

Interview with Dmitri Salynsky

Moscow 09.06.2013

Translated from English by Alexandra Ovtchinnikova

Notes:

Text that was originally in English.

(Text that was added by translator)

- 00.29 **Ok, I am ready.**
- 00.52-01.15 (About yourself) Translation right away... My name is Dmitrii Salynsky. Right now I live in Moscow and deal with cinema, but I was born in Ural, in the city of Sverlovsk, where I spent the first years of my life. My parents had moved there after the war, and it was only later that they relocated with the whole family to Moscow.
- 01.15-01.34 My father was a famous playwright during the Soviet times, author of plays which had a great success. My mother was also a writer. Right now they are not with us...regrettably.
- 01.34-02.09 I...I began my career not in cinema. I got involved in art first, as an artist. I painted paintings, exhibited my work...In order to understand better the nature of art I became an art historian. I became an art historian, completed university, and only after that got interested in cinema, rather late, when I was already mature...And became a film director...Made several films.
- 03.05-03.45 (How did you get interested in Tarkovsky?) First I saw...I saw his film...First film *Ivan's Childhood*, but because I was young and stupid I was not impressed by it. It was the beginning of the 60s; I was around 13 or 14 years old. I liked it because at the time I was studying art and understood complex art, avant-garde, I enjoyed unconventional artistic decisions a lot, but I did not understand the value of the whole thing completely.
- 03.45-04.13 Afterwards I saw *Andrei Rublev*...And I saw it in the first version, first, which was closed, shelved...and rediscovered and revealed to people only now. Translate, I will later...
- 04.57-05.55 (In the 60s there was a big exhibition of Andrei Rublev, have you seen it?) I can answer? ...Yes I am aware of it...I...it was not an exhibition, but an opening of the Andrei Rublev museum in Andronikov Monastery in Moscow. Certainly I have visited it, more than once. Once me and my friends found a huge icon and donated it to this museum. It was so huge that we had to take it there by taxi. And we simply donated it. A very interesting and complex icon. So, I know the museum very well. A lot of my course mates from the university are working there, art historians...I am from that nest...All of this is very close to me. But I remember the other exhibitions from the 60s. I remember all the exhibitions, perfectly, but I want...Tell, and I will continue...I will continue with this answer.
- 06.19-06.38 (About an icon that was donated) We found it at one of my friend's cottages, and so, we donated it with this friend. (Was it by Andrei Rublev?) No, no, no Andrei Rublev costs millions...No. It was an ordinary icon, but very beautiful and huge...Like this...
- 06.46- 07.23 After that...After that, during my university studies, I participated in the exhibition that drew church plans...archaeological plans of churches for the catalog of the architectural monuments on the territory of the USSR. Several of such groups worked in each region. So, we drove around the countryside drawing the archaeological plans of the churches, describing them...I dedicated the whole summer to this task so I am very well aware of the actual state of the churches and icons in the 60s.
- 07.36-07.40 Plans? Plans are ...Measuring with the tape measure, plan, drawn plans, archaeological plans, plans.

- 07.48 Archeological plans.
- 07.56-08.36 Anyway, I wanted to tell how I managed to watch *Andrei Rublev*, the film *Andrei Rublev*. It is a very peculiar story. As a matter of fact, one of my father's close friends was the chief editor at GOSKINO- Evgenii Surkov. They were very close friends. Evgenii Surkov was the father of Olga Surkova who...Who has worked with Tarkovsky for many years and a while back sold her archive at the Sotheby's. You probably know about that. I have known her since childhood, we were friends, our families were friends. My father was a friend of her father, hence I, and my brother, were friends with her.
- 08.52 Surkov, Evgenii Surkov.
- 08.56-09.26 Olga Surkova. She recently sell his...her...archive...on the Sotheby's. She is my friend, of my childhood... because.... my family were in friendship with her family. My father was a friend of her father. Evgenii Surkov was the chief editor of GOSKINO and he was a friend of my father.
- 09.26 -10.12 When I got accepted to the department of art history at the faculty of history, Evgenii Surkov gave me a present...And (to) my family. He invited us, my father, mother, brother and me, to GOSKINO...it was during the summer of 66...Nobody had seen the film yet. I saw the film which Evgenii Surkov personally screened for us in the empty theatre of GOSKINO. This was before the premiere...Nobody has seen it, but I have. Since then I understood the kind of director Tarkovsky was. And the kind of treasure he was.
- 10.29 No, no, no...no Gosfilm Fond...GOSKINO.
- 10.35 No, no, no...there is a difference.
- 10.52-11.34 Before, before, before...nobody has seen this film, only the chief editor, and the GOSKINO, and my family. It is a private present for me when I...became to be a student of history of art faculty in Moscow University...so...yes...Amazing...yes...And, and I like, I like, I love the creation, creations of Tarkovsky from that time...yes...yes...
- 11.56 Yes...yes... There is more... Details...I understood but there is more...Tarkovsky's dreams?
- 12.44 -13.44 (About the dreams in Tarkovsky's films. Why was he interested in dreams?)There is a theory that cinema is an analogy of dream. Many people like to repeat this, and base their arguments on this theory. Film directors in particularly. Since I am an art historian I realize that this is not the case. I realize that cinema is no more than a tool/technique. And within this technique everything is possible. Similarly, you can either write poetry or protocol in Russian or in English. Therefore it is wrong to assume that language dictates whether it is used for poetry or protocol. Language allows everything. Therefore one can't say that cinema is a direct analogy of dream.
- 13.44-14.33 Cinema is not the reason behind the dream, the dream occurs due to the personal stylistic choices of the director. Meaning that it is not connected to cinema, but to a film, to the film. But dreams have always existed in art. Since Ancient times, especially during Baroque...Calderon *Life is a Dream*...His famous play. During the period of Romanticism, especially German, Russian, British, and during Symbolism...During the time of Fin de

- siècle, during the time of decadence at the end of 19th beginning of 20th century.
- 14.33-15.20 As a film director Andrei Tarkovsky was rooted in the tradition of Symbolism of the beginning of the 20s century. His father belonged to this tradition. His father was a very prominent poet and heir to the Russian Symbolism. Through his father this tradition, that begun during Romanticism and Symbolism, was transferred to Tarkovsky. Therefore, such conversations (based on Symbolism) were completely natural to him. These general words are not that important. Importance possesses the concreteness with which Tarkovsky astonishes us. Because general words cannot astonish, only the concreteness can.
- 15.20 -15.37 Therefore in Tarkovsky's work there are a couple of moments which, in my opinion are dreams, but which are understood as dreams by a few, me included. Translate now, because later it is going to be harder.
- 16.35-17.44 Now I want to speak about concreteness. I believe that one of the most important things, which is rarely reflected...One of the most important things that I talk about in my book *Cinehermeneutics of Tarkovsky*...This very important thing is related to *The Sacrifice*. As you already know *The Sacrifice* depicts the beginning of a war. People hear a message on the TV that the war has begun and the protagonist Alexander is given an advice by the postman Otto to stop the war by meeting and sleeping with the maid Maria. Alexander follows the advice - he goes to Maria, sleeps with her, returns home, and when he wakes up he greets a peaceful morning without war.
- 17.44 It is a common belief that...repairing, repairing works...something...ok..You, you understand something, yes? A little, little bit?...Repeat, repeat yes?
- 18.23-20.20 A very important thing related to dream in Tarkovsky's work....Actually, there are two things...I will first tell about one, and then about the other...The first one is in *The Sacrifice*, the second is in *Mirror*. So, the very important thing that has to do with dreams in *The Sacrifice* is the following. Everyone knows that the film depicts the beginning of a war and what happened afterwards. After people ...excuse me...After the start of the Nuclear war the protagonist Alexander, receives an advice from the postman Otto, to go to the maid Maria, sleep with her, and stop the war by doing so. Alexander does this - he rides by bicycle to Maria's, meets her at her house, and sleeps with her. Afterwards when he returns home and falls asleep, everything is calm. In the morning there is no war. He phones to his friend in town, because they live on an island...and asks him, how things are. His friend replies that everything is good, everything is quiet and tranquil. He (Alexander) realizes that the plan worked. And hence it worked he has to keep his promise to God and burn down his house, as he promised...When he was praying to God he promised that if he cancels the war he would sacrifice his most important possession. And hence he got what he asked for, he realizes that he has to keep his promise. Therefore, he burns down his house.
- 20.22-21.38 Everyone knows about this. I am telling this now for reminding. I think that actually everything is not quite like this. As a matter of fact, Tarkovsky after the completion of the film told several times that the film can be understood at least in three ways. Either God heard Alexander's prayer, either occult-mystic forces did as he asked, aka sorcery, or Alexander is simply insane and imagined everything. In fact, apart from these three interpretations there is a fourth one which Tarkovsky did not mention. Actually, during one of the lectures on film directing that he taught, he told to his students - never reveal

- you intentions to anybody. This was his principle. Therefore, he never told why he shoots something one way and not another, and what lies at the foundation of his films. And I can understand why.
- 21.58-22.10 It is not a dream, everything takes place in so called reality. You made a very important slip of the tongue, very important slip of the tongue. You should tell correctly, like in the film, as if it is all reality.
- 22.12-22.38 You see the...in the film...everything, this made like it is in reality. In reality he, Alexander, goes to this Maria, and the act between them, and he returns...continue telling...about three interpretation.
- 23.05-23.14 Yes he told, yes, yes, yes...That he prayed to God and God did it, then the forces of the occult, or he is insane.
- 23.39 Never, never, open this...your...you should never open.
- 23.46-24.03 So... In order to understand the true fourth interpretation, one has to look very closely at the shots, because the answer is within the shot transitions.
- 24.04-24.09 Well, first I will tell you and then I will repeat everything in silence.
- 24.16-24.27 First time for you and then for this...yes...ok, ok...yes, yes...shooting...now...so...
- 24.37-26.08 A very important shot that reveals the whole meaning is the following: when Alexander has returned home, he sees a dream...No...Stop, not when he returns home...After he sleeps with Maria he falls asleep...And his dream begins...His dream. He sees how the town is being bombed, how...It is a very complex large dream...How the petrified mob is running in town and so on. After that he appears at his house in his dream. He sees how his daughter is running down the corridors and rooms of his house naked, nude...She is running after some hens and roosters...During the filming this episode was called the dream with roosters...His naked daughter is running. And we realize that this is a dream because in real life this girl cannot be running naked around her house and...Firstly. And secondly because there cannot be roosters in the house. It is a secluded house, a cottage of intellectual family, it cannot have hens. Hence, if a naked girl is running after hens and roosters inside the house it most definitely is a dream, a hundred percent.
- 26.09-27.06 He sees all of these...Afterwards the camera...Afterwards his wife enters the shot, Adelaide, wearing a period dress, very beautiful one, and then...This is very important...Then the camera pans after Adelaide and we see how Adelaide approaches a curtain and looks behind it. The shot continues...the shot continues...And Adelaide sees behind a curtain a big room in which Alexander sleeps. He sleeps and we see it with Adelaide's eyes. After that he wakes up...This is still the same shot, no editing, no cuts...He wakes up and goes to his table, his working table, and takes the phone...He makes a call to town. But we see all of this with Adelaide's eyes.
- 27.08-28.09 The film was made 25 years ago and it did not cross anybody's mind that if we see something in the shot from the point of view of a character from a dream, we are watching a dream. It is elementary. Everything that is seen by a dream character is a dream. If we assume that he (Tarkovsky) shot how his (Alexander's) daughter is running

naked after the roosters and he would show as the roosters in the frame, it will become clear that he sees it all inside a dream...And his daughter sees these roosters, too (Note, this sentence did not make much sense in Russian too). In a similar manner, when his wife approaches the curtain and pulls it...Pulls the curtain and sees him lying in the bed ...And how he gets up...She, she is inside his dream, she is inside his dream. Therefore, he wakes up inside of his own dream.

