiščem rabotionku kakuju*). It is obvious that this is a decisive departure: to explore the surrounding world and to search for their place in it. They behave like adult personalities, like creative artists, who feel the need for impressions and the expression of their creative power, but not like the monks who have vowed to follow the Holy Scripture as well as the rules of the governing body of the cloister. With the cut of the first mentioned scene of their departure, in which when asked they refused to return, the rebellious character of their journey is no longer obvious.

The journey of the three monks on foot through fields of grain is interrupted by heavy rain in both the long and shorter versions of film. They are looking for temporary shelter and enter a large cottage where peasants are enjoying leisure time entertained by a joker. The jester, or in old Russian *skomorokh*, played by Russian actor Rolan Bykov, is dancing, performing acrobatic feats, playing a stringed musical instrument and singing funny songs mocking noblemen and noblewomen, in Russian named *Boyar* and *Boyarynia*. When the monks enter, the host of the cottage suggests they drink some alcohol because they are soaked to the skin. Kirill answers: "Thanks, we do not drink" (in Russian: *Spasibo, nie pjiom*). The jester all at once makes a rhythmical joke: "And women do not shake" (in Russian: *I bab nie triesiom*).

An insignificant, but according to our view very important, shortening of the episode follows. The three monks enter the cottage at the moment when the jester is finishing his performance with an acrobatic jump upside-down on his hands. His pants slip down as if by chance, but as a result it appears that the intention of the jester was to show his bare buttocks, on which was drawn a human face. The spectators at the performance of the movie found this trick very funny and they burst into laughter. But not the CPSU officials responsible for Soviet cinematography who watched the film. As Milan Kundera revealed in his novel *The Joke* (1992), a peculiarity of totalitarian ideology is that it does not understand or accept jokes. So the officials did not understand Tarkovsky's joke and decided that these bare buttocks were a humiliation of Russian folk (Gordon, 2007, pp. 172–173). Tarkovsky was obliged to cut out the scene, and in *Andrei Rubliov* neither the film audience nor the characters in the movie see this scene. But in *The Passion according to Andrei*, the first thing the monks see upon entering the cottage is namely the laughing face drawn on the jester's bare buttocks. After his very dynamic performance, the jester leaves the cottage to relax in the rain.

4. A New conception of cinematic time

Indeed from that moment on, time starts to pass very slowly for events in progress: the speed of the constructed cinematic time approaches the duration of time in life itself. This slow passage of time is very clear because of the contrast: the rapid passage of time during

the entertainment is suddenly replaced by the slowness of everyday time when “nothing particular happens”. By creating this contrast, Tarkovsky revealed the secret fascination of everyday time, which seems at first sight to be unimportant. This effect is obtained by two additional replacements. The dancing and quickly moving body of the joker was replaced by a long meditation on a calm human face. The noisy performance of the joker was followed in contrast by a settled silence. Movement is made more meaningful in the context of stillness. The human voice in the discussion of drunken peasants was barely audible as an insignificant setting, strengthening the impression of prevalent silence. The silence is heard even more intensely, despite a woman singing in the musical soundtrack of the movie, not in the visible image. In this particular episode Tarkovsky revealed that mainly in silence the human face becomes a place of superior meaning. The camera slowly moves across the faces of the children and the faces of the monks: time passes more and more slowly. The silence and peacefulness of the episode is interrupted only by the joker’s trick. He suddenly appears from outside in the open doorway, hanging upside-down and crowing like a cock. It seems that for a brief moment the slow passage of time reaches the limit of reality, but all at once it becomes obvious that cinematic time, even in such a slow episode as the meditation on faces and silence, runs much more quickly in Tarkovsky’s movie than the passage of time in reality. It suddenly becomes obvious that Daniil Chorniy, a few seconds before shown reading a book, is already asleep. Kirill is suddenly missing and his figure is visible through the window talking to the raider (Boyar’s policeman), who as it later transpired was one of the malefic group of riders who knocked the joker into a tree and imprisoned him unconscious, before destroying his musical instrument. After the silence and it seems the harmony of human faces, Kirill managed to lodge a complaint against the joker with the authorities. Was it because he was annoyed by the joker’s raillery, or cared about the governess’ honor, or simply that he was just disgusted by the jokes, or for some other irrational reason? Kirill confesses this particular deed to Andrei Rubliov only in the last part of the movie, but only as fact without presenting the reason. The real forces of the event are left outside the image. Close observation of the episode reveals signs showing who is a traitor. The peasants understood at once: they did not answer Daniil’s Chorniy farewell on departure. Both the long and shortened versions include the arrest of the jester, and in both versions the viewer sees in the distance the slow movement of horses with the joker’s motionless body as an insignificant background while the monks go further from the cottage along their road. But the shortened version of *Andrei Rubliov* lacks aspects of this part from *The Passion according to Andrei* and, in our opinion, some of them are rather important for appreciating the movie. It was no great loss to cut down the advance of the monks during the first moments when they left the cottage and to skip over their passage through a little wood, but cutting out the episodes dealing with the meditative faces in the cottage during the “silence time” can be seen as a considerable loss for the conception Tarkovsky puts forward. He suggested his observers should view real time, reality as it passes, and he taught how to meditate not only by observing the pictures, but also the cinematic images. The faces of the monks in the cottage look like those from old pictures, and the faces of the children express the beauty of childhood. Tarkovsky tries to keep the slowness of the time of silence when nothing particular happens as long

