

Copyright © 2025 by Cherkas Global University



Published in the USA  
Media Education (Mediaobrazovanie)  
Issued since 2005.  
ISSN 1994-4160  
E-ISSN 1994-4195  
2025. 21(4): 562-573

DOI: 10.13187/me.2025.4.562  
<https://me.cherkasgu.press>



## The Leningrad School of Cinema and the Second Generation of Auteur Filmmakers in Film Criticism

Roman Karpov <sup>a, \*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Russian Institute of Art History, Russian Federation

### Abstract

The article examines the interpretation of the concept of “the second generation of Russian author's cinema” and the definition of “the Leningrad school” by Russian film critics. The concept of the “Leningrad School of Cinema” from the period 1985-1999 is discussed in first review part of this article. These include such works as the film critic Sergei Dobrotvorskii's article (Dobrotvorskii, 1996), a series of review articles in the *Seans's* [Séance] encyclopedia (Arkus et al., 2023–2025), the collective monograph *Lenfil'm: A Time of Change* (1980–1990) (Il'chenko i dr., 2023), the twelfth issue of the magazine *Sovetskii ekran* [Soviet Screen] (Sovetskii ekran, 1989), and others.

The second part of the study analyzes the work of two directors of the new generation at that time: Sergei Ovcharov and Sergei Snezhkin, whose films are vivid examples of the search for new themes and a new cinematic style. This part attempts to define the main genres and stylistic markers of the studied object. In conclusion, the author notes that the role of historical and sociocultural factors should be taken into account to accurately define terms such as “author's cinema” and “creative direction”.

**Keywords:** Leningrad school, film studies, film criticism, Sergei Ovcharov, Sergei Snezhkin, auteur cinema, postmodernism

### 1. Introduction

The “Leningrad school” is understood as a number of directors who worked at Lenfil'm in the 1970s and 1980s – Il'ya Averbakh, Vladimir Bortko, Aleksei German, Semen Aranovich, Dinara Asanova (Dobrotvorskii, 1996), while in the works of film historians and critics one can find such definitions concerning the same names as “the second call”, “the second Neva wave” or simply “the second generation”.

The aim of this study is to understand how the terms “Leningrad School” and “Second Generation of the Leningrad School” emerged and changed. The objectives of the study also include providing examples of directors and their works, as well as compiling a summary of critical and film studies articles devoted to them. It is important to note that these terms came into film studies from film criticism, as described by Sergei Dobrotvorskii (1959–1997): “This term was proposed by Leningrad critics who grouped around the Lenfil'm studio and referred to the generation of directors whose major films appeared at the turn and beginning of the 1980s. ... The public thought of the mid-1980s, hungry for labels, picked up the definition, and soon the term ‘Leningrad school’ was fully fledged in both journalistic and film studies vocabulary” (Dobrotvorskii, 1996). Moreover,

\* Corresponding author  
E-mail addresses: [RK\\_A@mail.ru](mailto:RK_A@mail.ru) (R. Karpov)

there is no single film study devoted to this phenomenon of Russian art. Most of the works analyzing this period are film criticism presented in professional Russian journals.

## 2. Materials and methods

There is no single study about auteur cinema created by Lenfil'm directors, but a number of books have been published about such directors as Aleksei German, Aleksandr Sokurov, Il'ya Averbakh, Dinara Asanova, Semen Aranovich and articles have been published about the film process taking place at Lenfil'm in the years under study (Arkus, 1994; Arkus, 2020; Gladil'shchikov, 1998; Klepikov, 1993; Kopylova, 1987; Lavrent'eva, 1992; Lev'e, 1994; Pavlova, Pavlov, 1998; Savel'ev, 1991; Savel'ev, 1996). There are also studies about Soviet and post-Soviet film production and rental (Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2024; Kelly, 2021).

The main sources for our study will be Sergei Dobrotvorskii's article *Aleksei German i "leningradskaya shkola kino" – Novyi epos [Alexei German and the 'Leningrad school of cinema' – New Epic]* (Dobrotvorskii, 1996) and other articles by the film historian, the encyclopedia *Kino i kontekst. Ot Gorbacheva do Putina [Cinema and Context. From Gorbachev to Putin]* (Arkus et al., 2023–2025) in five volumes, the monograph *Lenfil'm: Time of Change (1980–1990)* (Il'chenko i dr., 2023), as well as articles from the magazines *Seans [Séance]*, *Iskusstvo kino [The Cinema Art Journal]*, *Sovetskii ekran [Soviet Screen]* and *Sovetskii fil'm [Soviet Film]*.

Object of study: Films whose directors belong to the second generation of auteur cinema at Lenfil'm.

Subject of study: Reflection in film criticism of methods, artistic techniques, value of the films shot in the period from 1985 to 1999 and the use of the term “second generation of auteur cinema”.

Research methods: comparative analysis, classification, comparison, analogy, historical-comparative method.

## 3. Discussion

The value system of films made at the Lenfilm studio is rightly called a “school.” For the development and establishment of cinema, continuity between generations and the training of the next generation by the previous one is essential. This continuity is also important for the “Leningrad school of cinema.” However, the question of the existence of this school and whether the directors of the “second generation of the school” learned anything from their mentors and older colleagues remains open. As we have already said there is no single study about auteur cinema created by Lenfil'm but there are some studies similar in subject or direction.

There are studies that trace the influence of Western entertainment films on Soviet film criticism (Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2024). There is a study of the cinema of the Brezhnev era (Kelly, 2021; Shields, 2022). We can read also research of Soviet Industrial Film in article by Maria Vinogradova (Vinogradova, 2024). Can be found studies about film adaptations (Il'nytzkyj, 2009). Some studies examine the impact of Leningrad cinema on society (Bekus, 2021). It is also possible to refer to interviews with those who were directly involved in the development of cinema in the 1990s (for example: Nam, Konchalovsky, 2021 or O'Donoghue, Serebrennikov, 2022).

Sergey Dobrotvorskii's article *Leningrad Cinema: Evolution of the Author's Tradition* (Dobrotvorskii, 1996) is devoted to the phenomenon of the “Leningrad school” of cinema and its modification in the late 80s and early 90s of the last century. The author points out that the Leningrad school, first of all, is connected with the worldview principles of the authors, not with their artistic method: “Thus, the true typological feature of the ‘school’ was formed not only and not so much in the artistic as in the worldview sphere. In the sphere that identifies the aesthetic and ethical principles and brings the individual author's position to the level of collective morality, making it universally significant and generally binding” (Dobrotvorskii, 2016).