28.10-29.01 He makes a call to his friend in town and asks – how are you, everything is fine? And they answer - Yes, everything is fine. Inside of his dream. And the action continues. He gets up, makes a phone call, goes somewhere...Then performs some tasks...And then sets fire to his house...All of this inside of his dream. What does all this tell us? It indicates that in reality all these things did not happen. The war continues from where it started. It is a frightening film. *The Sacrifice* is a frightening film that tells how the war started and nobody, no one could stop it. And this intellectual who made an attempt to stop it, could do so only in a dream. This is the film's primary key. Nobody could stop the war.

29.05-30.09 Additionally, one has to ponder when does the postman Otto arrive and give advice about visiting the witch? He comes to him also in his dream. This is because in the middle of the film when Alexander is praying to God he falls asleep. Right when he falls asleep he hears a knock at the window, there is this big window, and discovers that Otto has climbed up the ladder to his window. Alexander opens the window, Otto enters, and tells him to go and see the witch...And he answers 'yes, fine', and goes on to see her. Therefore the advice to see the witch he received in his dream. He dreamt it. And everything that follows is a dream. His visit to the witch, to Maria, is a dream. His return is a dream. Within this dream there is a second dream, more accentuated, the dream with the roosters.

30.09-31.26 Dreams are multi-layered. There are many layers. There is **lucided** dream, what is also known as the lucid (Note, literary 'enlightened' but in this context 'lucid') dream which...which takes place when we comprehend what we are dreaming inside the dream. It is a dream with many layers, but a dream, nevertheless. There is a threshold of him entering the dream – when he prays and falls asleep. The action follows afterwards. Postman Otto comes, he goes to see the witch and the rest. But there is no threshold of him leaving the dream. Because when he wakes up, we see it with Adelaide's eyes, how he wakes up...He wakes up, then goes and a continuous action follows. A continuous action, there are no borders. His action goes on continuously. He goes, goes, sees his family having a breakfast, then they leave, he watches them, then sets his house on fire, and then the film ends, the house burns down. All these things occur in a dream. All these things did not happen.

31.26-32.03 Therefore, this film does not tell a story about a man who stopped the Nuclear war with his prayer or by turning to magical powers, mystical, or by simply being insane. He did not stop it. This film is about a man who desires to stop the war, desires strongly, terrifying excruciation of the soul...This film is about the soul of a man, that really wants to do something, really wants to save people, and therefore, he experiences all this.

32.05- 33.06 Victor his friend, doctor Victor, tells...To Adelaide in one of the episodes, he tells her that he (Alexander) has enough tenderness for everyone, he really loves these people, and therefore he wants to save them. He does everything he can to achieve this, but all his actions take place here (inside his head) making it a very terrifying film. Because people do not understand the laws of editing all the terror related to this film has not yet been

understood. If, I will repeat myself, something takes place inside one shot, it takes place inside one reality. If the reality is here, and the dream is there, there needs to be a cut. If inside of one shot we see a character of a dream that sees another character then everything is **inside of the dream...inside of the dream...inside of a dream...** this, for me this is the key to *The Sacrifice*. I think it is very important.

- 33.21 **Yes...Cutting, cutting, cutting frames meeting, yes frames meeting.**
- 34.16 **No boards...no boarders between frames.**
- 34.47-35.19 These are not different dreams, it is one dream. I just went back to the beginning. It begun, no, it begun simply...It is a big dream...No, no, no, no...No, I will explain once more...That the big dream I was talking about, I have returned to its beginning. I told when it begun. It begun when he prayed to God and fell asleep, and already inside of the dream he is visited by the postman Otto and the continuous dream that never ended goes on. And already within this dream there is couple of inserted dreams.
- 36.39 Katja please give me a hand, I understand but not everything, I understand but not everything...Help me a little bit.
- 37.08-38.06 (Is setting fire to the house/ burning house a metaphor for the fact that the war has not ended?) **Maybe yes, maybe no... Maybe yes, maybe no...** Meaning maybe yes, and maybe no because...I respect your interpretation, as a matter of principle I respect any interpretation, but they are all interpretations. They are all interpretations of meanings. I love interpretations, my own and by others, but most of all I love facts and only after them interpretations. Establishing facts is very important to me, in a similar manner like I said, that everything is in a dream, and afterwards people can interpret it as they like. Like this, or like that but basing the interpretation on the facts. Hence for me it is very important that prior to my discovery interpretations were based on the wrong facts. I gave new facts that can acts as basis for new interpretations.
- 38.38-38.50 (Tarkovsky and Myth) Tell me...I can read English very well, but aurally not very well, that is why help me a little bit. **I can read in English very easily, but...it is difficult for understanding...**
- 39.22-41.08 The book is not about the myth, there is only one chapter about the myth, one chapter...The book is about hermeneutics. Hermeneutics is an ancient theory of text interpretation. Semiotics was based on it, contemporary semiotics. Practically they are one and the same, semiotics and hermeneutics, just different terms. In semiotics there are three branches (Note, he says layers but branches fits better in the context) that open up when an artifact or a text is analyzed: pragmatics, syntactics and semantics. Similarly in hermeneutics. Literal layer, which corresponds to pragmatics. Tropological layer, which corresponds to syntactic, meaning the correlation of elements within the text. And symbolic or anagogic layer which corresponds to the semantics in semiotics, and refers to the meaning of elements. Semiotics was born during the ancient times, and then developed further during the early Middle Ages. The foundations of the Christian semiotics were established by Origen, and later by Augustine of Hippo, and... I use as my

basis the concepts of Origen to a greater degree and Augustine's to a lesser degree.

- 41.09-41.42 One critic who read my book and wrote a review on it said the following: Because hermeneutics is a theory from the Middle Ages, the book uses archaic methods. I think he understood absolutely nothing. Because, firstly, hermeneutics is not an archaic theory because in essence it is semiotics, and secondly, application of ancient methods to contemporary art gives more fascinating results. It renews theory.
- 41.43-43.41 Hermeneutics differs from semiotics in how unlike in semiotics, where all branches are treated separately, separately pragmatics, separately syntactics, separately semantics, layers are given in hermeneutics as a successive transition from one layer to another. When we don't understand something on literal level we switch to the mechanics behind the relationship between elements, to syntactics and tropology. When we don't understand the relationship between elements we turn to symbolic meaning, as well as, to anagogic or sublime meaning, as Augustine puts it...Yes...And there we understand something. Philosophers of Middle Ages used the term absurd/absurdity, especially Tertullian as well as others, to show that the absurd is the signal or a marker for the transition from one layer to the next. When we don't understand something in pragmatics, or as hermeneutics said literal or historical level, the level of actual events, we don't understand, absurd happens and acts as a signal for switching to the next level of understanding, syntactics. When we cannot find the answer there, we progress to the next level...We reach an absurd and progress to the semantics or as hermeneutics puts it- to the layer of anagogic meaning. It is a deep, ingenious theory. I have...It was created by geniuses, and I have simply tried to slightly apply it to the contemporary art, and I discover very interesting results. It is not archaic at all. And...
- 43.44 -44.27 Translate... Can you? Do you remember? I will give you a hand. **Hermeneutics... The first is pragmatic, syntactical, semiotical. Three levels. Yes, your business...yes and mine the same.**
- 44.34-44.41 **Not this, not this...I speak in my book, I write about that hermeneutic of middle ages is the semiotic, semiotic of middle ages, because they are the same three levels but the real level, historical is like, like pragmatic in semiotics, then the tropological level, it is like syntactical in semiotics, and the higher, anagogistic, symbolical, level it is like semiosis, semiotical level in semiotical...so...some scientists say that Augustine is the father of semiotic because he...Augustine worked with hermeneutics but he is considered to be the father of semiotics, different terms used for the same thing. Tell.**
- 45.44 -46.00 Ok...please, please, please, hermeneutics...yes, yes, yes...for her not for me...no, no...I made a mistake, I apologize. Everything is correct.
- 46.22-47.50 Yes, yes, and additionally...In the book the layers are given slightly differently, not like in semiotics or in old hermeneutics of Augustine and Origen. I examine the layer of fabula and interpret it as the historical layer of hermeneutics and pragmatics in semiotics. That is to say things that actually took place. Afterwards I show how Tarkovsky rejects fabula and moves to the next levels. Additionally, I interpret these layers as separate worlds due to the fact that cinema presents complete worlds. In text, literary text, we see only

letters, but in cinema we see worlds. We see air, we see water, we see trees, we see the atmosphere between people, but we don't see letters. Therefore, cinema is not exactly a text, it is a complete world. Therefore all the layers, literal, syntactic, semantic, are not layers of the text but worlds. That is why every world, every film possesses inside itself several worlds. It is like matryoshka doll, one world has another world that has a third world inside. Every layer of cine-text is a separate world.

