

Copyright © 2023 by Cherkas Global University



Published in the USA
Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie)
Issued since 2014.
ISSN 1994-4160
E-ISSN 1994-4195
2023. 19(3): 404-412

DOI: 10.13187/me.2023.3.404
<https://me.cherkasgu.press>



Theoretical Articles of Film Expert K.E. Razlogov in the *Cinema Art* Journal

Olga Gorbatkova ^{a,*}

^a Don State Technical University, Russian Federation

Abstract

The evolution of theoretical film studies positions of the famous film expert K.E. Razlogov (1946–2021) in *Cinema Art* journal is analyzed in this article.

Purpose of study: comprehensive retrospective analysis of the theoretical film studies position evolution of K.E. Razlogov in *Cinema Art* journal in configuration of historical, political and socio-cultural snapshot.

The results of content analytical discourse of the film studies positions in the theoretical articles of K.E. Razlogov on the pages of *Cinema Art* journal allow outlining some conclusions:

- the theoretical film studies positions of K.E. Razlogov to a greater extent were focused on the plot-structural analysis of the film, its genre originality, the specific features of expressive means in the historical context;

- the content of some articles of the film expert reflected the problems of studying the most important phenomena of the foreign cinematography history and theory by the Soviet film critics, standing for the need of conscious orientation towards the development of spectacular cinematography, the importance of developing a methodology based on the principle of historicism, the segment unity of the ideological and semiotic approaches;

- the texts of the theoretical articles of the film expert, written in the Soviet period, contained the traces of ideology of the ruling Communist party; the author repeatedly referred to the ideological dogmas, resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR in his publications, paying attention to the semantic content analysis of the official documents and degree of cinematography development in accordance with the established positions;

- in the period of the 21st century the author's works substantially referred to the studies of the historical evolution and the problem of film presentation on Russian TV screens;

- in general, the film studies publications of K.E. Razlogov were dedicated to studying the correlations and influence of political and socio-cultural transformation processes on the development of cinematography in the context of various periods of history.

Keywords: Razlogov, theoretical articles, film studies position, film expert, film studies, *Cinema Art* journal.

1. Introduction

Today the theory and practice of cinema develops a wide range of problems using a deep deconstruction and understanding of the scientific heritage as a fundamental support in the context of film studies.

* Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: gorbatkova1987@bk.ru (O. Gorbatkova)

The appeal to the Soviet and Russian scientific potential of film studies is by no means accidental, but determined by the need to find answers to currently unsolved problematic vectors in the field of methodology, development of expressive means, structure of the film, determination of the boundaries of the film studies subject field in the space of its study by film experts of the past years.

One of the most recognized experts on cinema and television, and media culture in general, was the outstanding film expert, cultural scientist, film critic, teacher, journalist, professor of Russian State University of Cinematography, President of the Guild of Film Experts and Film Critics of Russia (2015–2021), Honored Artist of the Russian Federation (1996) – Kirill Razlogov (06.05.1946 – 26.09.2021).

The main theoretical works published by K.E. Razlogov on the pages of *Cinema Art* journal were dedicated mostly to cinematographic problems, mainly to professional issues of film studies, theory and art of film production, its plot and imagery concept (the basic works were published at different times under headings “Theory and history”, “Culture contexts”, “Discussions”, “TV – resonance”).

At the same time, a significant number of K.E. Razlogov’s scientific studies referred to such important issues, as development of methodological problems of film studies; analysis of problematic field of studying the methodology of Western cinema production in line with the ideological and political, economic dogmas of the Soviet period; significance of television in the socio-cultural context; problems of film screening on television.

Unfortunately, today no fundamental scientific research on the transformation of the theoretical conceptual positions of the outstanding film expert K.E. Razlogov has appeared yet, that emphasizes the scientific novelty and theoretical significance of our article.

2. Materials and methods

In our study the time limits, which were made within the retrospective analysis of the theoretical studies of cinema expert K.E. Razlogov, reflected in *Cinema Art* journal, are determined by the beginning of theoretical articles publication in *Cinema Art* journal (1973) and ending with the life and professional path of K.E. Razlogov (2021).