Dobrotvorskii also speaks of two components of the “school” of the first generation and calls them “Kammerspiele” and “new epic”. The first includes “the cinema of moral restlessness” (Asanova, Averbach); the second generation is associated primarily with the name of A. German. The film historian also notes that, strictly speaking, it is impossible to call this phenomenon in cinema a “school”, because a school implies a unified style and form, while the authors in question had a distinct individualism: “It is clear that there was no school as such, which implies thematic unity, stylistic uniformity and a cross-cutting structure of both formal and substantive analogies in Leningrad. It is more appropriate to speak of a certain socio-psychological commonality and

worldview position, of a 'big style', acquired not so much through artistic as through ethical dominance" (Dobrotvorskii, 2016).

Nevertheless, Dobrotvorskii tries to trace the evolution of this "school" during the emergence of the "second wave". The author answers the question: how did the ideas of the older generation change in their followers. Here is what the film scholar writes about German and his followers: "The signification of reality in the forms of cinematic reality itself turned out for German's followers to be a loss of form and a weakening of figurative intonation. The ultimate expression of this tendency was in A. Rogozhkin's *The Chekist* (1991) – from the first to the last frame on the screen there are gunshots, blood is pouring out, shot people are falling against the wall... Probably, according to the director's idea, the image of a horrible conveyor belt of death is impressively self-sufficient, structure and logic are found in the absence of structure and logic of mass destruction. However, the shock effect of co-presence at the executions in the Cheka's cellars, an effect that is the only structural component of the movie, very soon turns into the opposite and takes revenge on the author" (Dobrotvorskii, 2016). And here is how the scholar compares the cinematography of Sokurov and his followers: "While in Sokurov's film the sound background enters into a complex and sophisticated counterpoint with the visual series and, without detaching from the photographic nature of the image, creates the effect of authorial presence, in Sokurov's followers the authorial vertical is mainly declared" (Dobrotvorskii, 2016).

Two tendencies of the second generation, highlighted by the author of the article, are also important for our study: "The first of them is a statement of the hopelessness of common life, a voluptuous swarming in the physiological layer. The zone, the brothel, the sober house, the barracks and the communal kitchen at the same time claimed to be the sad symbolism of the Soviet reality, and thus allowed us to stay afloat.

The second, no less common motive is the end of the world, the universal exodus. Ecological, moral, social, but again inevitable for all, giving the right to preach universalisms and impersonal truths" (Dobrotvorskii, 2016).

There are also some studies dedicated to problem of family and education (Mikhaleva, Chelysheva, 2024; Skorova, Suvorova, 2021), which will be important for a thorough analysis of the family's disintegration in the paintings being studied and for analyzing the moral decline of society in them.

These thoughts are also valid for the first generation of author's cinema directors at Lenfil'm, but with the beginning of perestroika, the theme of family in films began to be viewed as something destroyed and lost. We will explore this later in the examples of Sergei Ovcharov's film *The Orchard* (2008) and Sergei Snezhkin's film *Marigolds in Flower* (1998).

Victoria Baltag's study *Humour in Film as a Method of Expression* perfectly describes Sergei Ovcharov's method, which will be discussed further below. It can also be noted here that comedies became increasingly rare during the period under study, which raises the issue of humor as one of the main problems. Although the study is largely devoted to humor in films of the interwar period, it contains several theoretical propositions concerning the psychology of art and the relationship between humor and cinema (Baltag, 2021).

Encyclopedia *Kino i kontekst. Ot Gorbacheva do Putina [Cinema and Context. From Gorbachev to Putin]* by the magazine *Seans [Séance]* is a collection of articles by several authors edited by Lyubov Arkus (Arkus et al., 2023–2025). The book is a chronicle of events surrounding film production and film perception. It is noteworthy that the authors, according to the title, take into account the context of film events, which makes it easy to trace the historical development of the processes. We are interested only in those fragments of the book that are relevant to our topic.

Summarizing the results of 1986 (the chapters in the book correspond to one year in the life of the country), in a text analyzing the work of Leningrad directors, Arkus singles out the loudest names of the year: "German, Sokurov, and Muratova absolutely overshadow the new cinema. Especially since the lion's share of it is made up of a swathe of 'gray films', which was a consequence of the tightening of planning from the mid-1970s, and this 'legacy' was passed on to the beginning of perestroika" (Arkus et al., 2023–2025).

Analyzing the films of the First and Experimental Film Studio (PEEF) and the cinema of 1989 in general, the authors of the book pay attention to the fact that the young generation at Lenfil'm does not inherit the traditions and forms of the older one. At the same time, the individual view of the authors and their adherence to a common worldview are also noted by the Arkus team: "This year's cinematic life resembles a patchwork quilt: first of all, we are talking about the aesthetics of

the films released. In the past, they could be grouped by genre, style, direction. Now, with few exceptions, all films – are ‘auteur films’, and their aesthetics have absolutely no style commonality: Sergei Ovcharov's caustic, inventive satire on post-reform Russia – *It*; Sergei Soloviev's carnival, extravaganza, glum, masquerade – *Black Rose emblem of sorrow*, as funny as it is scary upon further reflection; Sergei Selianov's rediscovered (once underground) *Day of the Angel* with its unprecedented poetics, not to mention Alexander Sokurov's monumental auteur film *Save and Preserve*, – all these films represent authors only, they do not inherit anything from Soviet cinema, and they do not inherit anything” (Arkus et al., 2023–2025). Note that most of the names mentioned are again – directors whose work is attributed to the “Leningrad school”.

The authors of the book also point out the problems of the division of cinema in the 1990s into two opposing camps – cinema that does not take into account the viewer's opinion and cinema that is made for the viewer. Here are two quotes: “*Spiritual Voices* (directed by A. Sokurov) is made without any regard for the viewer and without a single indulgence for him, but there are also directors who still try to tell ‘viewer's’ stories” (Arkus et al., 2023–2025) and “The second breakthrough event of the year – film *Peculiarities of National Hunting* by Alexander Rogozhkin. Or rather, not the movie itself, but the audience's perception of it. This is the first national picture identified by the mass audience as ‘their own’: there is no doubt that if cinemas had already been operating in 1995, it would have gathered full halls, while in the meantime it is promised to be a huge success in video distribution” (Arkus et al., 2023–2025). Note an interesting feature of this division and specifically of these two examples. It is Lenfil'm and St. Petersburg cinema that clearly demonstrates this division. After all, both *Spiritual Voices* and *Peculiarities* were made at the same studio. These are obvious signs of the disintegration of the unified film process into genre and auteur cinema, which began much earlier – in the 1970s.