- 48.04-49.56 And I...I explore the film... In Tarkovsky's films I explore the real world, the world of fabula, then the inner world of characters which I call the imaginative world, **imaginations**, their dreams, their imagination. Afterwards I demonstrate the world of culture which is embodied in his films through plenty of cultural attributes which are present in every film. Consequently, I show the world of pure symbolism, this is exactly the layer of the myth, where pure myth acts through forces of nature: water, fire and so on. This is only the fourth part, the fourth chronotope. All these worlds form chronotopes, that is time and space simultaneously...Chronotopes...And so, every film in my interpretation is the combination of these four chronotopes, and all of the chronotopes engulf all of Tarkovsky's films. Meaning that the chronotope of fabula carries within itself all the stories he has told. Inside the imaginative chronotope is the inner context of his characters. The chronotope of culture, I also call it dialogue of culture consists of exactly the same problems as those within the characters themselves, only presented from the point of view of culture. Because culture evaluates...Every chronotope evaluates everything that character does, from the reality's point of view, from the point of view of the inner world, from the point of view of culture and thought the point of view of the myth.
- 49.56- 50.38 And myth gives the conclusive evaluation. In this particular context this is hermeneutics not semiotics, because in hermeneutics this ladder that took you from one layer to the next leads to the sublime meaning, which gives the conclusive evaluation. Similarly, in my work the last mythological level gave a final evaluation of what took place in the film. Evaluation not from the director's point of view, not from the protagonist's point of view and not from the audience's point of view, but from the eternity's point of view. From the God's point of view. Therefore it is a final evaluation. It is a verdict.
- 50.38-52.03 Such four-part structure gives a full interpretation of the film within its inner dynamics. It is a very complicated book, which is hard to understand, hard to understand, and...I am convinced...I don't get offended, I don't mourn, because I am convinced that those who want to understand will understand, and those who don't want to understand, won't, and it is fine, they don't have to understand, because if they don't understand it is for the better. My goal is not to make everyone understand it. It is l'art pour l'art ...Art...Science for the sake of science, art for the sake of art. This is done for the sake of...For supreme values, not for the sake of...I am not interested in any sort of compliments from anybody and so on. Though, I did get a lot of awards for it from my colleagues...I got three elephants for the Tarkovsky book. Elephants are awards, awarded by the guild of film critics. I have three of them. Few people possess three of these awards. I value this a lot, I am grateful to my colleagues, they understand this (the book). But I don't want everyone to understand. I am not concerned about that. Those who want to understand will, and those who don't...It is their problem.

- 53.38-54.22 (How did Tarkovsky use....was there anything in the myths and dreams of his films, taken from the context of culture and politics of the 60s?) This question has several sub questions, because myths are one matter, traditions are another matter, and reality of the 60s is a third matter. These three realities are not connected. Let's go in order. Tradition and myths were certainly appeared, but Tarkovsky took them from his father. They are traditions of the Russian Symbolism which is based on the mythological, romantic traditions...On the tradition of Russian Romanticism as well as German Romanticism. And Tarkovsky took this from his father's blood. It is acquired through blood.
- 54.22-56.04 The next is the question of cultural tradition. In fact the second part of 50s was known as *Thaw*, that opened up...*Thaw* is a period when a lot of things which were closed for discussion opened up. Abstract art, abstract painting, constructivism in architecture, new poetry, Voznesensky, appeared. It was a sort of minor renaissance of the beginning of the century and the early 20s. And so, Tarkovsky belongs to this period fully...One can say that it was a renaissance, and one can say it was the second coming of the avant-garde. It was second coming of the Russian avant-garde from the early 20s, symbolic and constructivist. Hence, he is of course part of the Russian avant-garde culture, but in its second form. The second coming of avant-garde appeared in theater, architecture, fine art, poetry and everywhere after the cult of Stalin was removed during the 20th congress. And Tarkovsky brought it to cinema. Therefore, he is part of this cultural tradition. This is related to the structure and form of his films, though.
- 56.04-58.05 Things were reverse with regards to the subject matter and the reality of the 60s. More likely, he pushed it away, moved away from the reality of the 60s, abandoning it for the world of forms. Avant-garde and symbolic forms from the beginning of the century. He threw away the reality of the 60s. However, he did not throw away everything. He kept some things. He kept the conflict between artist and authority/power. Certainly the film *Andrei Rublev* is build around the conflict of artist and authority, the central conflict of the 60s. But this is not the problem of the myth, it's a political problem. Tarkovsky tries to solve this conflict that occupied the minds of everyone, everyone at the time. It was the central conflict of the period. Dissidents thought about this conflict, artists thought about it, directors...I don't know who was not thinking about it. Dissidents protested on the Red Square. Then they were put to prisons. Tarkovsky did the same in his film. He demonstrated what is an artist, and what is authority. He showed how artists are tortured by the knyaz, how he sends soldiers to gouge their eyes out for building a beautiful church. Thus, he demonstrates that authority is ruthless to everyone, and especially to artists. And that periods during which people lived and died and suffered could be redeemed in history only by the artists and poets that they had. We know history through artists. And he shows this. Of course this caused hostility, authority did not like this very much.
- 58.05-59.44 And he shows the brutality of that period. And through it we see the brutality of the contemporary period. A lot of critics scolded Tarkovsky for depicting overly brutal Medieval Russia. Solzhenitsyn, Shafarevich, Kunet (Note, I am not sure who this is) ...Many people...But most importantly Solzhenitsyn said that it was wrong that Tarkovsky depicted Medieval Russian in such a brutal manner. This makes me laugh. This is laughable. This is nothing but irony, because how can Solzhenitsyn, who has been to the prison camps and knew very well the brutality of the present, could think that past was less brutal then the present? How could Russia have been good, beautiful and benevolent during the Middle Ages and suddenly, suddenly, suddenly everything went

bad to the point of Stalin's rule during which Solzhenitsyn himself ended up behind the bars? No. She (Russia) has always been this way. That is why Solzhenitsyn simply...He did not lie per se, he was trapped by his own concepts, we are all trapped by our concepts. We are all is some kind of personal dreams. Tarkovsky in his own dream. But Solzhenitsyn in his own dreams, as well. This is interesting. He dreamed of a beautiful Russia, that is why he scolded Tarkovsky. But it is a dream. If he would dream about the time he spend behind the bars he would speak differently.

59.44-
01.01.02 In addition to dreams, Solzhenitsyn tried to prove with his nationalistic concepts that Medieval Russia carried some sort of truth, goodness and beauty, and that today we should use it as a foundation. But this concept is wishful thinking. And this is given the fact that Tarkovsky loved Solzhenitsyn very much. And more, when Tarkovsky immigrated...In his diaries he talks about this moment. When he was going through the border control at the airport, a photo of Solzhenitsyn was found in his bag. He loved him to an extend of taking his photo with him to immigration. The boarder control officer saw the photo, but either did not recognize Solzhenitsyn or decided to let it slide, returned the photo and closed the bag. He was allowed to go with this photo. So Tarkovsky took Solzhenitsyns photo with him to immigration. He loved him very much. That is why it was a hard blow for him when he heard that Solzhenitsyn scolded his film *Andrei Rublev*. He (Tarkovsky) did not understand anything, and said, how so, how so? It was a big trauma for him. Anyway, God bless him.

01.01.02-
01.02.36 This is how it related to the reality of the 60s. Myth was the....That sacred territory that people escaped to from the sinful land. The reality of the 60s was such sinful land, sinful. They went to the world of kindness, truth and beauty. The truth was carried out by myth through its truthful relationship of mythological elements. Because myth by definition is truthful. There is nothing else we possess. Cult of the sun lies at the basis of the myth. Sun is at the foundation of all myths. And hence sun is the truth for it exists. Everything else is untrue. That is why they went there. Went away from the 60s. Leaving the nonsense that surrounded them. This is the relationship Tarkovsky had with the reality of the 60s and the myth. Early century Symbolism, which he (Tarkovsky) took from his father, was the one that revealed him the myth. He knew the poetry of his father very well. He knew every line by hard. He loved him very much. And regardless of the fact that his father divorced and left him with his mother, Tarkovsky visited his father, they got along.

01.02.42 Katja help me.

01.02.58-
01.04.04 (About the episode in *Andrei Rublev* where pagans are running to the river) Yes, yes, yes, this is...yes...aaa, she says that it is a symbol of the 60s?...**Maybe, maybe, maybe...very, very nice, very nice idea. Very ni...I like it.** Perhaps it is so, but...you are looking at this situation from the contemporary point of view when we know that there was immigration in the 70s. In 1972 Carter persuaded Brezhnev to open the gates that lead people to immigrate, but this was in 1973...1972/1973. But in the 60s nobody immigrated. I understand that the episode with the people running to the river and women swimming away can act as an analogy of immigration. However, in the 60s it (immigration) was but a new wish to escape, a wish to escape. None could escape in reality. Only wished to.

- 01.04.20 Yes, Carter was in 1973.
- 01.04.30 *Very, very nice idea. Very nice idea. I like it, yes...yes, ok.*
- 01.04.45-
01.07.05 I see the relation between the reality of the 60s and the myth in Tarkovskys work in the following way. That...During all periods and even now... And especially in the 60s, myth was...The...The other shore which people wished to escape to from the sinful reality of the 60s. From the reality that was disliked, that was not true, and especially because myth was seen as something true...That it possessed some sort of truth. Indeed it is there...Truth in myth. Because all myths are based on the cult of the sun, and sun existence is true. Within the myth the relation between the elements, water, fire, wood determines the whole ideology, all the concepts human being has possessed throughout the history. There is no country in the world, no culture that was not based on that myth; this myth is a foundation of our culture. Therefore when a human being wants to find something...Reevaluate...He wants to reevaluate the contemporary life from the point of view of the ultimate truth, he turns to this mythological foundation. Myth embodies the ultimate truth. In a similar way that there is a standard of a gram and of a meter in Paris, myth is the standard that can be used to measure everything. When we measure something we always makes mistakes, but there is a standard. It is in Paris. We can affix what we have to it and have an absolutely accurate measurement. This is what myth is. When we compare (Note, he uses the word affix) something with it, we see things for what they are. That is why, returning to my book, the fourth mythological layer is the one that reveals the absolute truth. It is the last verification. It reveals not how we think but how things actually are.
- 01.07.05.-
01.08. 46 Therefore, in the 60s it was not the political immigration that took place, but the ideological one...Into the world...Into the world of eternity. From the temporary sinful world into the world of eternity. Of course. Tarkovsky learned about this world from the tradition of Russian Symbolism. From his father in particular. He was the last of the great Russian symbolists. Tarkovsky was very friendly with him, regardless of the fact that he left the family...He (his father) later had another wife, and then a third one...Nevertheless Andrei Tarkovsky visited him regularly, knew all his poems by hard, and often inserted them into his films. And of course he understood them like no one else could. He understood their inner mythological component. Arsenii Tarkovsky, his father, poet, is one of the deepest philosophers of complex philosophical symbolism expressed through poetry. As a matter of fact, he was closer to theosophy rather than to Christianity. Rather than Orthodox...For theosophy is also part of Christianity but it is theosophy not Orthodoxy. And Andrei Tarkovsky definitely accepted this theosophical part from his father. It is a theosophical culture fully and completely. Tracing its roots to Jakob Böhme, to Swedenborg and so on. It is complicated conversation, takes time to answer.
- 01.08.47 Can you translate?
- 01.10.21 (Did you know Tarkovsky?)Yes, yes, yes.
- 01.10.30-
01.12.18 (Have you met Tarkovsky?) *Twice*, twice. Both meetings were very short. During one of them I was simply present...I was an extra who accidentally heard some words. In...When Dom Kino screened *Amarcord* by Fellini, Tarkovsky was there. He was walking out of the theatre with his friends. He was always surrounded by a group of friends. He was like a king with his retinue. They were walking down the stairs... There is this one staircase in

Dom Kino... I was walking right behind them. He (Tarkovsky) was saying something to his friends...I know that eyes drooping is not nice, but I was not eyes drooping, he was talking loudly and so I heard...He was talking to someone next to him, and I was right here behind his shoulder, and heard everything. It was a peculiar situation like in a fairy tale. He said...Yes, someone asked him what he thought about *Amarcord*? He answered in a flamboyant manner - that right now I am working on something similar, but better. I heard this. He was working on *Mirror*. He shot it already, it was being edited. I heard it straight from the horse's mouth (Note, he said 'from first hand but it's the same proverb). He said I am working on something similar but better. Of course this was not meant for my ears, I heard this by accident.