The research material is represented by the texts of theoretical film studies of K.E. Razlogov published in *Cinema Art* journal. Various methods were used for the analysis, including content analysis, comparative historical analysis, textual and hermeneutic methods of text understanding and interpreting, as well as theoretical methods of analysis, synthesis, induction and deduction.

The object of study is the semantic content of the texts of K.E. Razlogov’s film studies in *Cinema Art* journal, and the subject of study – evolution of theoretical film studies conceptual positions of K.E. Razlogov in *Cinema Art* journal (Razlogov, 1976; Razlogov, 1978; Razlogov, 1982; Razlogov, 1990; Razlogov, 1995; Razlogov, 1997; Razlogov, 1998; Razlogov, 2002; Razlogov, 2006 and others).

Thus, this scientific study aims to analyze the evolution of K.E. Razlogov’s theoretical views in *Cinema Art* journal and investigate the semantic development of his concepts in the context of historical, political and socio-cultural changes.

3. Discussion

Film study trends and conceptual views undergo transformations depending upon the historical period. For example, in the period of classical cinematography development the researches aimed at analyzing the film structure, studying the language of cinema and its impact on the viewer prevailed.

The investigation of transformation of the film study trends and conceptual views in correlation with the development of scientific knowledge makes it possible to understand how the scientific-research community adapts to the changing conditions and requirements of modern times.

The issues of history of cinema art and cinematography are reflected in the scientific film studies texts (Andrew, 1976; Andrew, 1984; Anosova, 1961; Aristarco, 1951; Bazin, 1971; Bergan, 2006; Braniganetal, 2015; Casetti, 1999; Dobrenko, 2008; Gibsonetal, 2000; Iezuitov, 1958; Kenez, 1992; Komarov, 2000; Lebedev, 1974; Levin, 1967; Livingston, 2009; McIver, 2016; Plantinga, 1993; Ryabchikova, 2014; Shlapentokh, Shlapentokh, 1993; Stam, 2000; Villarejo, 2007; Woll, 2000 and others)

Recently, the scientists have been actively researching and getting an understanding of the theoretical approaches and methods used in the film studies in order to shed light on their

semantic shades and role in the analysis and interpretation of the deep constructs of film productions. However, it is important to say that, in general, the studies are of contextual manner.

The analysis of theoretical aspects of the cinematic construct allows us to expand and enrich our understanding of the cinema art, its aesthetic and semiotic features. As a result, the scientists are developing theories of cinema art, offering new approaches and views on the cinematography.

It should also be noted that *Cinema Art* journal plays an important role in this process providing a place not only for publishing and sharing new study ideas and results, but analyzing the best practices as well.

The publications of A. Fedorov and A. Levitskaya present a profound analysis of the theoretical concepts of the film studies in *Cinema Art* journal of the period of 1930-s – 2000s (Fedorov, 2022; Fedorov, 2023; Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022; Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2023; Levitskaya, 2022; Levitskaya, 2023), disclosing the film studies positions of the film experts through the lens of the retrospective analysis.

In our previous articles, a content analysis of the theoretical articles by famous Russian film critics I.V. Weisfeld (Gorbatkova, 2022), R.N. Yurenev (Gorbatkova, 2023) was carried out.

In this article, we performed a retrospective analysis of the theoretical texts of film studies by one of the leading authors of *Cinema Art* journal K.E. Razlogov in the subject field of the evolution of positions in correlation with historical, political and socio-cultural representation.

4. Results

Analyzing K.E. Razlogov's works, it is important to note that throughout his film study path, one of the central subjects of his scientific search was the discussion of methodological problems of the film studies in different historical contexts.

Back in 1975, in the article "Material, problems, methodology", K.E. Razlogov raised some problems of the methodology of Western cinematography focusing on such theoretical issues as: the phenomenon of specific refraction of historical achievements through the lens of the investigation of foreign film studies (i.e. reliance on the principle of historicism in the course of film texts comprehension); the lack of studies focused on the creative work of individual masters; the research of various trends in the film art determined by the ideological processes, and the trends of its critical comprehension in the West; the problem of aesthetic understanding of communication systems between people and their synthesis in the cinematography integrating various audiovisual forms; the issues related to the nature and genres of the Soviet literature about cinematography.