as possible in his shortened version as well, but he has to omit the second return of the camera through the children's faces and the folk peacefully talking about their own affairs in the corners of the cottage. It might seem that this second turn of the camera around the cottage is insignificant, but it gave time for Kirill to disappear and inform the raider about the jester. In the shortened version, Kirill's disappearance seems unrealistic, too quick: as though it happens in an action-image. The impatience of the critics, who demanded that the long scenes in *The Passion according to Andrei* should be shortened, speak not about defects of the film, and not about the inability of Tarkovsky to calculate time, but about the inability of the observers to grasp this new conception of cinematic time. Tarkovsky's intentions were perfectly understood by French philosopher Deleuze in his second volume *Cinema 2*, in which the philosopher came to the same point as Tarkovsky, only from another direction, not cinematic but philosophical. According to Deleuze, it is a feature of modern cinema, which turned from movement towards time: time is already made visible:

“The image itself is the system of the relationships between its elements, that is, a set of relationships of time from which the variable present only flows. It is in this sense, I think, that Tarkovsky challenges the distinction between montage and shot when he defines cinema by the ‘pressure of time’ in the shot. What is specific to the image, as soon as it is creative, is to make perceptible, to make visible, relationships of time which cannot be seen in the represented object and do not allow themselves to be reduced to the present” (1989, p. xii).

Conclusions

The first version of the film *The Passion according to Andrei* was not a classical film, based on the action-image. It suggested a new conception of time. The time-image, according to Deleuze, is a presumption for modern cinema. The reductions made in the shortened version of *Andrei Rubliov* (1971) do not make the film into an action-image. It still remains as an example of a time-crystal. But these obligatory cuts made to some of the first version screens are significant signs of social political pressure in the film industry during Soviet times, but not of the inner necessity of the creative plasticity. It was a new conception of time not only in Soviet cinema, but also accepted as an innovative conception of time in the West.

References

- Agamben, G. (2005). *The time that remains: a commentary on the latter to the Romans*. Series: Meridian: Crossing Aesthetics. W. Hamacher (Ed.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bird, R. (2008). *Andrei Tarkovsky: elements of cinema*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- Botz-Bornstein, Th. (2007). *Films and dreams: Tarkovsky, Bergman, Sokurov, Kubrick, and Wong Kar-Wai*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1989). *Cinema 2: the time-image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dostoyevsky, F. (2004). *The Idiot*. London: Penguin Books.
- Eisenstein, S. (1977). *Film form: essays in film theory*. J. Leyda (Ed.). San Diego, New York, London: A

Harvest Book/Harcourt, Inc.

Gordon, A. (2007). *Ne utolivshij zhazhdy. Ob Andree Tarkovskom*. Moskva: Vagrius.

Green, P. (1993). *Andrei Tarkovsky: the winding quest*. London: The Macmillan Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-11996-7>

Izvestya. (2019). *Fil'm syna Andreyta Tarkovskovo ob otce vstretili aplodimentami v Venecii*. Retrieved from <https://iz.ru/916420/2019-09-01/film-syna-andreia-tarkovskogo-ob-ottce-vstretili-aplodimentami-v-venecii>

Johnson, V. T., & Petrie, G. (1994). *The films of Andrei Tarkovsky: A Visual Fugue*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Karvelytė, K. (2011a). *Mąstyti prievartą: „Andrejus Rubliovas“ (I)*. Retrieved from <https://aplinkeliai.lt/recenzijos/filmu/mastyti-prievarta-andrejus-rubliovas-i/>