01.12.18-
01.14.43

Our second meeting was ordinary, I talked with him. I...But it was also rather funny because I came to the set of *Mirror*...in September in 1973 I came to see, not him, but an artist Nikolai Lyvovich Dvigubsky. I was writing articles for the *Isskustvo Kino* at the time...I wrote an article about several films, one of the films was *Uncle Vanja* by Andron Michalkov-Konchalovsky, and Dvigubsky worked as an artist for it. So, I came to Dvigubsky to talk about this film and to get illustrations for the magazine. It was a purely journalistic conversation. Anyway...Olga Surkova in fact told me the address of the place where they were working, in Tuchkovo, near Moscow. I took a train and came there. I ended up on the set and it was extraordinary. Couple of amazing moments took place there, I will tell you about them...But first I will say that I met Dvigubsky, had a talk with him, and then heard Tarkovsky asking 'Who is that walking around the set?' In a rather cross manner. He actually never...He never liked when outsiders came to the set, they were bothering him, so he asked me - Who are you? He was told that I was a journalist visiting Dvigubsky, and since I was a journalist it was fine. In this manner my presence on the set was legalized. Later, during the evening...I left the set in the same car with them, with him, Rerberg, Dvigubsky and somebody else. It was a relatively big car, so we sat there and talked about something. Some small talk. Who? What? How? This time I actually talked to him, saw him working on the set of *Mirror*. It was amazing. One thing was left unexplained to me. I think nobody can explain it, because nobody could...I asked many people what it meant but nobody could give me an explanation. Absolutely no one.

01.14.43-
01.16.04

In fact the episode took place in the forest next to the house, old wooden house in *Mirror*. The episode with a small boy running around in the forest. So, when I was crossing this set...Of course they were not filming at the time, there was a break...Looking for Dvigubsky...So, when I was crossing the set I heard someone screaming - Be careful, don't step on the mirror! What mirror? The film was called *White, White Day*, there was no mirror yet, nobody knew that it will be called *Mirror*. And here somebody was telling me not to step on the mirror. So I looked around and saw mirrors under the trees...In the forest...Mirrors under the trees, mirrors lying in the grass, mirrors. But they were not technical mirrors which are usually used in film for directing the light, silver foil glued to the plastic. They were ordinary framed mirrors, antique mirrors, of the kind which appeared in the room of the last episode of *Mirror*. When he is with a bird...The protagonist with a bird surrounded by people...Everybody remembers this episode, the final scene of *Mirror*, when he passes out and the bird flies away from his hand. There are 9 or 10 mirrors on the wall.

01.16.04-
01.17.28

Anyway, these mirrors were lying under the trees for some reason, and nobody knows why. It is a very complicated magical mystery. He had a reason for placing the mirrors under the trees. They are not visible in the shot, they were not seen. They were not filmed, they simply lied there. For some reason... And they were not arranged in some

technical way, for storage...Because otherwise they would be arranged in stacks. Yes? For storage, stock...No they were spread out...So that every mirror was under a separate tree. They had some sort of function. But only he knows what. For something... They are not in the episode...They are in the city episode, and this episode was in the countryside prior to war. But they appeared in the episode after the war in the city. They were not supposed to be there, but for some reason they were taken from the Mosfilm prop storage, they were taken to Tuchkovo, and in Tuchkovo they were taken to this forest, and placed under the trees...Why? Nobody knows. Only he knows. And nobody writes about it. I saw it with my own eyes. It is absolutely amazing. Amazing.

01.17.28-01.18.31 And...As a matter of fact I have asked Tarkovsky's assistants who worked with him on *Mirror*, everyone...Nobody can tell why this took place. But I realize that there was some purpose behind it, something mystical was there. He was trying to capture something in this way, some sort of, some sort of reflections of something, of some thoughts. It was very important for him. Of course he was very funny on set. He was of a small stature, and he was wearing a red jacket, puffy, thick, red jacket, knitted and a wide hat. Sombrero...Not sombrero but Stetson, beige cowboy Stetson. He looked a bit like a character from some sort of cartoon. Like Signor Tomato...Yes in Cipollino, in Gianni Rodari's fairytale Cipollino, yes...In such hat, very funny.

01.18.31-01.19.11 But he was a very strict, cross man, that's why...You know, for some reason in all biographies everyone who writes about him always describes what he was wearing. It is very strange. When you are reading Fellini's biography you won't find how he was dressed...Simply dressed in a jacket or something. Nobody knows what Bergman wore, what Coppola wore, what Fellini wore....Completely unimportant. But all the biographies about Tarkovsky describe what he was wearing. Any, everywhere...He was wearing a bright red plaid jacket, in some sort of scarf, in some sort of coat, in some sort of jeans.

01.19.11-01.20.01 He was a great zooty/teddy-boy (Note, I would use the word 'show-off' but I am afraid it is too colloquial), he enjoyed dressing in an extravagant manner, unusually, but...All the biographies point this out. That is why I allowed myself to recall how he was dressed on the set of *Mirror*. I personally don't care how he was dressed, but for some reason it is very important. That is why I am recalling what I saw. And then again, this hat, this Stetson appeared...No later...At first it appeared in *Solaris*. In the film *Solaris* in Kris Kelvin's room was a skeleton in this hat...No, not a skeleton, a dummy, a dummy was wearing this hat. This or a similar one...Later Tarkovsky appeared in a similar hat on the set of *Mirror*. He had some sort of personal relationship with this hat.

01.20.01-01.20.58 All of these is definitely funny, but of course among the irony there are some actual mysteries, because irony is irony...He was a very ironic man. Some say that he was very serious, did not like joking around and he himself liked repeating that...That he does not have a sense of humor. But regardless, he understood true mystery. True mystery. And you know, on set somebody might have spotted how he was dressed in his hat, somebody else might have spotted the mirrors, but I spotted both. I saw him walking in that hat and saw the mirrors under the trees. And this is a mystery for me. This is interesting.

01.20.58-01.22.08 This meeting, of course, was very important for me. But at the time I did not know that I will be doing research about him. I enrolled in VGIK, got a second degree after university, made films, and then left film-making because in 1987 I saw...When...Tarkovsky died in the last days of 1986, right before new year. But already in spring of 1987 his films *The*

Sacrifice and *Nostalgia* were brought and screened in Moscow. I saw them there. I was attending this screening. And when I watched these two films, one after the other, I realized that there are things which only I can see, and others cannot. I wanted to understand them even deeper, and realized that I have to write about them. So I began to write, write, write.

01.22.08-
01.23.45 I wrote an article..which was widely quoted around the world. In US it was quoted, everywhere. It was published in *Isskustvo Kino*. It was the one called *Director and Myth*. It was quoted by Vida Johnson in US...By somebody in Germany. After that I started working on my book, which I was writing for a long time. Because of this I stopped making films and was engaged only in writing. And in a way from being a director I went back...I remembered my past as an art historian and became an art historian again. As a matter of fact, I found it rather interesting because I realized if you can do something better than everyone else that's what you ought to do. Not something that you do as well as the others. This is my principle. I became uninterested in what everybody was doing. I pondered and realized that the theory I was working on was far more powerful, interesting and cool than cinema. That is because there are tens of thousands of films coming out each year while a good theory is born once in ten year. Kracauer, Andre Bazin...Who else created good theories? Bela Balazs...Two or three, four theories during the hundred years of cinemas existence. Therefore, it is better to come up with a good theory than to make one film out of ten thousand. Film that no one needs. It is cooler.

01.23.53-
01.24.16 (What did you talk about with Tarkovsky during your second meeting?) Nothing much, it was a mundane conversation. They were planning the filming for the next day, thinking to shoot according to the schedule or not, with Rerberg. They were discussing the schedule, while asking me about the impressions I got from Dvigubsky and how my magazine article was going. A conversation about nothing in a sense. Simply...They were talking about schedule and I was talking about my article on Dvigubsky.

01.24.46 Schedule you are translating like schedule, yes? Do you know what is schedule? Ah, about that...it is super, it is super, super.

01.25.12 Dvigubsky, Dvigubsky, Nikolai Dvigubsky, yes a great artist...**artist**.

01.26.42 Could you tell that there is no need to include my irony about Senior Tomato into the film, it is not going to be nice. Like from a fairytale. My irony, could you tell to leave my irony out. No need, it is too ironic.

01.27.05-
01.28.35 **No...I like it very much so irony only between us but not for the film...only, only between us. And the, and the...the next very funny thing.** There is one more funny thing. I already mentioned that all of them were zooties/teddy-boys. Tarkovsky was a zooty/teddy-boy, one of the top zooties/teddy-boys in Moscow. Rerberg as well. Rereber was a handsome, handsome man. Always in some kind of unimaginable leather jackets, jeans, which were very rare at a time. The most beautiful women of Moscow loved him, the most beautiful. In the 60s they were like Gods in Moscow. Anyway, Dvigubski the artist whom I visited, is French. He is not French, he is from Russian family that lived in Paris and has always lived in Paris. He studied in Paris. A sort of French Russian. And on the set he was dressed not like a French man, he was wearing a soldier's trench coat, and simple sneakers. He, a

man from Paris, was the only one that looked like a simple working man, while zooties/teddy-boys from Moscow were dressed in such way.... It is very funny. I am not sure if this needs to be included in the film, but that is how it was...you understand, yes?

01.29.01

About the war?