The book did not ignore Alexei Balabanov's *The Brother*, legitimately claiming that Danila Bagrov (Sergei Bodrov Jr.) “has been identified and accepted as a folk hero” (Arkus et al., 2023–2025).

In the collective monograph *Lenfil'm: vremya peremen (1980-1990) [Lenfil'm: time of changes (1980–1990)]* by Sergei Il'chenko, Aleksandr Pozdnyakov and Vitalii Poznin (Il'chenko i dr., 2023) explore a turning point in the life of the Lenfil'm film studio. Perestroika and the introduction of the “basic model of film production” – is what separates the first, somehow recognized “Leningrad school” from the second, about which opinions differ. Here is what S. Il'chenko writes about the subject matter of the films of the first half of the 1980s: “Directors of different personalities coexisted at the studio as a whole and in creative associations (not for nothing could directors shoot their films in different associations), but the very atmosphere that reigned at Lenfil'm in those years made creative workers make maximum efforts to create a film at a high artistic level. Striving to find new aesthetic forms, to create expressive images that affect the emotions of the audience, and to counteract officialism and falsity was always a priority here. This was the distinctive feature of that phenomenon of Soviet cinematography, which would later be called the ‘Leningrad school’” (Il'chenko i dr., 2023). And here is what the art historian writes, speaking about the second half of the 80s: “Of course, the powerful moral and aesthetic authority of the so-called “Leningrad school” gave some creative indulgence for the search for new forms and experiments. But it was the objective circumstances of the studio's life, connected primarily with the premature departure of Dinara Asanova and Il'ya Averbakh, that pushed the line of ‘films of moral concern’ to the thematic margins. The studio's plans for films of this category nevertheless did appear during these years. But those who followed the masters of the older and middle generation into the cinematic art still tried to be in no way like them. Hence the intense and partly fragmented desire of each of the young to search for their own themes, their own characters, their own style, and having found it, to develop it further” (Il'chenko i dr., 2023).

The shift in the aesthetic and ethical paradigm noted by our colleague would continue to develop in the 1990s. The question of whether new films belong to the “Leningrad School” was raised by scholars in the late 1980s. Vitalii Poznin writes: “The aesthetic paradigm of the new cinema is the creation on the screen of a world dominated by gloomy, dreary tones, where there is no room for hope, smiles, and light. The famous ‘Leningrad school’ of cinema, characterized by attention to the human being, his psychology, and the creation of a special, soulful atmosphere of everyday life, in the late 1980s is a thing of the past. A new generation of screenwriters and directors is beginning to master a different style, to convey a different perception of the world in screen images” (Il'chenko i dr., 2023).



Maya Turovskaya in the article *Mechty idiotov [Dreams of idiots]* deduces a certain list of taboos of the Soviet time, which is violated by the cinematography of the new era: “1) reference to the leader in various sotsartist variants; 2) nudity, sometimes sexual intercourse; 3) odious vocabulary; 4) the moment of violence, cruelty; 5) the presence of morons, freaks— any deviations from the norm; 6) integration of kitsch, bad taste into avant-garde aesthetics; 7) religious symbolism (most often the crucifixion pose)” (Turovskaya, 1993).

The directors of the “New Wave” broke established taboos. They attempted to change the language, ideology, and themes of cinema. Breaking taboos became a key feature of their style. They were rebels. Nevertheless, the use of such techniques must be justified by artistic intent, not political ambitions. Directors of “gray films” rushed to denounce and “allow”, while directors of auteur cinema used the resulting freedom to improve the quality of the artistic image. For example, K. Lopushansky, reflecting on where and why the country found itself in the perestroika era, depicts a world of brutal, ugly mutants in *The Museum Visitor* (1989), because it is impossible to talk about what is happening in the country at this time in any other language.

In the same article, the film historian notes that the new aesthetic is close to the spirit of Romanticism: “If the aggregate screen of the 60's, which to many now appears to be naively idyllic rose-colored glasses, then on the threshold of the market glimmers a cool Romanticism. Recall that Romanticism was an extension of experience into the realm of the irrational, of romantic irony; that it had an interest in folk roots and folkloric themes; that it was committed to the rhetoric of passion, the pathos of the ugly, the aesthetics of exaggeration” (Turovskaya, 1993).

In the article “*Global'noe kino*” *Petrogradskoi storony* [*“Global Cinema” of the Petrograd side*] Tatiyana Moskvina tries to understand the reasons for the failure of Leningrad films at the box office (Moskvina, 1990). As Moskvina herself admits, her analysis is subjective, but it is thanks to this article that one of the most important techniques of the new era can be formulated. This technique is summarized in the title and repeated by the critic – globalism. In Moskvina's opinion, it is necessary for artists to worry about the whole of humanity: “Shooting for a pittance on terrible film with blue-green reflections and deep scratches, earning heart attacks, here they suffer for humanity, for Russia, for the soul, for nature, for civilization” (Moskvina, 1990).

After ranting about all the analyzed films, the film critic comes to an interesting conclusion for us: “Man has been forgotten.... Our ‘global cinema’ is all about man, even in defense of him. But man is neglected there, a small cog in grandiose constructions. I would have nothing against ‘global cinema’ – okay, a dish among other dishes – but it is supernaturally infectious and strives to conquer as much space as possible” (Moskvina, 1990). Thus, Moskvina emphasizes the Perestroika directors' departure from the main feature of the “Leningrad school” – attention to the human being. “Vitalii Kanevsky's first film, *Freeze Die Come to Life* (1989), a modest and sad story about a boy from the Far Eastern town of Suchan, recently premiered. In that sad, careful attention to the man that this film shows, in my opinion, more points of contact with the traditions of the ‘Leningrad school’ than in the dead expressiveness of other ‘global’ our pictures” writes the critic (Moskvina, 1990).