Karvelytė, K. (2011b). *Mąstyti prievartą: „Andrejus Rubliovas“ (II)*. Retrieved from <https://aplinkeliai.lt/recenzijos/filmu/mastyti-prievarta-andrejus-rubliovas-ii/>

Karvelytė, K. (2011b). *Mąstyti prievartą: „Andrejus Rubliovas“ (III)*. Retrieved from <https://aplinkeliai.lt/recenzijos/filmu/mastyti-prievarta-andrejus-rubliovas-iii/>

Kundera, M. (1992). *The joke*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Loughlin, G. (2009). The long take: Messianic time in Andrei Tarkovsky's *Nostalghia*. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 13(3–4), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14797580903244753>

Martin, S. (2005). *Andrei Tarkovsky*. Series: The Pocket Essential. Harpenden: Pocket Essentials.

Milerius, N. (2013). *Apokaliptė kine: filosofinės prielaidos*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Redwood, Th. (2010). *Andrei Tarkovsky's poetics of cinema*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Robinson, J. M. (2006). *The sacred cinema of Andrei Tarkovsky*. Series: Media, Feminism, Cultural Studies. Maidstone: Crescent Moon Publishing.

Skakov, N. (2012). *The cinema of Tarkovsky: labyrinths of space and time*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780755698448>

Tarkovskij, A. (1987). *Hoffmanniana: Szenario Fur Einen Nicht Realisierten Film*. Munich: Schirmer/Mosel Verlag.

Tarkovsky, A. (2006). *Interviews*. J. Gianvito (Ed.). Series: Conversations with Filmmakers Series. P. Brunette (General Ed.). Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Tarkovsky, A. (1987). *Sculpting in time*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Tarkovsky, A. (2002). Zapechatlioniye vremena. In *Archivy, dokumenty, vospominaniya* (pp. 9–94). Moskva: Podkova, Eksmo-Press.

Notice

This work was supported by the Research Council of Lithuania under Grant No. S-MIP-17-37 and was carried out in cooperation with Vilnius University Faculty of Philosophy.

ĮTAMPA TARP SUKURTOJO LAIKO IR REALIOJO LAIKO ANDREJAUS TARKOVSKIO KINO FILME *ANDREJUS RUBLIOVAS*

Jūratė BARANOVA

Santrauka

Šis straipsnis prasideda prielaida, kad rusų režisierius Andrejus Tarkovskis (1932–1986) sukūrė naują kinematografinio laiko koncepciją. Ši jo įnašą į moderniojo kino teoriją pastebėjo ir apmąstė prancūzų filosofas Gilles Deleuze'as (1925–1995) savo knygoje *Kinas 2: Vaizdinys-laikas* (orig. *Cinéma 2: L'Image-Temps*, 1985). Straipsnyje keliamas klausimas apie konceptualias ir socialines kasdienybės laiko bei sukurtojo kinematografinio laiko santykio trajektorijas. Kaip tokio santykio unikalus pavyzdys pasirenkamas ir aptariamas Tarkovskio filmas *Andrejus Rubliovas*. Pirmoji filmo versija "Pasijos pagal Andrejų" (orig. *Strasti po Andreju*, 1966) buvo sustabdyta, režisierius buvo priverstas jį sutrumpinti ir 1969 metais pateikti naująją versiją kitu pavadinimu – *Andrejus Rubliovas*. Straipsnyje lyginamos abi filmo versijos keliant klausimą: kokia yra šių trumpinimų reikšmė ir prasmė? Ką simbolizuoja kai kurių prievartos ir nuogybės scenų atsisakymas? Tyrimo išvada tokia: reikalaujančių trumpinti kritikų nepakantumas ilgoms *Pasijų pagal Andrejų* filmo scenoms liudija ne filmo trūkumus ir ne Tarkovskio negebėjimą skaičiuoti laiką, o tik pačių kritikų stebėtojų nesuvokimą, kad Tarkovskis išrado ir sukūrė naują kinematografinio laiko koncepciją, kurioje sukurtasis laikas suvokiamas kaip realus kasdienybės laikas. Pasak Deleuze'o, siekdamas transformuoti kinematografinį laiką į daug lėtesnį kasdienybės laiką, Tarkovskis sukūrė vieną svarbiausių modernaus kino bruožų – jis laiką kine padarė matomą.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: *Andrejus Rubliovas*, Andrejus Tarkovskis, kinematografinis laikas, sukurtasis laikas, kasdienybės laikas, Gilles Deleuze'as, *Pasijos pagal Andrejų*.