01.29.33-
01.30.38

(About the war and its influences) Well you know for Tarkovskys generation...He was born in 1932 and was 9 year old when it begun...And for my generation the war was different from what it is now. Not what we think about it today. Today we think about it objectively, Germans were at fault, Russians were at fault, Stalin was at fault. Who begun the war nobody knows. That is not what people thought then. At that time fascism was an absolute evil. At that time calling somebody a fascist was a worst possible insult. During my childhood there did not exist a word worse than fascist. It was an absolute evil. Today is different; today there are Russians who are fascist. Today everything has changed. But for him, for Tarkovsky's generation, it was an absolute evil. That is why in *Ivan's Childhood*, Germans were an absolute, mythological evil. This is very important because it is not the same war we imagine now.

01.30.39-
01.31.40

At that time...There were traces of war. Everybody's parents fought...My parents, his...His father fought at war and returned an invalid. He was an officer and an invalid of war. My father fought, my mother fought. My mother went to the front as a volunteer and fought. They met with my father at the front and got married after the war. That's why I am a war child...war child...war child... I am from a generation of people who met during the war. That is why I remember everything very well. I was wearing my father's gymnasterka (Note, military shirt-tunic) which reached to my toes. Later it was re-sowed into a jacket and then into some kind of vest for me...We did not have anything, we were very poor. My father's officer's gymnasterka was made from a very good fabric which was constantly re-sowed into things for my older brother and me. We did not have anything...

01.31.41-
01.32.31

That is why to us, the war is completely different from the war we talk about today. We used to play with bullets....Children wore their father's field bags to school not schoolbags. It was a luxury to have a field bag. You were an object of envy if you had a field bag, since there were no schoolbags. Books would be tied with a belt or a rope and carried in this way. Hence a field bag was o-go-go for show-offs. I had a school bag later...War was a part of our memories...There were a lot of invalids. In the trains war invalids would sing songs and earn money in this manner, in all trains...Even today the songs sung by invalids still exist. I know them and remember them perfectly.

01.32.33-
01.33.44

All the parents have been fighting. At least parents of my acquaintances. It was very close to us. And for Tarkovsky even more so. Unlike now. Nobody can understand this today. Today we talk about who committed more atrocities Germans in Russia, or Russians in Germany. This is bullshit, of course Germans in Russia. Russians in Germany had the right, I think....I may not be expressing myself politically correct, forgive me, but it was my childhood, I have survived through this, and I have the right to express myself in this way. People went through a terrible suffering, terrible suffering...The family of my mother (Note, extended family) used to live in South Ukraine. They were a Jew family. All of them were destroyed. My mother and her family (Note, close family) used to live in

another place and then ended up in Magnitogorsk. They survived, unlike the rest who stayed in the South Ukraine, who all perished. All perished, how so? I cannot have a different attitude. I consider it to be an absolute evil. Everything else is relative.

01.33.47-
01.34.54 My mother, a Jew, went to fight at the front. How much courage she must have possessed. Amazing amount of courage and faith in our victory. She was not afraid of anything. That is why I cannot have a different attitude. She used to work at...Things...At the post that listened to the sky. They were called and air force of surveillance, warning and communication. They had special tools that listened for the approaching aircrafts and send a signal to anti-aircraft gun artillery. My father served at the anti-aircraft forces as well, he later worked for their newspaper. And my mother who used to be a journalist before the war, initially worked on this 'listeners' and then when she was told that the newspaper editors...It was a very small newspaper which was printed in the forest on a small printing press...She was told that the newspaper lacked workforce and she was send there, and there she met my father.

01.34.57-
01.36.09 And here...This is my destiny, that's why I cannot have a different attitude. Forgive me if it is not politically correct, but I am me. Hence...Respectively, Tarkovsky's generation felt the same, the whole generation that saw how people returned without hands and legs, felt the same. And they were their relatives. My uncle had been captured, and escaped. The husband of my mother's sister, he escaped from captivity, he also fought. The husband of the other sister died during the war. It is our life, our life, we cannot have a different attitude. That is why it was mythological, mythological, absolute evil, chthonic, chthonic. Germans were like monsters of the underworld, nobody thought of them as human beings. Of course not Germans as a nation, but fascists, they were not considered as human beings. And when Erenburg, Russian, soviet poet wrote during the war 'as many times as you see him, kill him', everyone sacredly believed in it. It was our life.

01.36.10-
01.36.50 This was during my childhood. I saw how in 1953...I was born in 1949. In 1953 prison camps were freed and many, many prisoners ran away. A mob of prisoners was running passed my house in Sverlvosk. I saw them when I was 4.... They were running and being chased down the boulevard. Because...I do not know what was the reason either the wrong prison was freed or they were running in the wrong direction, but I saw them running away and soldiers trying to catch them. Then in 1954 we moved to Moscow.

01.36.51.-
01.38.03 And my father wrote the first play about a man returning from a prison camp, this was before the 20s congress, it was the frist play of its kind. The play *Drummer*, is a great play which...There was no theatre in Moscow that would not stage this play. It was about a girl who was a partisan and was given a task to work for Germans. So, she worked for Germans. How did she work? She drank with them, probably slept with them, because how would she work with the officers, drink with them and not sleep with them? It is life, life. So when the Germans were chased away and Russians came, what was she to do? She was hanging out with Germans, but nobody knew that she was a partisan. That was the great tragedy of this girl, who died at the end, at the end of this play. So when the Russian officer fell in love with her, and asked her to be with him, she replied that she could not be with him.

01.38.05- It was one of the most tragic plays of that time. He was a prominent writer, very

- 01.39.02 prominent. He has a lot, a lot of grand plays. He is one...For me he is the best soviet playwright. He is very well known, very well known....In the 70s he was writing completely different plays about the future of our country...He has foreseen everything, foreseen everything, the whole perestroika and wrote about it in his play *Rumor*...He is not the topic of our conversation. The topic is my generation, and Tarkovsky's generation...There is a difference of 15 years between us, but still it is the same generation. That is why I understand him very well. I understand him. He is also a war child to some extent he is also a **war child**.
- 01.40.19 I understood, but could you tell me precisely... **I understand but maybe not all**.
- 01.40.42-
01.41.12 (War as a hidden theme inside of Tarkovsky's films?) Yes, but only in a special way, in a special way. As a matter of fact, the mythological consciousness in any, in any culture, is found between the absolute evil and the absolute good. It is a polar consciousness...Two poles. Absolute evil and absolute good. In order to grasp the absolute good one has to be familiar with the absolute evil. And the war in a sense was this absolute evil, but mythological, not historical but mythological.
- 01.41.13-
01.42.20 Look, in the *Mirror* the evil is showcased not only through the war with fascists, but there are also Chinese, Chinese Red Guards. *Mirror* shows Chinese Chronicles, Chinese Red Guards, Nuclear war, the atomic bomb explosion in Hiroshima. That's why evil is very, very....It has different faces. But Tarkovsky displayed different faces and showed that they are basically the same thing. Evil can have a face of fascists, or a face of Maoists, or a face of atomic bomb, but they are all different faces of evil. Different faces of evil...But mythological evil which is contrasted with the good, absolute good. Absolute good is an absolute...here is absolute light, and there darkness.
- 01.42.21 I would like to again...we are talking about the dreams. I would like to tell about one more dream. In *Mirror*. Yes?
- 01.42.38 Translate everything I was saying before and then...
- 01.43.01-
01.44.10 **Enough? Enough light? Not enough?...Maybe for this, for this...Ok, colour temperature, another, another, another colour temperature, yes? This is yellow, this is blue, this is...so...It's? I sitting correctly? All right, ok.**
- 01.44.25-
01.45.00 With regards to *Mirror* I have an interesting concept which diverts from the commonly accepted interpretations. It is commonly accepted that there are three layers in *Mirror*: dream, historical reality of the time before the war, and actual reality of the early 60s. There is quite a lot written on this topic. There are tables drafted which represent which episode belongs to which of the three realities. All of this is very interesting, but I think that *Mirror* is....*Mirror* is a dream as a whole, everything is placed in a dream. This is very important. I don't think that there is only one particular layer which is a dream. No, everything there is a dream. Because the whole film is organized according to the logic of a dream. The time and space in it are constricted in a way the time and space are constructed in a dream. That is why...The whole reality of the film is build as a dream. It is...Right now I cannot base my argument concisely, it is very complicated, but in my book everything is written in detail, there are many arguments. Right now I am simply informing that it is so.

01.46.02-
01.47.45 And it is not a dream of the author of the film, the director, and it is not a dream of the protagonist of the film, but a dream of somebody third, whom I call a sleeper. There is a person we don't see. The sleeper, he is the owner of the dream. And it is his dream that we see. It is not the director and not the protagonist, but a third person. And so the whole film is build according to the dream that somebody is seeing. And I demonstrate, by providing many arguments, that it is a dream of some person above us. Who like an absolute governs the world, and controls this world, because he is the master of the dream. Every dream has a master. And he is not the protagonist of the dream. Aleksei who is the protagonist of *Mirror*, film *Mirror*, he is the protagonist of the dream, but he is not the master. The Sleeper is the master. And it is not the director either, because the director is also a kind of protagonist. The master is somewhere outside. It is a very strange concept but it can be argued in detail and proven... Only through this concept we can explain the nature of connections between the episodes in this film. Because many believe that they are chaotic, not interconnected, but actually they are very well connected by the logic of the dream.

01.47.45-
01.49.38 For example, the episode in which the protagonist is bidding farewell to his wife, or rather talking to his wife. But we don't see him in the shot, we only hear his voice. He is talking about divorce, about the fact that she needs to find a new man. An ironic conversation, a rather sad one. And he is saying that they are moving away from each other, moving away, moving away. Afterwards comes the scene with a balloon, high-altitude balloon from the soviet video chronicles...It is about the take off of the high-altitude balloon. But it is not shown as a victorious chronicle which is usually displayed as a victory of soviet science, accompanied by a march...A very happy marches. But he (Tarkovsky) inserted a very sad music, a very minor music, very sad. And so when the balloon...The music is very sad, weeping. And the balloon flies away. It is a dream. It is not the logic of life, because they are talking about their divorce in the 60s while the balloon was 30 years ago. There is no living connection between them, there is only a fact of estrangement, we are moving away...I am moving away from you like the balloon that once left the earth. It is this kind of logic. It is a logic of a dream. And so on and so forth. The whole film is built around this. It is made absolutely precisely, it is molded. And there is no chaos, everything is very systematic. It is not reality but the system of a dream. It is very easy to read. I consider it to be a very important interpretation.

01.49.42 [You understand a little bit, yeh?](#)

01.50.14-
01.50.55 Translate about the air balloon...And translate about the air balloon so she would understand. Did you understand, no? He really loved air balloons. If you can recall in *Solaris* there were pictures, etchings of the air balloon in the Kelvin's house. He really loved that moment when air...When something flies into the air. And the moment of levitation. Air balloon is a sort of levitation. In all his works love is connected with levitation. In *The Sacrifice*, in *Mirror*, always, when in love people levitate. And that air balloon flew away.