In the opinion of K.E. Razlogov, there were very few publications devoted to the study of the creative works of the Western masters of cinema, their art studies and journalistic performances reflecting the main historical stages of the cinema development in the research understanding of foreign cinematography in the Soviet film studies of the 1960s – 1970s. In this context K.E. Razlogov stated that "to some extent, this task was set only by the collections dedicated to the works of Federico Fellini, Ingmar Bergman and Jean Renoir. We think that with the next controversy of the next materials, inaccuracy of some assessments, which turned out to be especially prominent in the collection dedicated to Fellini, subjected to fair and reasonable studies in Communist journal, these books nevertheless helped the film experts in striving to see the film art phenomena they were interested in related to the real context, to the entire film process. Therefore, it seems extremely important that such collections (always accompanied by Marxist critical interpretation of the material included in them) appear not only for the individual masters, but also for the trends important for the history of cinema, for individual periods and national schools (such first experience – "Cinema of Great Britain" collection – unfortunately, cannot be considered a success)" (Razlogov, 1975: 102).

Proceeding from the Soviet ideological requirements of the 1970-s, K.E. Razlogov wrote that the film studies "tasks faced by the authors of future studies are truly immense; the main one even today remains the systematic study of the development laws of the Western cinematography – reactionary and progressive, democratic, meantime our cinema study had no time to accumulate enough studies focused even on more specific tasks: on the study of both individual masters and private problems. Thus, if, for example, Ch. Chaplin's creativity was constantly given a lot of attention, and only a list of works published in the Russian language about him could make a small brochure, then in case of Erich Stroheim, Fritz Lang, John Ford, Luis Bunuel, say nothing about younger, but already famous artists, each researcher is forced to act as some kind of a discoverer. After all, rare film reviews, as well as individual essays or reviews of international festivals, can in

no way be considered a sufficient basis for the consistent critical study of the creative work of these directors and the entire film process” (Razlogov, 1975: 103).

Among the obvious drawbacks of the Soviet scientific publications on the issues of foreign cinema of the 1960s – 1970s, according to K.E. Razlogov’s opinion, were: the systematic focus on the same personalities; the lack of the cinematic landscape expansion. At the same time, the film expert emphasized the paradox that “the works of masters of modern social and political cinematography, which despite of the fact that they cannot be considered unambiguous in any way, and which nevertheless are particularly interesting and important for us (the works of Frenchman René Allio, Italians Taviani brothers, Brazilian Glauber Rocha, American Robert Kramer can serve as the examples), are much more often analyzed on the pages of the foreign (bourgeois!) press, rather than in our books and journals. Moreover, the cinematography of recent years is increasingly demanding the research not at the level of individual films (like in festival reports) or the experience of even the most outstanding directors, but at the level of trends in the film art and the trends of its critical comprehension that have emerged in the West, due to the general ideological processes that include the mass media in their sphere of influence” (Razlogov, 1975: 103).

Studying the process of cinematography development, K.E. Razlogov reasonably stated that it was the social-political situation that determined the certain changes in the film art nature and form. According to the author’s opinion, this “process proceeds in a contradictory interaction of the external factors (patterns of social development of a country, its role in the international arena and related ideological cataclysms) with the intra-cinematographic factors (the nature of film production and distribution, their function in the social life; finally, the aesthetic level of individual works and the development of cinematic expression means)” (Razlogov, 1975: 103).

In addition, K.E. Razlogov reasonably believed that the relationship between the world history as a whole and the history of cinema in the focus of defining the boundaries of the film studies was clearly reflected in the importance of studying the sociological and aesthetic segment of the cinematography, and these aspects could not be interchanged or, moreover, “mutually absorbed, as it happens in many our film studies. We’d like to remind, in this regard, that the value of any research (regardless of its genre and scope) is ultimately determined by the author’s ability to generalize and classify the disparate data, overcoming the still living tradition of empiricism” (Razlogov, 1975: 104).