The twelfth issue 1989 of *Sovetskii ekran* [*Soviet Screen*] (Sovetskii ekran, 1989) is devoted to the cinema of Leningrad. In this issue we will find several important texts about the “Leningrad school”. The text of editor Yurii Pavlov *Ne mogu postupit'sya printsipami! [I can't compromise my principles!]*, ironically repeating the title of Nina Andreeva's famous letter to the newspaper *Soviet Russia*, introduces the reader to the compositional principle of the issue – Leningraders about Leningrad cinema. “The inhabitants of the city on the Neva have a special ‘complex’, born not in Leningrad, but introduced from outside: we are ‘the first sort, forever selling at the price of the second’. It does not depend neither on profession, nor on age, nor on any other ‘secondary characteristics’. Although to be honest, something is determined here by the character of the city, its nature, which surprisingly combines two mutually exclusive beginnings, two extremes: orthodox conservatism and ineradicable spirit of freethinking. And, perhaps, it is in the struggle of these extremes that that special, unique, perhaps, phenomenon is born – “Leningradism” (Pavlov, 1989) – film critic, speaking not just about the phenomenon of “Leningradism” in cinema, but bringing this concept to a universal level.

Thus, S. Ovcharov in his film *It* (1989) refers to Russian classical literature, to M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin's novel *The Story of One City*. The appeal of directors of the “Leningrad school” to the Russian classics in the late 1980s – is an attempt to comprehend the cultural heritage of the XIX century, to create a screen embodiment of important, key images for the Russian

consciousness, to translate the language of literature into the language of cinematography. In the novel *The Story of One City* Ovcharov was interested in satirical portrayal of Russian history: stupid, limited monarchs – on the one hand, and tortured, tormented, willless people – on the other. S. Ovcharov reinterprets these traditional, in a way, for Russian culture reflections on monarchy and the people, dating back to Pushkin's (and importantly for Saltykov-Shchedrin's) times, as a bold innovator. To emphasize the cyclical, endlessly repeated, even annoying nature of history, the director uses experimental music by Sergei Kurekhin so that the viewer can hear the rattle and howl of time, the intrusive leitmotif of an era from which there is no escape. Ovcharov turns to the genre of the parable, peculiar to classical literature; however, in the cinematography of the late 1980s and early 90s – this is certainly an innovative technique.

Another article in the journal is devoted to the relationship between films about rock and punk subcultures and their music. Aleksandr Pozdnyakov's *Nevskaya volna protiv damby zastoya* [*Nevskaya wave vs dam of stagnation*] describes the frame aesthetics of Rashid Nugmanov's film "Ya-Kha", which, in our opinion, is applicable to the aesthetics of Leningrad films of the 90s in general: "St. Petersburg firewalls, courtyards that look like the ruins of Hiroshima, garbage cans, by which one can only guess that the courtyards are inhabited. Mike, a sinister man in glasses – fist kicking down doors, climbing the stairs of an abandoned house, saying a cherished three-letter word in front of a mirror and smashing his reflection with his fist" (Pozdnyakov, 1989).

Yuri Pavlov (1950–2016), as editor-in-chief of the First and Experimental Film Workshop, writes an article in the issue devoted to the workshop itself, asking what will happen to the new generation of filmmakers in a capitalist economy: "After all, [referring to the difficulty of repaying the bank] the First Film Workshop cannot guarantee the emergence of competitive, cost-recovering and profitable films. Its main goal – is to discover new artistic individualities, to create conditions for free experimentation, and, as we know, experiments are not always profitable. Nowadays the word 'sponsor' has become very fashionable and the other word 'patron' is almost completely forgotten. Maybe because for a long time the state played this role. Today, under the conditions of self-financing, it is time to return to 'patronage', thanks to which art has existed and developed for centuries. I would like to believe that our workshop will have its own patrons" (Pavlov, 1989). Thus, the film historian raises the acute problem of the self-financing method and the influence of the economic factor on the artistic process. Can the "Leningrad school" continue, when its authors have to think about money, estimates and distribution instead of solving artistic problems?

Other works dealing with individual films or personalities in cinema are also of scholarly interest as a source in a periodical.

The article *Coma* by the well-known film critic and film historian M. Trofimenkov (Trofimenkov, 2010) is interesting to us not only because it belongs to the first issue of the St. Petersburg magazine *Seans* [*Séance*] (we will refer to the new edition of the article), but also because it shows the process of evolution of the "Leningrad school" in the late 1980s on the example of one film. Thus, the film historian writes: "The Leningrad school is rapidly going into circulation: A. German's authorial findings are turned into the canon of a new genre, which in *Coma* has a strong flavor of melodrama (the prisoner for the sake of saving the child signs a statement on his father-guard, and the other cons, having learned about it, throw her out into the cold). The techniques that gave reason to talk about the unprecedented 'authenticity' of the historical atmosphere are also going out of circulation. Now, apparently, the supposedly spontaneous, dirty phonogram, with the obligatory scraps of radio programs, is considered a powerful means of authenticity" (Trofimenkov, 2010). The film critic analyzes how German's polyphony is reduced to a mere "throw-on" soundtrack in Niyole Adomenaitė and Boris Gorlov's film. Another obligatory technique of the period's aesthetics, according to the critic, is the piling up of symbols: "The illustration of commonplaces is not related to the nature of cinema and is designed to familiarize viewers with truths extracted from other means of communication. For example: the opera's wife is portrayed by Lyubov Orlova. Moral: the false optimism of Stalinist art condoned terror. ... Everything is correct, but this is not a movie, but... socialist realism. Let me remind you that in A. German's episodic characters are in no way decipherable, they are beyond didacticism, beyond morality and that is why they are woven into a frightening cinematic image" (Trofimenkov, 2010). Critic considers programmatic and ideologized *Coma* as a big mistake.