01.51.53 A little bit, a little bit, help me out...Once again, Katja...Water...something about water, what about water? Ripples on water...yes.

01.53.17 Yes, yes, I understand.

- 01.53.25-01.54.29 (Future wars and their influence on your dreams, and dreams in general) My own?...No, you know something need to be cleared...There is a sort of paradox...The war, the second world war was very close to my and Tarkovsky's generation. But the wars of the future...Nuclear War, and Second World War... Or rather Cold War they were very far away from us on the other hand. It is very strange but they are further from us than from people in the West. It is a very strange paradox since propaganda talked a lot about Nuclear War and Cold War. All our newspapers wrote about them. But we were outside of propaganda, intellectuals were outside of propaganda. So we rejected it, we were not interested in it.
- 01.54.29-01.56.10 As a matter of fact in Western, democratic society everyone is involved in some sort of way...Actually involved. In some sort of elections, in some sort of decisions. We were not involved in anything; everything was decided by the big bosses in Kremlin. We were not interested in these bosses. That is why nobody was interested in the Cold War. I think so. Everyone laughed at it. It was a problem of our bosses. And the future Nuclear War was problem of our bosses. Here nobody took it seriously. It was very strange. Here nobody was afraid of it as much as in the West. Because in the West everyone said - it is our society, it is our war, we are responsible for everything. Here on the other hand everyone was indifferent towards the war because it was the business of the bosses in Kremlin. The Private individuals, especially the artistic bohemia, were completely uninterested in it. That is why nobody dreamed about it, except perhaps people who are completely...Under depression and with fears. On the level of depressive horror, nightmares, **nightmare**, it perhaps could take place, but not beyond that. Largely because it was not part of real life we were all....Soviet society was deeply divided. Interests of the bosses were one thing, and private individuals', workers, interests were another thing. Interests of artists were something third. It was not a united society that could be found somewhere else, in the West, in US, in UK. You have to understand that. That is why the attitude was completely different.
- 01.56.11-01.56.33 I think it was the same for him (Tarkovsky). He was completely uninterested in the Nuclear War, it was nothing but an excuse to talk about universal evil, about something...Politics...On the other hand, he was far away from politics, he did not understand much in it, like most of us during that time. And did not want to understand. It was not our game.
- 01.57.08-01.58.56 Katja? (What were the common fears? What were the people afraid of in the 60s?). In the 60s people were not afraid of anything...**nothing, nothing**...they either were not afraid of anything, or were afraid that the war would continue. Because there were still around people who fought. There was a saying 'anything but the war' (Note, he says, only if there was no war, but the meaning of the saying is the acceptance of anything but war). The continuation of that war, war with the fascist. People were afraid that fascist would return and they would have to fight them again. That was what they were afraid of. But it was so called domestic, fairytaleish fear. They said 'anything but the war' as a saying, as a proverb, 'anything but the war', as long as the worst thing does not happen. That was about it. It was an absolute, absolute evil. Otherwise, people were not afraid of anything. It was the time when people were liberated from fears. They were not afraid of bosses, of anything. That is why dissidents, who stopped fearing, appeared. In the 50s they were impossible, but in the 60s they appeared. Nobody was scared in arts. Abstract art, constructivism in architecture emerged. Ljubimov who was not scared of anything was working in theater. I remember his, Ljubimov's, plays, they were astonishing.

- Theatre on Taganka had no fear. I was there, I saw it.
- 1.58.56-
2.00.28 As a whole fear did not exist in the 60s. The 60s was a very strange period of release from fear. Fear came later, not fear per se...In the 70s authority and society had drifted apart. A sort of indifference took place, an abruption of authority. Announcing- you have your own games, we have our own games, that it...Simply do not interfere with us, we won't interfere with you. An unannounced social agreement was established. Authority allowed practically everything to the people, artists. Any kind of formalism, any kind of styles. Everything was allowed. Exhibition of abstract art took place, there you go...Though it was dispersed with a bulldozer, but afterwards a...Not a joke, the largest exhibition hall VDNH was allocated for the exhibition of the abstract art. I was there, it was gigantic....Thousand people were there. One pavilion, then another pavilion... In Moscow the exhibition hall on Gruzinskaja street was given for the abstract art exhibition. The Government said - do whatever you like just don't interfere with politics. The Artists also said – we won't interfere with politics, you don't interest us. So the society split, there were no fears, but there was a mutual indifference. Everyone had their own game. Especially since later on in economics practically everything was possible.
- 02.00.28-
02.01.45 At the same time a black market economy had appeared which made up 40 percent of the soviet economy. And if one was to imagine that the soviet economy was the largest one, after American, which was gigantic...One can imagine how much were these 40 percent. It was a gigantic volume. This eventually led to perestroika. Because it was not the intellectuals that started perestroika but the people from the black market who desired to turn their businesses legal through cooperatives. Perestroika is misunderstood as something that the intellectuals begun for the freedom. No. The Intellectuals woke up when the freedom was there. It was brought about by cooperatives, so called black market guilds, who operated in the black marked and wished to open up, expand...Because if in 70s, in 1978-1979, they had 40 percent of soviet economy, in the 80s they had perhaps more than a half. Of course this is a classical situation described by Marx, when the existing relations of productive forces are broken down due to the fetters with production. So the black market economy blew up this system, and came to light. This is how perestroika came about. It is a classical Marx revolution.
- 02.01.45-
02.02.46 Afterward the intellectuals were told – guys you are now free! – everyone was very surprised – yes? We are free? We are free? Oh, so nice! I know all of this because...A lot of things happened right in front of my eyes. When...I am not going to specify who, but I know who... Theatre workers, writers....Called Gorbachev, and asked - what is going to happen to us? Are we going to have our freedom? He answered – guys wait, let me unleash this flywheel, meaning- economy, and after that everything will be fine with you. And they answered – yes? Ok, fine. It came to them as a secondary thing. Everything started with economy. Only after that it came to the intellectuals. And the thing is.... This black market economy was born in the 70s when practically everything was allowed. Today it is not polite to talk about it. That is it.
- 02.02.46-
02.03.48 Soviet history is very strange, a lot of such things are unknown. Similar situation was with art. Artists were told to do whatever they wanted as long as they did not touch politics. Those who begun to preach to the authorities about what is good and what is bad got arrested. Authorities responded by declaring that they know themselves what is good and what is bad, do your art and we won't touch you. When artists begun to write their petitions they got arrested and sent to prison. I knew very well Jurii Orlov a

dissident, a prominent one. We were friends with him. The brother of Natalia Sharansky, the future wife of Natan Sharansky, who in Israel...Her brother was my course-mate, Misha Steblis. We were friends with him, so I am well acquainted with this environment from within. I know a lot of things, though this has nothing to do with Tarkovsky. This is not for the film, simply put, I know a lot.

02.03.50-
02.04.21 All of this should not be put in the film....It is everything this is not for film, because it is very private...yes, ok, it is between us, between us. Some of texts, some of texts for, some letters for defense... in favor of some dissidents, were written at my cottage by my friends. But it is not important. I don't want to wriggle myself to this cause.

02.04.33 Yes, yes...In France, in Paris, summer of 1968 in Paris. In Paris, summer of 68. You know, yes, very...Paris revolution.

02.05.02-
02.07.00 Yes... Yes, it is very interesting because people hoped that they could turn everything for the better. In the spirit of communism, by the way. The funniest and most interesting thing is the fact that at the time the West was almost communist. For the Paris, French revolution of the 1968 was organized by the communists. Yves Montand was a communist. Godard was close with the communists. Jeanne Moreau...all prominent French writers and actors, Sartre, they all were close to the communists. Italians...Communist party was in power and so on. Communism was not considered to be evil. All these people believed that communism can lead to very good things. The funny thing is that Russian dissidents were not anti-communists. They considered communism to be a very good theory, which was ruined. That is why the songs of for example Okudzhava, poet Bulat Okudzhava, who sang about the commissars, were very popular at the time. In them the commissars were depicted as good men, saints who served for an idea, but all died because the idea was perverted. That was the point. People wanted to rediscover...The true meaning of this good idea. This is very similar in history to how in the 16th century protestants decided to rediscover the true meaning of the Gospel. People thought that Catholic church, the Pope, had ruined Christianity. That is what Martin Luther thought. So there was a need to reintroduce a true Christianity through a true gospel. Protestantism was born, Luther appeared then Calvin, and so on. The whole protestant civilization appeared.

02.07.01-
02.07.24 So in the 60s there was something similar. They were thinking that they ought to reveal the truth to people, which Stalin had perverted, which soviet bureaucrats had perverted. And that we ought to return the true romanticisms, the good idea that people had fought and died for. It is very strange but the 60s are build on this.

02.07.24-
02.08.18 Dissidents who were imprisoned, they were not imprisoned because they were against the soviet rule, this is the strangest thing, they were for the soviet rule, and they were for communism, but another, good communism. And they were send to prison for this. The term 'communism with a human face' was invented, and became a sort of nemesis for the soviet ideology, and that's what people were sent to prison for. The same was in Prague in 1968...There was an uprising in Paris and in Prague. The uprising in France began during the Cannes festival and continued in Paris as student began to protest. Later in the autumn....At the end of the summer people protested in Prague. Then our tanks entered the city. Here again, they were not against communism. Leaders of these events were communists, but they believed that there ought to be a communism with a

human face. That is the problem.