K.E. Razlogov paid considerable attention to the development of the problem of cinematography expressive means, especially the study of the contradictory processes of the “cinema language” evolution in the West. At that, in the middle of the 1970s K.E. Razlogov wrote that “we should never forget that our ideological opponents, who widely discussed (of course, with the anti-communist positions) the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR “On measures for the further development of the Soviet cinematography”, and not by chance especially criticized that provision, which contained the studies of the attempts of individual directors to uncritically borrow the techniques of foreign cinema alien to the art of the socialist realism. As per the opinion of such “speakers”, in this part of the document allegedly appeared the misunderstanding of genuine innovation in art and the strive for restriction of the Soviet artists’ searches range. But formal solutions, the stylistic features of certain films are ideologically never neutral. That is why the study of how, why and in what context this method (or a set of methods) carries or is able to carry a particular content load is always associated with the demanding tasks of the ideological struggle. These problems can be solved only with the Marxist theory of the cinema” (Razlogov, 1975: 104).

Reviewing the theoretical problems of foreign cinema, K.E. Razlogov analyzed the issues related to the nature and genres of the Soviet literature on bourgeois cinema. Here he reminded to the readers that film studies included not only studies, aesthetics and film theory, which studied the general laws of the cinema art formation and development, but also “filmology, which combines all various approaches to the cinema from the standpoint of other sciences, the history of cinema. At the same time, it is history that is primarily intended to summarize all the data related to the cinematography and its development over time” (Razlogov, 1975: 112).

However, according to K.E. Razlogov’s opinion, it is precisely one of the reasons for the Soviet film studies lagging behind, studying the peculiarities of the development of Western cinema, that is the lack of research results in the field of the relationship between the philosophical thought and the cinematography. As per the author’s opinion, “only a creative community of scientists of different profiles can lead to significant results on the way of studying the relationship

between the philosophical thought and the film art”... Moreover, among the wide range of film study literature, there are no fundamental scientific studies in the focus of foreign cinema, to a greater extent there is only popular literature that has little in common with fundamentality. “Absence of solid scientific methodological base leads to precocious, often mutually exclusive assessments, shallow quick retellings, unlawful generalizations, and in some cases uncritical adherence to foreign samples of “sensational” literature. It is easy to see that often it is not a scientific, but a commercial approach. ... Such trend is dangerous not only for the reader (it is obvious), but also for our film studies” (Razlogov, 1975: 113).

The above-mentioned problematic issues of the theoretical fundamental field during the analysis of foreign cinema, according to K.E. Razlogov’s opinion, could only be solved by forming a conscious orientation among the Soviet film critics towards the development of “fundamental film studies, which will not only serve science as such, but will also solve one of the main tasks set by the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR “On literary and artistic studies” – it will contribute to raising the ideological and theoretical level of literary and artistic studies” (Razlogov, 1975: 119).

Obviously, relying on the attitudes and canons of the ideology prevailing at that time, in his theoretical works K.E. Razlogov tried to focus his attention on the importance of using the potential of the established ideological position in the development of film studies as a science, while clearly indicating that “only by mastering the entire arsenal of methods of Marxist science, the film studies will be able to solve those most difficult tasks, which are put before them by the ideological struggle in the modern world, in one of the acute areas of which there are figures of literature and art, and among them – film experts and film critics” (Razlogov, 1975: 119).

Investigating the film studies of K.E. Razlogov at the end of the Soviet period, one cannot ignore the position put forward by the film expert regarding the development of the cinematography of the totalitarian era presented in detail in *Cinema Art* journal in 1990 under the heading “Discussion” in the article “Cinema of the totalitarian era” (1990).

Here K.E. Razlogov identified four groups of film productions in the film repertoire of the totalitarian era:

- The first group – films that expressed the dominant ideological concept at the official level (for example, *The Great Citizen*, *The Triumph of the Will*);
- The second group – films that did not reflect the prevailing ideology so clearly, but were not devoid of the “imprint” of the totalitarian system;
- The third group – films that tried to avoid the real events of the totalitarian era in the storyline (the adventure and musical films are vivid examples here);
- The fourth group – films against the totalitarian regime (Razlogov, 1990: 115).