Oleg Kovalov devotes his article *Kino Leningrada ili leningradskoe kino?* [*Cinema of Leningrad or Leningrad cinema?*] (Kovalov, 2016) to the subject of Leningrad cinema. Since the author reproduces mainly only his own impressions of the entire history of Lenfil'm cinema, we are

primarily interested in the film critic's attitude to Leningrad cinema in general and his statements about the "Leningrad school" in the 1990s. O. Kovalov writes about "Lenfil'm" cinema as follows: "The Leningrad school – if we can call it that – did not emerge overnight. It was formed over decades. Leningrad historical cinema came out – as from Gogol's Overcoat – from the films of EAF (The Eccentric Actor's Factory) from twenties. It was a special kind of historicism – akin to bizarre hallucinations, elusive night visions, lunar dreams... It was St. Petersburg historicism. The EAF were restoring the lost traditions of Silver Age culture – something that the iron epoch of the twenties had tried to forget. It was a real takeoff of the Soviet historical film avant-garde. And it can only be compared to the rise of the seventies and early eighties, when, as if in defiance of the harsh timelessness appeared films by Alexei German, Semyon Aranovich... It had the effect of a bomb exploding. It was then that the phenomenon of Leningrad cinema was first talked about. It was a revival of the traditions of the twenties, which was possible only because the traditions were alive – both in the thirties and forties" (Kovalov, 2016).

The film critic makes another important observation for us in the article's conclusions: "What is the Leningrad cinema of the nineties? Does it exist? A lot of things are disturbing today. The appearance of vulgar films is alarming – Lenfil'm never allowed itself to do this before. That's why it had a reputation as the most intelligent studio in the country... Of course, there is A. Sokurov's unique cinematography. There are directors with whom Leningrad cinema can pin its hopes – Valery Ogorodnikov, Sergei Ovcharov, Igor Alimpiev... The necrorealist Evgenii Yufit, who resurrects the search for the absurdist cinema of the thirties... But we cannot speak of a unified school of Leningrad cinema of the nineties. There is no single school. Perhaps a distance is needed to understand something" (Kovalov, 2016).

### 3. Results

As we said in the introduction, many books and works are devoted not to the term "Leningrad School" but to specific directors and authors. Two names have been chosen for a more detailed analysis: Sergei Mikhailovich Ovcharov and Sergei Olegovich Snezhkin. Both directors were considered the "second generation of the Leningrad school" in the 1990s. In the 2000s, Ovcharov focused exclusively on auteur cinema and began working as a university lecturer. Snezhkin concentrated on genre films.

Did film critics consider Ovcharov and Snezhkin to be continuators of the "Leningrad school of cinema"? Can they be called the "second generation"? Today, we can clearly trace the aspect of media education that existed at Lenfilm in those years and point to the techniques and methods that were passed down from generation to generation of directors, but was this media education already noticeable in the 1980s and 1990s, or is this aspect only noticeable with the passage of time? We decided to trace in detail what film historians and film critics wrote about these two authors on the pages of the St. Petersburg film magazine *Seans* [Séance].

The attitude of the authors of the articles to the new aesthetics and ethics of the 1990s, which is reflected in the work of Lenfil'm directors of this period, is one of the central issues of film criticism. Inna Tkachenko writes about S. Ovcharov's worldview: "The author of *Barabaniada* is no longer concerned about the fate of the people who have fallen of their own free will from God-bearers to cuckolds. Ovcharov does not even try to give the image of his hero type features – like Bobyl, in which without problems and contradictions coexisted Icarus and Debil [Fool]. The characters of *Barabaniada* have that undoubted nationality, which requires a police registration, but they do not symbolize anything and are not responsible for anyone's ancestral sins" (Tkachenko, 2006). Tkachenko notes the lack of metaphor in the characters of the movie *Barabaniada* (1993, directed by S. Ovcharov). Time really does not dispose to symbolization and metaphor: freedom of speech, freedom of creativity, freedom of expression and, as a result – freedom from subtext. However, Sergei Ovcharov is simply creating a different subtext – subtext of the doom of the people and laughter from despair. "It's not funny anymore" as if the heroes of *Barabaniada* can say. The hero of another movie, a dissident (Viktor Aristov) in the movie *The Man Who Doesn't Return* (1991, directed by S. Snezhkin) is also devoid of subtext. Except that he is not indifferent to the people, but hates them terribly. Here's how Oleg Kovalov describes him: "He is not an ally of Korneev, and not only because of his long-standing betrayal of human rights activists, but because he sleeps and sees how the hated state is crumbling into tatters, along with its support, the obedient common people, the 'God-bearing people', that's what I mean! A fanatic that, without sparing himself, will not spare others... aligning himself with his enemies" (Kovalov, 2010).



Indeed, the cinematography of the 1990s is characterized by hatred of the past, but Aristov's character, in our opinion, is secondary to the film and it is wrong to consider his attitude to the people as fundamental to the idea of the film.

We also disagree with Tatiana Moskvina, who writes, regarding the same movie by Snezhkin: "Is it unseemly to have an affair with a sensible and healthy person? Not inspiring? Is it dangerously close to the recommendations of socialist realism?" (Moskvina, 2010). More recently, she also wrote about Sergei Ovcharov's *Barabaniada* and praised it for its humor and cheerfulness: "Ovcharov's attachment to Russian history and Russian humor is devoid of any aggression, and the sense of the national is not accompanied by morbid passion" (Moskvina, 2006). "Healthy" and "morbid" conflict with each other in the films of the era. Is it normal to be crazy in a crazy world? And poor in a poor world? And rich in a poor world? Judging by the films of Ovcharov and Snezhkin, in this era the answer to all questions is "yes". "Painful" attitude to the world is reflected in other paintings of this period. The heroes of the film *Daddy, Grandfather Frost Died* (1991, directed by E. Yufit) belong to a sect of murderers, the hero of the film *Happy Days* (1991, directed by A. Balabanov) is always showing everyone his head, the hero of the film *Khrustalyov, the car!* (1998, directed by A. German) – a drunkard ... The series can go on and on.

Film critic Natalia Ozerova emphasizes another feature peculiar to the cinematography of the "second generation of the Leningrad school": "The compressed space of action is expanded in the narrative by reminiscences of various kinds. The stereotypes fixed in our consciousness allow Ovcharov to 'translate' the decayed pages of the chronicle into other material – this is the style of the newsreel *News of the Day!* Here is the easily recognizable style of the films of Eisenstein, Medvedkin, Norstein, Klimov! Surprisingly but the effect is authentic: somehow you believe that if it was shot long ago, and the film is old, and everything is barely visible, then it is exactly as it was, even if the tape is not a documentary, but fiction" (Ozerova, 2010). Experimentation with form and stylization become almost the main technique of auteur cinema. What can accurately separate genre cinema from auteur cinema is – experimentation. Genre, commercial cinema is not ready for experimentation in principle. It does not need this technique; on the contrary, it needs to use established techniques as precisely and simply as possible.