- 02.08.20-
02.09.30 That means that communism possessed something that attracted these people. Anti-communism in its pure form was very rare, and was unpopular. People did not understand how can there be no communism, since it is so beautiful. It wants everyone to be happy. There is fascism that wishes evil for everyone, wants to destroy everyone. Communism on the other hand wants everyone to be happy. In theory. And when soviet communists were accused of killing millions of people, it was considered Stalin's fault, he is a bad guy, he is a cannibal, enemy of the whole humanity, devil. But the idea is very good. In practice everything worked out because the whole world had changed its priorities towards the ideas that had social orientation. The whole economy of US, Japan, the whole economy is oriented towards... practically commonwealth. It is some sort of...Not communism, its bases are capitalism and private property, but...Everyone gets their share and are happy.
- 02.09.33-
02.09.59 Everyone is happy....It is strange how everything was mixed up, but that is how thing were back then. It is very strange. But I remember that it was this way. And not only in my circle, among artists. Back then all my friends were artists and art historians. But it was a general thing, characteristic of the whole society. Everyone sang the songs of Okudzhava about commissars. And everybody enjoyed them.
- 02.10.30-
02.11.22 (Were the 70s a disappointment after the 60s?) No, no...**No, no...you see...**There is a phenomenon in the history of any society... I am telling you this as a historian. When every revolution condemns everything prior to it. For example, after the 1920s revolution in Russia, everyone was convinced that the state of thing before the revolution were very bad. Afterwards, after some investigation, it was discovered that in 1913 the level of production was so high, that Russia caught up to it only after half a century. Meaning everything was not that bad. The culture was grand, the production was grand. But revolution said that everything was very bad, to convince everyone that at the moment everything is much better. The same with the French revolution, all revolutions, that's the law. When a new government comes it criticized everything prior to it.
- 02.11.22-
02.11.38 By the same law the government that rose after perestroika, began to criticize everything before perestroika. The word 'zastoi' appeared. Do you know the term zastoi, yes? Explaine, explaine...
- 02.11.50-
02.13.00 **Stagnation....stagnation, stagnation, yeh, stagnation....** The truth of the matter was that there was no stagnation in the 70s. It is a myth created after perestroika. It is very easy to prove. It is clear from a very obvious fact. After perestroika, for 20-25 years only the infrastructure that was build in the 70s worked. The factories worked, the machines worked. And everything that is produced today is functioning only because it was bought, build, created during the so called period of stagnation. There was no stagnation. The economy was grand, it had a fantastic capacity. When Soviet government was overthrown... I am not defending the soviet government I am simply saying objectively that it was a very powerful economy. After the soviet government fell nothing was build, no factories were build. But it was told that during stagnation, in the 70s, the production was about to collapse. It was believed that is would work for another year and would collapse. It was that bad.
- 02.13.00- But it did not collapse. It worked in the 80s, it worked in the 90s, it worked in the

- 02.13.33 2000...the same factories are working at this very moment. That is how powerful it was. Nothing new is bought. The same machines are working, that is how powerful the economy was. It could have survived for another 50 years. There was no stagnation, it is a myth, political myth. There are a lot of political myths. I am not protecting the 70s, or the soviet government, I am just looking at things objectively.
- 02.14.14-
02.15.26 (Why did Tarkovsky want to immigrate?) Well, he was not the only one who wanted to immigrate, everybody wanted. In the 70s a lot of people left. Actually he did not want to immigrate. He was...it was the stupidity of the government. De facto he was thrown away. He wanted to work there (abroad) as a soviet citizen, but live in Europe where it was much easier to work. They did not let him. He was told to get out. That is it. It is the stupidity of our authorities. In reality it was the government that killed the soviet system. Soviet system was not destroyed, it perished due to the stupidity of our authorities, who did not allow people to live normally. Who were so deeply fossilized in their dogmatism that they could not perceive reality. Hence, they threw away everything that was outside of what they considered likeable. So they threw everything out, and in this way a lot of people were thrown out.
- 02.15.27-
02.15.57 Starting from...a lot of writers, artist, directors, film directors, musicians. Rastropovich for example left in a similar manner. If Tarkovsky was given a passport and told – go ahead, live and work, return, come back – he would never have left. Soviet government was fully responsible for this. He was forced to leave, he did not want to.
- 02.16.21-
02.17.42 Practically soviet system committed a suicide. Largely, due to the stupidity of its leaders. The Later leaders, not the old ones...And even not due to Brezhnev, but Suslov. During the soviet time Suslov was the scariest man. Mihail Suslov, who was the leader of ideology...He worked on all these horrible, horrible concepts. Suslov is a monster. Brezhnev was a very tolerant man; he was good natured so to speak, very sentimental and not evil, not evil. He was a kind man. Suslov on the other hand was a monster who threw people out, and did not let anybody breathe. And, practically, because of Suslov everything collapsed. If we were to remove Suslov, soviet system would still exist. Nobody could have done anything with it, absolutely. So, yes...He was an idiot. I am not protecting it (Soviet System). Perhaps now there are shortcomings but in many respects things are much better. We can freely travel now, buy anything, speak out, of course it is better. But a lot of things could have been avoided if Suslov was removed from the picture. Everything could have continued.
- 02.18.09-
02.19.08 (Do you have dreams? Are they black and white or colored?) **Yes of course...** Of course I have dreams....I mean... I say it as if one ought to have them, but I see colour dreams, and only colour. I never have black and white dreams. I don't know if it is natural for me or for everybody in general, but I don't have black and white dreams only colourful ones. Some of them are very vivid. Perhaps that is because I have been painting. In general I have a visual perception. Only colourfull, of course. But some of them are symbolical, and some not. Some of the symbolical dreams I remember. I will not talk about them now, it is very personal. But they were full of symbols. And I can clearly understand their symbolism, but won't talk about it.
- 02.19.56-
02.21.22 (How did cinema changed the way we dream?) **How cinema changed the way we...? Cinema changed our dreamings, yes? Very interesting question.** It is a very interesting

question. It is a common belief that dreams have changed cinema, but the way cinema changed dreams is very interesting. Though, I am not sure that it has changed them. I am not sure that cinema has changed dreams. And, in fact, that there is anything that can change dreams. You see, I am not a professional psychologist or psychoanalyst, no, no, there are professionals. But I believe that dreams, mechanics behind their appearance, has been developed in ancient times, when not only cinema was inexistent, but the human being was not exactly a human being. Not exactly...My dog has dreams. And monkeys have dreams. Everyone has dreams. And this system has evolved long time ago, that is why I don't believe that anything contemporary can influence it in any way. It is more likely, more likely that cinema can bring into dreams some kind of themes. Some moments of content can enter them. But the structure, formal structure of a dream has not changed since the ancient times. Here, explain, so it would be clear concretely.

02.21.50-
02.22.42 I may say the same thing but rephrase it. Like anything dreams are made of form and content, yes? The formal structure of the dreams does not change. But the content...Because the formal structure has evolved long, long time ago, in ancient times. When the human was not exactly human. But the content changes. Everything that we see every day, what we remember, what we have read, what we have been talking about to people enters our dreams...All these things enter our dreams from reality. And cinema also enters from reality, but as an object. Not like a formal structure, but as an object. Dreams have a stable formal structure, historically stable, which has not changed in thousands year, but the objects within this structure change. That is the point.

02.23.16 In film, like a part of our everyday impression can come, come into dream, but only come part of our everyday experience. Not more, not more.

02.24.16 Explain, I understood but not everything.

02.24.49 So, Greeks say that I met a dream. So, what?

02.25.36 It is very difficult to understand help me out.

02.26.37-
02.28.50 Yes...There is, I see, I see. I see. Maybe I don't know correct, or not correct, but I think so...Greek have thought about dreaming like about another reality which is...which exists in parallel with his reality. Maybe in English it is not so perfect... I will tell in Russian, that the Greek perceived dreams as an actual reality that was parallel to his reality...yes...But it was independent from him, he could either meet it or not meet it. Contemporary man on the other hand, perceives it as something that is dependent on him, as an object that he can...and in English...contemporary men thinks about dreaming like about some object which he can take and put inside his soul, inside his mind and the... he...and this idea belong to him. It depends on him, he is the master, man is the master. For ancient Greeks these two realities were separated and independent form one another, but today man became the master of the world and the dreams. He can take and place it here (inside his head), or if I don't want to I won't. That is why I have a dream, I own it, I possess it. On the other hand, the dream appeared before the Greek. Do you understand the difference, yes? Dreaming had Greek. Explain.

- 02.29.17-
02.30.56 Like thing... For contemporary man a dream is like lunch ... like thing, like an object...Tell, tell...which he can own. Something, thing...I can take this thing, and put it here, put it there, put it there, put it here. It is a question of...practically it is a question of power. Of power. Who is the master of the world? Who is the master? In contemporary, contemporary world the man is master of the world. He can took anything and put in any place. The same about dreaming. Yes? But in Ancient time, Greek was not the master of this... his world. The Gods, one God and a lot of Gods, they were masters. So...Because of this he was not a master of his dreams. By the same reason. It was parallel reality, yes, yes. And maybe, maybe, maybe...
- 02.30.56-
02.32.20 Tarkovsky has something similar. He is in a way the owner of his dreams. They come to him. That is why the absolute was very important to him. Why do I talk about absolute good and evil? They are not extreme points. Here is good, from here to here, and at a certain point good becomes absolute. No, not like that. There is no border, no scale. It is absolute simply because it belongs to the absolute. The Absolute is a subject, it is a principle subject not from the Christian pantheon, it is from a theosophian pantheon, created in ancient times. And early Christian. It is a Gnostic concept...or rather close to Gnosticism. In it, the Christian Orthodox God that is common for Russia, does not exist. Same with the catholic God that one can negotiate with by means of indulgences, no. It is a separate thing, a separate thing, absolute. It is a theosophian notion which possesses and builds the whole world, and which...with which you cannot negotiate. Which is simply commanding us.
- 02.32.20-
02.32.48 Actually *Solaris* is about this. *Solaris* is a film about the absolute. It is a film that tells that there is something that has created everything but it is not a god in the Christian sense. And it possesses us wholly. Everything that we think about is caused by desire, or lack of desire of this so called god. *Solaris* is about this. It is a theosophian theme absolutely.
- 02.33.05 What, what?...Absolute...tell about the absolute, that the absolute is a theosofian notion...
- 02.33.35-
02.34.21 And *Solaris* creates everything, it creates phantoms, yes? Which visit the astronauts, yes? So, this raises a question - if he can create something where are the limits of his power of creation? Nobody can say that he can create here and cannot do so there. Perhaps it created everything, including the Earth? And perhaps, we who live on Earth and came to him from there, we are also his phantoms? That is the problem. The film is about him creating everything, that he is a creator of everything. That is why at the end the protagonist Kris comes to him as a prodigal son to God. Tell.
- 02.34.45 And in, and in the final, final scene, Chris came to his father, like to God. How do you say prodigal son in English? How is prodigal son.... Lost son, yeh, yeh.
- 02.35.19-
02.36.26 There is a very interesting story connected to this film, *Solaris*. Interesting story...Actually, there was a conflict between Lem, Stanislaw Lem, the author of the novel *Solaris*. Lem was very mad at Tarkovsky, because Tarkovsky made a religious film. But he considered his novel not to be religious. He thought that he wrote a fantasy novel not a religious one. Tarkovsky on the other hand set it on religious tracks. Actually, I think Lem was wrong. He hid his religious intentions, hid them. He simply did not want to talk about them openly. Because everything is laid out in the novel, the concept of God is laid out in

the novel. The concept of conscience is laid out in the novel, there is everything. Tarkovsky simply made an adaptation, that revealed the true Lem. That is why Lem was mad at him.

02.36.48

He tried to hidden it, he tried to hidden it.

02.37.40-
02.38.15

Yes, yes, yes, Rembrandt, Rembrandt's painting, yes. The composition is from the Rembrandt's painting, of course, of course. This is the case when visual reference turns into reference for meaning. There is not a single word about God, in the film, but the composition of the painting becomes a text. Because the composition is well known, as a composition of Rembrandt's painting on the subjects or prodigal son, we can read the theme through Rembrandt. It is a type of Aesopian language which brings the meaning to us through the composition. A very interesting thing.