In the post-Soviet period, K.E. Razlogov was sure that in the 1990s the film studies existed mainly in the forms of the opinion-based journalism: “It (like the printer’s ink in general) has ceased to be perceived as a mouthpiece of ideology and has become an expression of private or (rarely) group position. Rarely, because the cinema ... seldom becomes the object of political disputes. ... Methodologically, the post-Soviet studies is both colorful and traditional. Having shed the “donkey skin” of Marxism-Leninism ..., the studies returned to descriptiveness, journalism (in the context of political pluralism), aestheticism... Critical exhibitionism has become a new word, which made some works more readable and funny, but even more removed them from any film process. ... The studies continues to be non-demanded, now by the authorities too. It has no effect on the public opinion, on the repertoire and attendance of the cinemas, or even on the priorities of the cinematographers’ community, whether it is the distribution of state funding or the Nika Award, etc. The film studies remains a thing in itself, existing mainly for self-satisfaction (of the film critic), so the well-being of each of us depends on how well one or the other managed to get settled” (Razlogov, 1995: 55).

It can be noted that the above trends, so keenly noted by K.E. Razlogov above, continued and continue to dominate the Russian film studies in the 21st century.

Analyzing the aspects of cinematography and television interaction, K.E. Razlogov argued that on Russian TV “as it was expected, the plenitude of outstanding Western films stopped soon. The films were purchased “by packages”, where two or three masterpieces accounted for tons of waste paper...” (Razlogov, 1997: 46). One of the key reasons for the “collapse” of foreign “junk” on the Russian television in the 1990-s, according to K.E. Razlogov’s opinion, was the appearance of the NTV channel with the content reflecting clear reliance on the political messages and high-

quality cinema of that time, and the arrival of a “new” team at ORT.

K.E. Razlogov very evidently revealed the existence of a tendency to return to the past Soviet cinema characterized by the fact that “the most popular are already well-known works of the past decades, first of all. Of course, the national ones (here Gaidai was and remains the absolute champion), and among the foreign ones – the former champions of our film distribution (Fantomases and Angelicas)”.

Moreover, the author drew readers’ attention to the fact that “although they talked about cinema on the Russian television, but it appeared in TV shows “almost exclusively as an element of advertising, scandalous chronicles or show business. It fit into the “extra-cultural” context. ... It was not by chance that the programs that set themselves the task of “cultivating” the demonstration of films were gradually replaced from the broadcast grid: “Cinema Museum”, “Century of Cinema”, “Cinema Marathon”... Thus, the kind of art, which works are completely repeated by the television and with minimum distortions, moreover, constitute a significant part of the repertoire, is purposefully deprived of the status of artistic value. ... The current crisis of film screening on the television is also a kind of payback for the cinema withdrawal beyond the culture framework” (Razlogov, 1997: 47).

Thus, according to K.E. Razlogov, it is very significant that “the multiplication of cinema programs on all channels went parallel to the disappearance of the latter in the classical cinema version from the cultural practice of the bulk of the population. The current crisis of film screening on the television is also a kind of payback for the cinema withdrawal beyond the culture framework” (Razlogov, 1997: 47). In this regard, the film screening remained in non-cultural context, since the programs of the educational and cultural segment, as a rule, did not include various kinds of reflections on the film process. A significant part of the film productions that was repeated by the television was purposefully deprived of artistic value orientation.

Considering the audiovisual process in the historical context of its whole existence period, K.E. Razlogov believed that the Russian film screening on TV in the 1990s went from “a stream of masterpieces to a stream of junk”, and this was determined by several reasons:

- cinema for television (except for some high-quality works of the 1970s) has ceased to be at an advantageous position;
- absence of “new” foreign films on the screens;
- lack of technology to identify the outstanding films in the stream of television programs in the Soviet film studies.

Several years later K.E. Razlogov continued his reflections in the context of the problems of film screening and the spectrum of film production analyzing the beginning of a new stage in the history of the Soviet film screening associated with the “domination” of TV series and individual TV films on the television screens. According to the film expert’s opinion, the national cinematography was experiencing difficulties at that time due to the dominance of the American film production on the television screens. However, television series and films became more and more popular, and despite the fact that the national industry at the turn of the 21st century did not reach a high level of profitability, there was a kind of revival of the cinematographer’s profession, and there was a tendency to “protect national culture” (Razlogov, 2001: 95).

