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Introduction

The process of assimilating material, i.e. making it ‘one’s own’, happens at the moment when, coming into contact with reality, it begins to set itself out according to a grid of outlines and sketches of the same special structure as that in which one’s consciousness was formed.1

Eisenstein’s work is multi-faceted and encyclopaedic in its scope, like that of other intensely creative artists such as J.S. Bach, James Joyce and Vsevolod Meyerhold. If we decide to study a facet of Eisenstein’s output, we soon find that this facet inter-reflects with other facets, which in turn relate organically to other aspects of his achievements.

Fortunately, like Bach, and to a certain extent Meyerhold, Eisenstein had a gift for pedagogy and in his case, an overwhelming need to explain to others what he was doing and why he did what he did. This need led to his extensive writings about film, in particular about his own work and the experiences that led to the development of his ideas. His preoccupation with the expressive possibilities of the sound film, and his search for ways of structuring it, meant that he wrote more about film as an audiovisual medium than any other filmmaker.

However, there is a problem with a large proportion of his writings, a problem of which Eisenstein was very much aware. When he was writing the introduction to his autobiographical texts in 1944, he admitted that ‘beginning a page, or a section or a phrase, I have no idea where it will take me as it develops.’ This lack of a prepared structure resulted in texts which have the character of an inner monologue, a stream of consciousness resulting in a fusing magma of ideas. He explains how this writing style leads him to ‘whole new tracts of utterly unexpected territory whose existence I never dreamed of, much that is completely new.’ He reaches these new territories of thought by the technique of unexpected juxtaposition: ‘but for juxtaposition – the separate and uncoordinated facts and impressions had neither the right nor the grounds to claim their place here!’ Eisenstein’s serious heart attack on 2 February 1946 contributed to a strengthening realisation of his own mortality, and consequently to a speeding up of his highly
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associative stream of consciousness style of writing: 'on a good day I can manage up to thirty-four pages of manuscript (this is in the region of one printer's sheet) at one sitting.' This speed of composition and consequent lack of structure contributes to a feeling of improvisatory brilliance which energises his text. However, this kind of writing may cause problems of clarity: Eisenstein had planned to write a textbook. As early as 1927, he wrote about his aim to combine 'autobiography and practical examples (to) make a high-flown theoretical abstraction concrete.' This idea was not an unusual one at this time. Konstantin Stanislavsky had written *My Life in Art* (published in London in 1925), Meyerhold had written *On Theatre* (published in St Petersburg in 1913), and Walter Gropius had commissioned a series of strongly individual artist's textbooks under his Bauhaus School imprint.3

So my primary aim in this research is to broaden and clarify our understanding of Eisenstein's ideas, specifically focusing on his thinking about cinema as an audiovisual medium. I am aiming to answer this question: how does Eisenstein contribute to our understanding of cinema as an audiovisual medium?

By the term 'audiovisual' I mean the interaction of music, sound and film. This definition is a generalised one, as Eisenstein is more specific when he uses the term 'audiovisual', depending on his context.4 I believe that these contemporary contexts are vital to an understanding of Eisenstein's ideas on audiovisual cinema.

My other aim is to provide the beginnings of a study of Eisenstein's ideas on audiovisual cinema. Eisenstein was a polymath: he was trained as an architect and civil engineer, he was also a theatre director, actor, graphic artist, film theorist, film director, writer and teacher. In addition he was influenced by a bewildering range of artists, philosophers, scientists, writers, poets, even composers. Where, and from what perspective does one even begin to examine Eisenstein's ideas on audiovisual cinema?

Since 1977, when I came across Yon Barna's biography of the director, I have read everything I could find by Eisenstein which has been translated into French and English.5 Several key ideas emerged from my thinking about his writings, amongst them are audiovisual counterpoint, organic unity, nonindifferent nature, and synaesthesia. These four ideas form the chapters and the basic thematic structure of this text, which is part of my continuing research on Eisenstein's ideas on audiovisual cinema.