Another important thing is the relevance and importance of the topic. Thus, Snezhkin's movie about the putsch hit the spot. But opinions differ about the predictive aspect of the movie. According to Olga Shervud's recollections, the crew was afraid not to keep up with the story: "Feature film is a slow business: 'We'll probably be late' the cameraman Vladimir Burykin told me" (Shervud, 2010). The film criticism, on the contrary, considered the movie visionary: "In the final scene, the rumble of the overthrown Pushkin monument rumbled through the night city, as if putting a bold point in the book of our fates; the TV screen was covered with clouds, plunging us into the unknown. The movie became stereoscopic – we were really inside it..." (Kovalov, 2010).

Another critic – T. Moskvina even reproaches the picture for this predictability: "In the finale of S. Snezhkin's film *The Man Who Doesn't Return* (shown on TV on the evening of August 20), a crowd of obscurantists raze a monument to Pushkin to the ground and, as we know, Pushkin and humanism are the same face. In the finale of the August three-day action movie, filmed by life by its own order, a completely different monument, a monument to cannibalism was felled. I willingly believe that Sergei Snezhkin dreamed of such an outcome but he embodied only his dreary fears in no less dreary forms" (Moskvina, 2010). It is necessary, however, to clarify the difference between the foresight of auteur cinema and the relevance of genre cinema. Snezhkin's film is an understandable, topical movie, not lacking in artistic content. Whereas Ovcharov's films contain a visionary aspect. Natalia Ozerova also writes about a prediction in Sergei Ovcharov's movie *It*: "Slowly the camera rises higher and higher and higher! The steel bird – a new incarnation of the Tower of Babel – turns out to be a watchtower of a new formation. It [in Russian: Оно (Ono)] (UFO?) is approaching a menacing apocalypse that threatens to destroy time itself. "Memento mori" (Ozerova, 2010). It should be said that the movie was released in 1989, right before the beginning of the difficult 90s for many families, which allows us to speak about the metaphor of the desolation that *It* brings with.

Toward the end of the period under study, another film by Sergei Snezhkin, *Marigolds in Flower* (1998, directed by S. Snezhkin), was released. The director moves from the eschatological theme to the theme of the family and its destruction. Deconstruction is also one of the most important aspects of the art of this era. What can represent this idea better than the strife within a family of 5 women and 2 men? Here is how ironically Lidia Maslova writes about the plot: "Trying



to consider the problem of 'woman and her real estate' from different sides, Snezhkin as if cloned Ranevskaya in five copies of different ages and colors, but of the same hysterically egoistic temperament. In a bathhouse heated with stolen wood, Ranevskaya-4 persuades Ranevskaya-3 and Ranevskaya-5 to get rid of Ranevskaya-1 and share the profits from the sale of the house. Ranevskaya-2 dislikes Ranevskaya-3 because her former lover has gone to her. Four younger clones make periodic friendly raids on Ranevskaya-1, trying to get to the city and formalize the ill-fated gift of the house. And having caught her, they dress up in precious costumes of museum beauty and make a show for grandmother, inevitably ending in quarrels, hysterics, and strokes" (Maslova, 2011). The problem of feminism is also raised in this movie and is also important for this period of cinema. The author explores it not within the framework of the "Leningrad school", in which the heroine would necessarily be alone, with a complicated fate and moral torment (such a film, however, exists *Hardly the First Hundred Years*, 1988, directed by V. Aristov), but within the framework of "experimental" cinema.

Chekhov's motifs sound ironic, even mocking, in Snezhkin. Parody and play as important postmodernist concepts of course become one of the form forming concepts in the films of the 90s as well. But, as already noted by the critic, parody is not so essential in the "Leningrad" school. This is most likely due to the fact that even a director of a genre film can and does make an auteur film.

Let's say a little more about the sound design of the 90's films, because when talking about the "second generation" they often refer to a special phonogram. Sound in movies is an important part of the creative process. The hero of our study (S. Ovcharov) says: "Sound for me is of great importance. If I had not been a movie director, I would probably have become a sound engineer. Near my music school, in Maikop, there was a movie theater. It was hot, all the shutters were open in the school, and in the theater the projectionist's booth was always open. Instead of my scales, I heard only the phonograms of movies. And I fell in love with cinema by listening to movies I couldn't get to" (Vasil'eva, 2012). Sound in 90s cinema is also being experimented with. Directors of auteur cinema are looking for new ways of expression, stylization, and technical possibilities that allow almost endless possibilities. Nikita Eliseev sees the problem of *The Orchard* (2008, directed by S. Ovcharov) in the same sound: "We can formulate precisely what the main reason for the failure of Ovcharov's *The Orchard* is. Sergei Ovcharov is a master of silent, wordless movie. Words to him are not that superfluous. Words hinder him. His best films are fundamentally wordless" (Eliseev, 2010). It is impossible to agree with the critic, knowing how precisely and interestingly Ovcharov works on the film's soundtrack. Words are not the only thing that makes up the sound content of a movie.

Sergei Ovcharov was a little late with the theme of "selling the motherland". Only in 2008 he will release the movie *The Orchard* based on Anton Pavlovich Chekhov's story *The Cherry Orchard*. However, *The Orchard* Ovcharov as if to complete the era of the 90s and opens a new 2000s. The movie was sold to producers and those, like a true Lopakhin, from dirt to princes, began to perch, break into plots, cut down trees. In addition to the theme, remarkable in Ovcharov's film is the use of theatrical and silent film stylistics. Veronika Khlebnikova writes about these techniques: "Behind the stunts, and gags, and 'silly stomping' in the film there is a clear need to break away from the routine view of Russian history through the elegies of cherry blossoms and the anguish of the intelligentsia, to break away from the past, where admiration for underdogs and infantile passion for authority are dangerously mixed up. Ovcharov's *The Orchard* unobtrusively helps to delve a little more consciously into the present time, poisoned by the memory of phantom greatness and poorly digested literary and journalistic templates" (Khlebnikova, 2010). "The closing film" could be labeled Ovcharov's cinematography. The era of experimentation, free (sometimes too free) creativity and destruction is gone, and a new one has arrived, about which future researchers have yet to write.