Thus, the key topic of the theoretical scientific research of the film expert and culturologist K.E. Razlogov throughout his professional career were the methodological problems of film studies, such as the analysis of the theoretical heritage of the Soviet cinema, directing, film drama, genres, specifics of the cinema and television. In his publications he repeatedly pointed out the need for substantial study of the cinematography, the determination of the cinema development by the political, economic, socio-cultural factors characteristic of a particular historical segment.

At the same time, K.E. Razlogov made an attempt to look at the film process in a generational context. So, he evidently noted that the representatives of several generations carried out activities in the Soviet cinema:

- the first generation, characteristic of the period of the 1920s and 1930s (S. Eisenstein, D. Vertov, L. Kuleshov, A. Dovzhenko and others). At that, among the great masters (in 1940s – 1950s) only those preserved their influence further, who successfully “switched” in 1930s: G. Kozintsev and S. Gerasimov among those, who finished from the Factory of the Eccentric Actor, G. Aleksandrov and I. Pyryev, S. Yutkevich and M. Romm... These people together with the officials and party workers decided what is good and what is bad on the screen, helped (or did not help) the young people to start their carrier. ... They (then they were gradually replaced by

G. Chukhray, S. Bondarchuk, Yu. Ozerov, L. Kulidzhanov and others, who made their directorial debut in the 1950s) established the “game rules” in the cinematography until the middle of the 1980s (Razlogov, 2002: 83);

- the second generation, “the fifties — the sixties (A. German, A. Konchalovsky, K. Muratova, N. Mikhalkov, S. Solovyev)” (Razlogov, 2002: 84).

- the third generation, associated with the appearance of a new type of the cinematography, which K.E. Razlogov called “a new Russian cinema” (the beginning of the 21st century), their representatives included, “first of all, the descendants of famous cinematographers, secondly, people who started their professional career as clip makers... masters brought up not only by the cinematic screenings, but also ... by television (F. Bondarchuk, F. Yankovsky, E. Konchalovsky and others) (Razlogov, 2002: 85).

5. Conclusion

The analysis of K.E. Razlogov’s main theoretical articles demonstrates that they are written at a high professional level, abound with cinematic terms and are not devoid of expressive artistic imagery. The theoretical concepts presented by him are confirmed by clear logic of presentation and consistent argumentation based on primary sources. At the same time, the author’s position, assessment and attitude to the subject of study are clearly traced in the general content and the generalizing conclusions to each article. Structurally the articles are usually written with scientific style, have clear structure and rather large volume.

The results of the content-analytical discourse of the film studies positions in K.E. Razlogov’s theoretical articles on the pages of *Cinema Art* journal allow us to make a number of conclusions:

- K.E. Razlogov’s theoretical film studies positions were mostly reduced to the plot-structural analysis of the film production, its genre originality, the specific features of expressive means in the historical context;

- the content of some articles of the film expert reflected the problems of studying the most important phenomena of the foreign cinematography history and theory by the Soviet film studies; emphasized the importance of developing a methodology based on the principle of historicism, which allows using the data of modern history, sociology, aesthetics to study the controversial issues that determine the evolution of the Western cinematography, the value of the ideological and moral content of the Soviet cinema, as well as the unity of ideological and semiotic approaches, increasing the ideological and theoretical level of the literary and artistic studies;

- the texts of the theoretical articles of the film expert, written in the Soviet period, contained the traces of ideology of the ruling Communist party; the author repeatedly referred to the ideological dogmas, resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR in his publications, paying attention to the semantic content analysis of the official documents and degree of cinematography development in accordance with the established positions;

- in the period of the 21st century the author’s works substantially referred to the studies of the historical evolution and the problem of film presentation on Russian TV screens;

- in general, the film studies publications of K.E. Razlogov were dedicated to studying the correlations and influence of political and socio-cultural transformation processes on the development of cinematography in the context of various periods of history.

6. Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (RSF, project No. 22-28-00317) at Rostov State University of Economics. Project theme: “Evolution of theoretical film studies concepts in the *Cinema Art* journal (1931-2021)”. Head of the project is Professor A.V. Fedorov.