I shall now outline one of Eisenstein's key ideas: the 'montage of attractions', and compare it to the ideas on montage of his contemporaries, Dziga Vertov and Vsevolod Pudovkin. In my continuing
research I shall examine in depth Eisenstein’s concept of ‘dialectical montage’ and how he developed it from his ‘montage of attractions’ idea, and then extended its application to his approach to audiovisual montage.

**The montage of attractions**
It is remarkable how much of Eisenstein’s early article about his new approach to theatre, *The Montage of Attractions*, relates to his future work in cinema. In 1923 this article was published in the journal *Lef*, edited by the poet and playwright Vladimir Mayakovsky. In it Eisenstein states that what he terms the ‘basic material’ of theatre ‘derives from the audience’, and he gives his definition of what he calls ‘the montage of attractions’:

> any aggressive moment in theatre, i.e. any element of it that subjects the audience to emotional or psychological influence, verified by experience and mathematically calculated to produce specific emotional shocks in the spectator in their proper order within the whole. These shocks provide the only opportunity of perceiving the ideological aspect of what is being shown, the final ideological conclusion.⁶

In this approach the audience is raw material which is processed by the theatre, like a factory which moulds the basic audience material into the correct ideological shape or product. The image of the artist-engineer which underlies this definition is characteristically Constructivist, as is the idea of mathematically calculating the emotional or psychological shocks to which the audience will be subjected, once these shocks have been verified by experience. Just over a year later, in 1924, in his article *The Montage of Filmed Attractions*, Eisenstein states that theatre ‘is linked to cinema by a common (identical) basic material – the audience – and by a common purpose – influencing this audience in the desired direction through a series of calculated pressures on its psyche.’⁷

The idea of an ‘emotional or psychological influence, verified by experience’ is one that Eisenstein explored further in his study of reflexology, in particular Vladimir M. Bekhterev and Ivan P. Pavlov, and the latter’s work on conditioning and the conditioned reflex. Eisenstein’s research on audience response studies and other psychological matters (like the phenomenon of synaesthesia) was carried out in close collaboration with Lev Vygotsky and Alexander Romanovich Luria, the pioneer Soviet neuro-psychologists, in the 1930s. Like them he was fascinated by the idea of how ideas could be transferred to an audience just through cinematic means.⁸

In his 1923 article, Eisenstein mentions the popular entertainments
which were the source of his montage of attractions idea: the circus and the music-hall. He underlines the importance of form in these performance genres, which rely for their success on well-structured programmes. His concern with the structure of a show leads him to describing an attraction as being a ‘molecular (that is compound) unit’, which is also an ‘independent and primary element.’ Eisenstein sees the attraction as being a ‘unit of the effectiveness of theatre and of theatre as a whole.’ The relation of the ‘molecular unit’ to the whole demonstrates his interest in organic unity.

Eisenstein also mentions another form of popular theatre, the Grand Guignol, to differentiate it from a genre he wants to avoid: the bourgeois theatre with its ‘unravelling of psychological problems.’ He is drawn to popular theatre because of the emotional and psychological shocks it provokes in the audience by representing acts of extreme violence on stage. He used this kind of explicit violence the following year in his first feature film, The Strike, when he shows a tiny baby deliberately dropped from a high balcony. Eisenstein concludes his film with the graphic slaughter of a bull, which he inter-cuts with the massacre of a crowd of workers by soldiers representing the ruling class.9

He also mentions the influence of the mystery play in relation to the ‘compound’ nature of his attraction. In his attraction, Eisenstein saw the emotional shock to the audience not as a simple and straightforward emotion, but one which is full of psychological ambiguity. To illustrate this emotional dynamism he mentions the torture scenes from mystery plays, where ‘religious pathos gives way to sadistic satisfaction.’ Eisenstein went on to research various forms of religious experience, especially in the Catholic tradition, and what he called ‘pathos’, a form of emotional ecstasy. On his visits to France (in 1929 and 1930) he spent much of his time visiting Catholic holy places, gathering information which was to prove of considerable value when he was shooting his film of Mexico in 1931. In this country he found the combinations of different religions, the mixtures of Mesoamerican and Catholic faiths as well as various combinations of religious pathos and sadism, which are described in the chapter, Nonindifferent Nature.10