Let's finish the research of the two directors with the answer of the one who was able to adapt to the producer's reality Sergei Snezhkin (in interview to N. Pakhomova) to the question "Which system answers the time?": "The producer system. The director comes to the producer and enters into a contract as an equal partner. I want to go to a firm, not to a small feudal appanage, which is what the association is now" (Pakhomova, 2010). It should be noted, however, that the director insisted in the same interview on state support for children's and documentary films, realizing that without laws protecting domestic production, the country's cinema would be lost.

## 5. Conclusion

To summarize the above, we can note the following aspects of the Leningrad school of cinema, as noted by film critics and scholars: *“painful” perception (dating back to Dostoevsky's novels); metaphoricality; expressionism and romanticism; doubt; intimacy; foresight; closeness to the hero; the image of the city from its non-parade side; reference to Russian culture; individualism; readiness to experiment.*

On the other hand, second-generation directors are developing their own directions, unrelated to the school: *the end of the world and eschatology; he sale of the homeland; parody and grotesque; deconstruction; feminism; relevance; indifference.*

The question of the term “Leningrad school” (not only about its appearance and development in the history of science, but also about its boundaries) is still before scientists. Many film scholars point out that the term has no precise and unambiguous definition, and those who accept it tend to speak of an attitudinal phenomenon rather than a formal one. When it comes to the films of the late 80s and early 90s, scholars contrast them with the “Leningrad school” saying that the minimalism and attention to the human being is replaced by simulacra and a tearful attempt to present the human being in a new cruel world. There are also those who, on the contrary, try to comprehend the new style, but they also separate it from the “Leningrad school”.

The term “Leningrad school” can be understood in two ways: as a formal method or as a philosophical tradition. In the first case, it is a set of principles that have not yet been fully established; in the second, it is an ontological or existential aesthetic paradigm.

It is important to note that since the late 1980s, two main approaches to the interpretation of reality have dominated at Lenfil'm pessimistic view of the country's past and present and experimental search for new cinematic forms.

When using the term “Leningrad school” it is still advisable to keep in mind that only in the present time the distance between the phenomenon under study and the scholarly community is not so small, but at the same time not so great either. It is already possible to talk about the time limiting the phenomenon designated by this term, about its limits, it is possible to compare motion pictures, in one way or another, with this or that degree of appropriateness, correlated or connected with the term “Leningrad school” with others, the intonation of which is strikingly different from the phenomenon under study. At the same time, despite the innovation of contemporary cinematography, we still observe how the tradition of the “Leningrad school” is refracted both in the films of the 2000s and in contemporary films. In addition to all this, we should add that a number of directors have educated a new generation of students who, despite everything, inherit the masters; the film workshops of Ovcharov, Lopushansky, and Sokurov still exist today; film education, as the most important feature of the ethical paradigm of the “Leningrad school” continues. This allows us to consider the phenomenon designated by this term as somewhat established, but at the same time alive and evolving.

## References

- Arkus et al., 2023–2025 – Arkus, L. (2023–2025). Kino i kontekst. Ot Gorbacheva do Putina [Kino i kontekst. Ot Gorbacheva do Putina [Cinema and Context. From Gorbachev to Putin]. *Séance*. [in Russian]
- Arkus, 1994 – Arkus, L. (1994). Sokurov. *Séance*. [in Russian]
- Arkus, 2020 – Arkus, L. (2020). A. German. *Séance*. [in Russian]
- Baltag, 2021 – Baltag, V. (2021). Humour in film as a method of expression. *Galactica Media: Journal of Media Studies*. 3. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://galacticamedia.com/index.php/gmd/article/view/205/136>
- Bekus, 2021 – Bekus, N. (2021). Echo of 1989? Protest imaginaries and identity dilemmas in Belarus. *Slavic Review*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27059922>
- Dobrotvorskii, 1996 – Dobrotvorskii, S.N. (1996). Aleksei German i “leningradskaya shkola kino” – Novyi epos [Alexei German and the ‘Leningrad school of cinema’ – New Epic]. *Chapaev*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://chapaev.media/articles/3723#footnote-2> [in Russian]
- Dobrotvorskii, 2016 – Dobrotvorskii, S.N. (2016). Leningradskoe kino: evolyutsiya avtorskoi traditsii [Leningrad cinema: the evolution of the author's tradition]. *Istochnik nevozmozhnogo, Séance*. Pp. 540-559. [in Russian]
- Eliseev, 2010 – Eliseev, N. (2010). Neudavshiysya eksperiment [Failed experiment]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/neudavshiysya-eksperiment/> [in Russian]