References

Alakshin, 2014 – Alakshin, A. (2014). Osobennosti redakcionnoj politiki v zhurnalah o kino: sravnitel'nyj analiz (na primere zhurnalov “Seans” i “Iskusstvo kino”) [Features of editorial policy in magazines about cinema: comparative analysis (on the example of the magazines *Séance* and *Cinema Art*]. *Znak*. 2(14): 33-35. [in Russian]

Andrew, 1976 – Andrew, J.D. (1976). *The Major Film Theories: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press. 288 p.

Andrew, 1984 – Andrew, J.D. (1984). *Concepts in Film Theory*. New York: Oxford University

Press. 254 p.

Anosova, 1961 – Anosova, N. (1961). Nekotoryye problemy sovremennogo kino i zhurnal "Sinema" [Some problems of modern cinema and the *Cinema* magazine]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 10: 116-125. [in Russian]

Aristarco, 1951 – Aristarco, G. (1951). Storia delle teorie del film. Torino. Einaudi. 165 p.

Bazin, 1971 – Bazin, A. (1971). What is Cinema? Berkeley, University of California Press. 183 p.

Bergan, 2006 – Bergan, R. (2006). Film. New York, DK Pub. 512 p.

Branigan, Buckland, 2015 – Branigan, E., Buckland, W. (eds.). (2015). The Routledge Encyclopedia of Film Theory. Routledge. 654 p.

Casetti, 1999 – Casetti, F. (1999). Theories of Cinema, 1945–1990. Austin, University of Texas Press. 368 p.

Demin, 1966 – Demin, V. (1966). Fil'm bez intrigi [Film without intrigue]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Dobrenko, 2008 – Dobrenko, E. (2008). Muzej revolyucii. Sovetskoe kino I stalinskij istoricheskij narrativ [Museum of the Revolution. Soviet cinema and Stalin's historical narrative]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Fedorov, 2022 – Fedorov, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in the *Cinema Art Journal* During the Perestroika Era: 1986–1991. *Media Education*. 2022. 18(4): 574-599. <https://doi.org/10.13187/me.2022.4.574>

Fedorov, 2023 – Fedorov, A. (2023). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in *Cinema Art Journal*: 1969–1985. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2023. 8(1): 14-60. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2023.1.14

Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022a – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in the *Cinema Art Journal* in the First Decade (1931–1941) of Its Existence. *Media Education*. 2022. 18(2): 169-220. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13187/me.2022.2.169>

Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022b – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in *Cinema Art Journal*: 1945–1955. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2022. 7(1): 71-109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13187/ijmil.2022.1.71>

Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2022c – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in *Cinema Art Journal* in the First Post-Soviet Years: 1992–2000. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 2022. 7(2): 355-397. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13187/ijmil.2022.2.355>

Gibson, Dyer, Kaplan, Willemsen, 2000 – Gibson, P.C., Dyer, R., Kaplan, E.A., Willemsen P. (eds.). (2000). Film Studies: Critical Approaches. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 148 p.

Gorbatkova, 2022 – Gorbatkova, O. (2022). Teoreticheskie stat'i kinoveda R.N. Ureneva (1909-2003) v zhurnale "Iskusstvo kino" [Theoretical articles of film expert R.N. Yurenev (1912-2022) in the *Cinema Art* journal]. *Crede Experto*. 4. [in Russian]

Gorbatkova, 2023 – Gorbatkova, O. (2023). Teoreticheskie stat'i kinoveda I.V. Vajsfel'da (1909-2003) v zhurnale "Iskusstvo kino" [Theoretical articles of film expert I.V. Weisfeld (1909-2003) in the *Cinema Art* journal]. *Crede Experto*. 2. [in Russian]

Jesuitov, 1958 – Jesuitov, N. (1958). Kinoiskusstvo dorevolucionnoj Rossii [Cinema art of pre-revolutionary Russia]. *Voprosy kinoiskusstva*. 2: 252-307. [in Russian]

Kenez, 1992 – Kenez, P. (1992). Cinema and Soviet Society, 1917-1953. Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press. 291 p.