02.38.41-
02.38.58

This is a case of composition becoming a communication tool. The language that communicates ideas. The pure composition became a means of communication that expresses ideas, though Rembrandt of course, directly through Rembrandt. Tell.

02.39.05

But across Rembrandt. Across Rembrandt. Like a medium.

02.39.37

(When was the last time you saw Tarkovsky?) Last? The two time I have told you about.

02.39.53-
02.41.59

(What is your favorite episode from Tarkovsky's film? What is your favorite film by Tarkovsky?) Of course his best film is *The Sacrifice*. *The Sacrifice*. There is no particular episode, the whole film...the Film...beyond any words, beyond any praise. As a matter of fact Tarkovsky does not build his film from scenes. He does not build them from pieces, episodes. Everything he does is one whole. Even his work as a whole, his oeuvre, is not build from separate films, but is one whole. It is one whole...One cannot pick a certain film, and certainly a particular scene from a film. They cannot be separated, separated. That is why some are closer and other not so close. For example, I feel that *The Sacrifice* is closest to me. Though of course, all his films are grand, absolutely grand. Even my...Even his film, which is remembered quite rarely *The Streamroller and the Violin*. A short film *The Streamroller and the Violin*. 48 minutes. Everything that his future films talked about is already there, watch it carefully, it has absolutely everything. All the themes are explored there. Of course, it is not perfect, light, student work. But thematically everything is already there, and it seems that Tarkovsky was born as a complete director. He did not go through the period of apprenticeships, during which he would discover something step by step. He found everything all at once. He simply learned how to use it. There is only perfecting of film directing. The theme was already there, shaped from the very beginning, and did not change since then. This is very interesting. He was born completely ready in a way.

- 02.42.30 - And I also like very much his earlier student film *Killers, Killers*...It was a diploma work
 02.43.36 (*The Stemroller and the Violin*) and *Killers* was his course work. Sound sketch.... You know this film? You know?...Based on Hemingway, yes, yes...Very good film-noir. It is in film-noir genre. Gangster film. Impeccable noir, I generally like noir as a style or a genre. It is very strange that a director who is considered to be Russian, orthodox, begun his career with noir. A western cinema...Noir. Very interesting and puzzling. It is a very crisp, crisp noir. Very beautiful.
- 02.43.52- And generally Tarkovsky is much more complex that people say, because behind the
 02.46.04 problems familiar to us such as orthodox, not orthodox, spiritual problems, and so on....The Noir tradition that he grew with can be noticed. Apart from symbolism, he has a very strong tradition in noir. And he also has an absolutely hidden...It is tradition which nobody talks about...It is the French New Wave tradition. He is greatly influenced by Godard. Nobody talks about Godard. It will be especially interesting to those who work with the sound, Katja, that his audio score was build according to Godard's principles. And also, he actually always wanted to make documentary films. *Mirror* was planned as a documentary film. He always dreamed of a documentary film, in a...Documentary film not in a way it was understood by the soviet system, as documentation of some events. It will be more befitting to call it a spontaneous cinema, when a man goes out and films life as it is, unaware. He dreamed about it. You know, it is very strange, that there is so much written about Tarkovsky, probably around 4000 texts, including thick books, including the one written by yours truly...But he is still not figured out completely. There is still a lot to dig, and dig. It is a whole universe. Whole universe. And his place in history, in the history of art, not cinema, in the big history of art, is very unusual. It is sort of... It is very hard to identify this place. I identify it as relic avant-garde.
- 02.46.04- Relic avant-garde, meaning avant-garde which was reborn after some time. Like there
 02.47.30 are relics...We find shells which have...Or rather stones with fossils, fossils of ancient animals in stone, yes? So, he is a fossil of avant-garde which has died...Was during the beginning of the century and then died...It was reborn in him. Relic middle ages is...Actually this is not my idea it belongs to other people but I agree with it. That he is a man with a middle age perception/worldview. Perception of the middle ages reborn nowadays in all its exactness. Strange. Renaissance perception. Perception of period of reformation with its theosophical ideas...Absolutely. Jakob Böhme can fully be found there, and he read Jakob Böhme, he knew him very well. He also knew Swedenborg. In general he was a very strange man, he was very well educated, it is thought...It is believed that he was a sort of man of intuition, that he always invented something from somewhere, god knows where. And basically knew little, relying fully on his intuition, on some kind of imagination, on his dreams. Nothing of that sort. He was very well-read man. Very well-read.
- 02.47.31- Once I tried...Oh, I forgot about another meeting I had with him. I will tell you about it,
 02.48.20 about the third meeting. Very funny. But I once tried to complete an alphabetical index for all his works. I took all his works that I could get my hand on, his diary, his book *Sculpting in Time*, all his articles, and wrote down the names of people he has mentioned. For the alphabetical index. It was something amazing. There were a lot of names of philosophers. He read a lot. Böhme, Swedenborg, Ilyin, Florensky, Bulgakov everyone was there. He read more than any soviet film director. He actually knew the history of culture very well. And he went to libraries.
- 02.48.20- So, the third meeting that I forgot, but remembered now took place in the historical

- 02.49.55 library. I went there regularly when I was a student, and he went there too. And I saw him in the smoking room. The room for smoking was located, as a custom in all soviet institutions, next to the toilets. There were toilets for gents and ladies, and in front of them a big room where people gathered to smoke. I also smoked. So, I saw him running through the smoking room to the toilet. Oh, there, Tarkovsky running, Tarkovsky running. It is funny, I remember him. The important thing is that it happened in the smoking room of historical library which was visited scarcely. I can't recall any film directors who would go there, but he did. It is very important. I am a witness, I saw him there. It is very important, because it was a library for the elite. Everyone who worked with history of culture went through this library. It is serious. He knew history of culture and philosophy very well. I think he read Jung, though Jung was not published here (Soviet Russia). But there was a Russian language edition of Jung from 1938, which was published in Zürich in 4 volumes. He could very well have got his hands on it in the historical library, or in the library of his father. His father was a bibliophile. It is very important.
- 02.49.55-02.51.08 His father was one of the biggest bibliophiles in Moscow. He actually had two libraries. One of them disappeared during the war, and the second one he bought after the war. You could buy any book in the book stores in Moscow then. And it was such a good library that in miscellany....In the 70s a miscellany Bibliophil's Almanac was published. It was not a magazine but a series of books. Rather thick books. So, they had articles on the best private libraries in Moscow...Collections, book collections. And they had an article about the library of Arsenii Tarkovsky, his father. It was a remarkable library. Andrei Tarkovsky visited it, and could read those books. In the 60s in the book stores in Moscow you could buy any book, everything was sold for cents. So, I believe he bought books and read them. His personal library was not bad either. He was a very educated man. It was not simply a play of intuition, he was a man of actual knowledge. Everything is not as simple as it seems.
- 02.51.27 **In smoking room.**
- 02.52.10-02.52.38 I visited it every day, because it was our club. We were a art history department in the faculty of history. Historical library was like our home, we spend all our time there. But the fact that it was visited by a film director was unbelievable. He read there, firstly, when he was working on *Andrei Rublev*. He read books on the history of medieval Russia. He was also there when he was working on *Mirror* and *Solaris*.
- 02.52.41-02.54.16 Actually I remember, I saw *Andrei Rublev* sets in Suzdal. The construction that was used during the smelting of the bell. Do you remember in *Andrei Rublev* the smelting of the bell? There is a wooden construction. It was build in Suzdal where there are a lot of old Russian monasteries. I found myself there after the filming of *Anderi Rublev* was completed. We came to Suzdal to do sketches. We went there all the time to paint monasteries, like all young artists. I was enrolled in the art school then, or maybe I have completed it already. So we saw next to one of the monasteries all the lumber...The pit. We were told that *Andrei Rublev* was filmed here. We did not know about the film, it did not come out yet, we haven't even heard about it. So I remember this...Of course Tarkovsky was not there, there were no people there, just wooden lumber, and the construction for lifting the bell. And I saw it. Afterwards already as a grown man, many many decades later, I came there. And there was nothing. There is a small coffee shop now, there is not even a single sign saying - here the bell was smelted.

- 02.54.17-
02.55.38 What characterized the monastery next which the bell was smelted was that it has been a colony...Like a prison for young girls. Criminals. Colony for children, but specifically for girls. It was disbanded later. And these girls were taken out for a walk in a row. And they were walking passed us, watching how we sketched. I remember the sketch with the row of girls and the matron/female guard. Perhaps they have done something bad; they were not dissidents, but young criminals. They probably killed somebody, beat up somebody, killed...Or they were young prostitutes. They were not good girls. So, perhaps it was a good place. For it was not politics but a normal domestic...So to speak, domestic hooliganism, theft and so on. But they were rather cute. And so they were taken for a walk around the city, without guards or guns. There was only one guard with them, or a matron, I don't remember. Their crowd would walk around, would gather around me, look....Paining...They watched, we exchanged few words, and they continued on. They walked like this every day in Suzdal.
- 02.55.38-
02.56.51 After that...It is very funny how destiny throws everything together, connects. When the colony was closed, I and my friends were already in university, but one of my friends and course mates was studying at the Polygraph Institute. During Soviet times there was a custom to send university students for all sorts of works. To dig potatoes in kolhoz, to the constructions sites... I have worked on many construction sites with students, because we were send there. But his institute send him to the construction, disassembly of that monastery...Disassembly of what remained of the colony. He told me how he was lifting plank-beds the girls slept on, or rather floors, they slept in beds...Floors...And under the floor everything was stuffed with little notes. They exchanged little messages; there was a lot of interesting stuff. It does not have anything to do with the film, it is simply curious. The curious thing was that these girls were behind the wall next to which the bell was smelted, that is it. Katja, tell.
- 02.56.56 Of course, it is a full story.
- 02.57.10 Sketches...Crocs? Crocs? Essay, essay...sketches...little painting from nature...little paintings. Sketches, sketches!
- 02.57.40 How was it?...Prison, it was the prison for young girls. Not political but hooligans, robbers maybe, bad girls, bad girls...putains...but, but young, before 18. After 18 they were edute to the normal prison for the adult, adult. Before 18 years old they were in child, children colonies. Childrens prisons, this childrens prisons for young girls was in the monastery near it monastery was the place where this...Tarkovsky shooted this scene with... bell in English? Bell! Bell, bell. In the background of is the wall of this monastery. Very funny, very funny, very funny, very. And they were all in this place, I have seen this by my own eyes, yes. Very funny, very funny.
- 02.59.19 Yes, yes...So, so a little more than *War and Peace* yes?