In Eisenstein’s montage of attractions idea, each attraction is arbitrarily chosen and independent of the work. In this way he achieves an ‘effective structure’ for the show as a whole, as well as an efficient means of expressing an idea: ‘a specific final thematic effect’, an ‘essential’ ideological theme. An example of his approach to montage is his image of a serape, with its violently contrasting coloured stripes, which he used as an overall structure for his film Que viva Mexico! For Eisenstein, this serape
is ‘the symbol of Mexico’. The different stripes of this garment are analogous to the contrasting episodes (‘attractions’) in his planned film: ‘different in character, different in people, different in animals, trees and flowers.’ He intended these contrasting attractions to be ‘held together by the unity of the weave’ of the serape. For *Que viva Mexico!* he planned ‘a rhythmic and musical construction’ which would have been part of this unifying weave of the montage of attractions, for what would have been his first audiovisual film.11

Published in the same issue as Eisenstein’s article *The Montage of Attractions*, was an article entitled *The Cine-Eyes. A Revolution*, by a very different proponent of montage construction, Dziga Vertov. His text, in a layout designed by the Constructivist artist Aleksandr Rodchenko, implies a shouted delivery, as if by a speaker at a large revolutionary rally of party workers. Its tone resembles Mayakovsky’s declamations of his poems, to be performed to big audiences, not for reading silently to oneself under the light of a lamp in a bourgeois living-room. Mayakovsky was a close friend of Vertov, and they both shared a passion for revolutionary statements in the form of slogans: Mayakovsky in his agitprop posters and poems, and Vertov in his texts about his type of documentary cinema. This sloganising revolutionary fervour does appear at times in texts by Eisenstein from this period; he was also a passionate adherent of the Revolution, but his background was very different: Eisenstein made a transition from the theatre medium to working in film, whereas Vertov never worked in theatre.12

A close contemporary of Eisenstein, Denis Arkadievich Kaufman was born in Bialystock in 1896. He changed his name to the dynamic sounding Dziga Vertov in 1918, when he became involved in making newsreels in Moscow. He had studied psychology at the Psycho-Neurological Institute in Petrograd, where he had set up a ‘Laboratory of Hearing.’ There he experimented with the use of early recording techniques to capture ‘the exterior world of sound.’ He cut up recorded sounds and arranged them in musical rhythms, and worked with language, making ‘literary-musical montages of words.’ His interest in sound was also musical: he had studied the piano and violin in his home town, before his studies and research in Petrograd. Vertov’s background was thus a combination of musical and scientific influences, and his special interest in the perception of sound and vision led him naturally to filmmaking. In 1918 he began working at the Moscow Film Committee, and there he developed what he called his ‘Cine-Eye’ method for making documentary films.13

Vertov, like Eisenstein, also wanted to avoid the bourgeois genre of six-act theatre productions, which had become in cinema what he called
'six-reel psycho-dramas.' He wanted a 'revolution through newsreel film.' He believed that his camera was superior to the human eye. Vertov’s camera has a life of its own, it 'gropes in the chaos of visual events for a path for its own movement or oscillation and experiments, stretches time, dismembers movements, or it does the opposite, absorbing time unto itself, swallowing the years and thus schematising the lengthy processes that are inaccessible to the normal eye.' This Constructivist apotheosis of the machine, of the new technology of the cine-camera, is an example of the artist-engineer who transforms the material of everyday life through an industrial process, to produce art to ideologically influence the newly liberated working class. This idea is parallel to Eisenstein’s own new and industrial approach to theatre, described above. Nevertheless there is a divergence of approach between these two filmmakers: Vertov never had to deal with a theatre audience.14