Komarov, 2000 – Komarov, S. (2000). Zhizn dlinnoyu v vek [Life is long in a century]. Moscow. [in Russian]

Lebedev, 1974 – Lebedev, N. (1974). Vnimanije: kinematograf! [Attention: cinematography!]. Moscow [in Russian]

Levin, 1967 – Levin, E. (1967). V zashchitu syuzheta [In defense of the plot]. *Iskusstvo kino*: 33-42. [in Russian]

Levitskaya, 2022 – Levitskaya, A. (2022). Theoretical Concepts of Film Studies in *Cinema Art Journal*: 1956–1968. *Media Education*. 2022. 18(3): 390-438. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13187/me.2022.3.390>

Levitskaya, 2023 – Levitskaya, A. (2023). Film Studies Discussions in *Cinema Art Journal*: 1969–1985. *European Researcher. Series A*. 2023. 14(1): 31-46. DOI: 10.13187/er.2023.1.31

Livingston, 2009 – Livingston, P. (2009). Cinema, Philosophy, Bergman: on film as philosophy. OUP Oxford. 215 p.

- [McIver, 2016](#) – *McIver, G.* (2016). Art History for Filmmakers. Bloomsbury Publishing. 256 p.
- [Plantinga, 1993](#) – *Plantinga, C.* (1993). Film theory and aesthetics: notes on a schism. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Studies*. 51(3): 445-454. DOI: 10.2307/431516
- [Razlogov, 1973](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1973). Mekhanizm uspekha [The Mechanism of success]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 11: 141-149. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1975](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1975). Material, problematika, metodologiya. Nekotorye voprosy izucheniya burzhuaznogo kino [Material, problematics, methodology. Some questions of studying bourgeois cinema]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 7: 100-119. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1976](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1976). Metodologicheskie problemy sovetskogo kinovedeniya [Methodological problems of Soviet film studies]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 12: 90-93. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1978](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1978). Ot “kontrkul'tury” k “neokonservatizmu”? [From "counterculture" to "neoconservatism"?]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 8: 137-154. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1982](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1982). Uroki “primitivov” [Lessons of "primitives"]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 1: 100-114. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1990](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1990). Kino totalitarnoj epohi [Cinema of the totalitarian era]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 1: 115. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1995](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1995). Anketa “IK” [Questionnaire of Cinema Art]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 6: 55. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1995](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1995). Kinoklassika ili kinomodern? [Film classics or film modernity?]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 11: 10-15. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1997](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1997). Kino – “ne kul'tura” [Cinema is not culture]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 6: 45-47. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1997](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1997). Prishestvie televideniya [The Advent of television]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 2: 56-58. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 1998](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (1998). Stereotipy i paradoksy kinopokaza [Stereotypes and paradoxes of film screening]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 8: 88-95. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 2001](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (2001). Vpered v proshloe [Forward in to the past]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 3: 95-98. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 2002](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (2002). Novo(e) russkoe kino [New Russian cinema]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 11: 83-92. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 2006](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (2006). Geopolitika kul'tury [Geopolitics of culture]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 8: 58-60. [in Russian]
- [Razlogov, 2006](#) – *Razlogov, K.* (2006). Vyvozu ne podlezhit [Is not subject to export]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 7: 64-70. [in Russian]
- [Ryabchikova, 2014](#) – *Ryabchikova, N.* (2014) Pervye gody sovetskogo kino I problem istoriografii [The first years of Soviet cinema and problems of historiography]. *Humanities, socio-economic and social sciences*. 9: 173-175. [in Russian]
- [Shlapentokh, Shlapentokh, 1993](#) – *Shlapentokh, D., Shlapentokh, V.* (1993). Soviet Cinematography 1918-1991: Ideological Conflict and Social Reality. N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter. 293 p.
- [Stam, 2000](#) – *Stam, R.* (2000). Film Theory: An Introduction. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 381
- [Villarejo, 2007](#) – *Villarejo, A.* (2007). Film Studies: The Basics. London: Routledge. 182 p.
- [Woll, 2000](#) – *Woll, J.* (2000). Real Images. Soviet Cinema and the Thaw. London. New York: I.B. Tauris. 267 p.