- Fedorov, Levitskaya, 2024 – Fedorov, A., Levitskaya, A. (2024). Western Cinema on the Pages of the *Soviet Screen Magazine*: 1986-1991. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 9(1): 60-116. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2024.1.60
- Gladil'shchikov, 1998 – Gladil'shchikov, Yu. V. (1998). Uzh polnoch' blizitsya, a Germana vse net [It's nearing midnight, and still no German]. *Itogi* 17. [in Russian]
- Il'chenko i dr., 2023 – Il'chenko, S.N., Pozdnyakov, A.N., Poznin, V.F. (2023). "Lenfil'm": vremya peremen (1980–1990) [Lenfil'm: time of changes (1980–1990)]. SPb. [in Russian]
- Ilnytzkyj, 2009 – Ilnytzkyj, O. (2009). Nikolai Gogol' / Mykola Hohol', 1809-2009: A Note from the Editor. *Canadian Slavonic papers*. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://www.academia.edu/107823299/Nikolai\\_Gogol\\_Mykola\\_Hohol\\_1809\\_2009\\_A\\_Note\\_from\\_the\\_Editor](https://www.academia.edu/107823299/Nikolai_Gogol_Mykola_Hohol_1809_2009_A_Note_from_the_Editor)
- Kelly, 2021 – Kelly, C. (2021). Soviet art house Lenfilm studio under Brezhnev. Oxford university press. 512 p.
- Khlebnikova, 2010 – Khlebnikova, V. (2010). Za glupym topotaniem [Behind the silly stomping]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/za-glupym-topotaniem/> [in Russian]
- Klepikov, 1993 – Klepikov, Yu.N. (1993). Podtverzhdenie obraza [Confirmation of the image]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 6. [in Russian]
- Kopylova, 1987 – Kopylova, R.D. (1987). Il'ya Averbakh. *Vsesoyuznoe byuro propagandy kinoiskusstva*. [in Russian]
- Kovalov, 2010 – Kovalov, O.A. (2010). My [We]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/we/> (date of access: 17.06.2024). [in Russian]
- Kovalov, 2016 – Kovalov, O.A. (2016). Kino Leningrada ili leningradskoe kino? [Cinema of Leningrad or Leningrad cinema?]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/leningradkino-kovalov/> (date of access: 14.06.2024). [in Russian]
- Lavrent'eva, 1992 – Lavrent'eva, E. (1992). Finansovye paradoksy kinorezhissera Germana [Financial paradoxes of the movie director German]. *Delovye lyudi*. 4. [in Russian]
- Lev'e, 1994 – Lev'e, L. (1994). Sokurov, A. N. Ya shel k professii rezhissera ochen' ratsional'no [I went to the profession of director very rationally]. *Kino-glaz*. 3. [in Russian]
- Maslova, 2011 – Maslova, L. (2011). Sochnoi kalenduly grozd'ya dushistyie [Juicy marigold bunches fragrant]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/sochnoy-kalendulyi-grozdy-dushistyie/> (date of access: 17.06.2024). [in Russian]
- Mikhaleva, Chelysheva, 2024 – Mikhaleva, G., Chelysheva, I. (2024). Representation of Family and Family Upbringing in Soviet and Russian Feature Films: Quantitative and Genre Analyses. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 9(1): 161-170. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2024.1.161
- Moskvina, 1990 – Moskvina, T. (1990). «Global'noe kino» Petrogradskoi storony ["Global Cinema" of the Petrograd side]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 7: 70-80. [in Russian]
- Moskvina, 2006 – Moskvina, T. (2006). V bezudarnom sloge [On the stressless syllable]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/v-bezudarnom-sloge/> (date of access: 17.06.2024). [in Russian]
- Moskvina, 2010 – Moskvina, T. (2010). Obidelas' zhizn' na iskusstvo [Life was offended by art]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/life-art/> (date of access: 17.06.2024). [in Russian]
- Nam, Konchalovsky, 2021 – Nam, S., Konchalovsky, A. (2021). From Russia with Detours. *Cinéaste*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27087937>
- O'Donoghue, Serebrennikov, 2022 – O'Donoghue, D., Serebrennikov, K. (2022). Save Us! We Need Your Help! SOS! *Cinéaste*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27180659> (date of reference: 18.08.2024)
- Ozerova, 2010 – Ozerova, N. (2010). Ne vchera, ne segodnya, ne zavtra [Not yesterday, not today, not tomorrow]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://seance.ru/articles/not\\_today/](https://seance.ru/articles/not_today/) [in Russian]
- Pakhomova, 2010 – Pakhomova, N. (2010). Ne prodatsya vdokhnoven'e, no mozhen rukopis' prodat' [Inspiration is not for sale, but you can sell a manuscript]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://seance.ru/articles/economy\\_ne\\_prodatsya/](https://seance.ru/articles/economy_ne_prodatsya/) [in Russian]
- Pavlov, 1989 – Pavlov, Yu. (1989). Ne mogu postupit'sya printsipami! [I can't compromise my principles!]. *Sovetskii ekran*. 12: 2: 14-15. [in Russian]
- Pavlova, Pavlov, 1998 – Pavlova, I., Pavlov, Yu. (1998). S. Aranovich. St. Petersburg. [in Russian]

- Pozdnyakov, 1989** – Pozdnyakov, A. (1989). Nevskaya volna protiv damby zastoya [Nevskaya wave vs dam of stagnation]. *Sovetskii ekran*. 12: 20-22. [in Russian]
- Savel'ev, 1991** – Savel'ev, D.K. (1996). IO. *Séance*. 2 [in Russian]
- Savel'ev, 1996** – Savel'ev, D.K. (1996). Sokurov A.N. Sdelajte to, chto mozhete sdelat' tol'ko Vy [Sokurov A.N. Do what only you can do]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 6. [in Russian]
- Shervud, 2010** – Shervud, O. (2010). Pervaya primerka avtomata Kalashnikova [The first fitting of the Kalashnikov assault rifle]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: [https://seance.ru/articles/pervaya\\_primerka/](https://seance.ru/articles/pervaya_primerka/) [in Russian]
- Shields, 2022** – Shields, C. (2022). Review on Soviet Art House: Lenfilm Studio under Brezhnev by Catriona Kelly. *Cinéaste*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27248442>
- Skorova, Suvorova, 2021** – Skorova, L., Suvorova, D. (2021). Peculiarities of teenagers' perception of the characters of a film narrative in a situation of moral choice. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 6(2): 416-425. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2021.2.416
- Sovetskii ekran, 1989** – Sovetskii ekran [Soviet Screen]. 12: 32. [in Russian]
- Tkachenko, 2006** – Tkachenko, I. (2006). V gostyakh u rodiny [On a visit to the homeland]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/v-gostyah-u-rodiny/> [in Russian]
- Trofimenkov, 2010** – Trofimenkov, M.S. (2010). Coma. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/coma/> [in Russian]
- Tselykh, 2021** – Tselykh, M. (2021). Forbidden Soviet Cinema (1951-1991): A View from the 21st century. *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 6(1): 239-245. DOI: 10.13187/ijmil.2021.1.239
- Tselykh, 2021** – Tselykh, M. (2021). The best films of soviet film distribution: what were they like for readers of *Soviet Screen* magazine (1958-1991)? *International Journal of Media and Information Literacy*. 17(4): 715-722. DOI: 10.13187/me.2021.4.715
- Turovskaya, 1993** – Turovskaya, M.I. (1993). Mechty idiotov [Dreams of idiots]. *Iskusstvo kino*. 9: 9-11. [in Russian].
- Vasil'eva, 2012** – Vasil'eva, I. (2012). Ovcharov S.M. Sud'ba barabanshchika [Ovcharov S.M. The fate of the drummer]. *Séance*. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://seance.ru/articles/sudba-barabanshchika/> [in Russian]
- Vinogradova, 2024** – Vinogradova, M. (2024) Soviet Industrial film across categories: negotiating between utility, art and science. Amsterdam University Press. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/jj.11141794.25.pdf>