Eisenstein actually observed the way in which theatrical audiences react to performances, and he understood their capacity to empathise with what is happening on the stage. At a performance at the Moscow Art Theatre, he had been highly amused at the way an entire audience hummed the waltz a couple on the stage was dancing and singing.15 Vertov was more concerned with motion, rather than emotion, with showing the audience what the Constructivist camera could do technically, rather than getting the audience to empathise with what was happening on the screen:

I am the Cine-Eye. I am the mechanical eye.
I the machine show you the world as only I can see it.
I emancipate myself henceforth and forever from human immobility.
I am in constant motion.16

Vertov, the Constructivist, is keen to impress his audience with the power of the new cinema technology, and this is his ideology. Eisenstein, also a Constructivist, but with a background in theatre, uses his audience as raw material, and uses the new cinema technology to transmit his ideology through his audience’s empathy with what is happening in the film they are watching.

Vertov, the Constructivist, is influenced by Lev Kuleshov’s early montage experiments: he revels in the ability of his new medium to create imaginary spaces, to create a room by showing twelve walls filmed in different parts of the world. Just like Kuleshov experimented with inventing an ideal filmed woman from parts of different women, Vertov proposes a new Soviet ‘Adam’:
I am the Cine-Eye.

I take the strongest and most agile hands from one man,
the fastest and best proportioned legs from another,
the most handsome and expressive head from a third
and through montage I create a new, perfect man. …17

As part of his montage method, Vertov is keen on the idea of a montage breakdown which uses his ‘mechanical eye’ to create a ‘dislocation’ of the audience’s normal view of a staged event like a boxing match or a ballet. His aim is to impose on the audience his own view of these performances, to avoid what he calls the ‘series of incoherent impressions that are different for every member of the audience.’ Eisenstein, with his experience of theatre, knows that audiences’ impressions are far from incoherent, especially when the performance is effective, and the audience empathises, as one person, with what is happening on the stage. In his montage breakdowns he parallels the reaction of someone to an event, rather than using Vertov’s method of depicting the action from his own, the Cine-Eye’s point of view, which Eisenstein believes results in ‘illusory depictions.’18

And where in Vertov’s montage method is an equivalent of Eisenstein’s idea of a practical overall conception, relating each element in the work to the whole film? Vertov asks ‘How can we construct our impressions of a day into an effective whole in a visual exercise?’ His answer is to build ‘by intervals to an accumulated whole through the great skill of montage’. Vertov explained what he meant by ‘intervals’ in an earlier article, *We: A Version of a Manifesto*, published in 1922, in the journal *Kino-Fot*. He uses a Constructivist image of a machine to explain this term: ‘the material – the elements of the art of movement – is composed of the intervals (the transitions from one movement to another) and by no means the movements themselves. It is they (the intervals) that draw the action to a kinetic conclusion.’19

Eisenstein makes use of a similar idea in his concept of the ‘montage of attractions’, except that it is based on a theatre model. He sees his montage as being separate, not from the mechanical process of editing, but from ‘any thematic connection with the actors.’ This separation of the ‘attraction’ from the work enables an audience to link one part of the work with another, to compare a later part with an earlier section. This ‘historical’ dimension within a work is not a feature of Vertov’s ‘intervals’, which exist only in the present moment. His audiences are passive witnesses to a mechanical process, whereas Eisenstein moulds his audience by using a series of emotional and psychological shocks. This set of attractions is held together by an overall concept: the part is in the
whole, the units of attraction combine to make the work itself an attraction, to produce for the audience ‘the final ideological conclusion’. In Vertov’s case the ideological conclusion remains the same; like the poetry of Mayakovsky, it is largely anchored in the Constructivist present tense. The historical dimension which is nearly always there in Eisenstein’s work, in both his filmmaking and in his film theory, is what makes his ‘montage of attractions’ concept possible and different from Vertov’s montage of ‘intervals’.

Another close contemporary of Eisenstein and Vertov, the film director and film theorist Vsevolod I. Pudovkin, was born in 1893. Like Vertov, he had a scientific background, studying physics and chemistry at Moscow University. He was a front line soldier from 1914–15 in the First World War, and was wounded and captured; he escaped and returned to Moscow in 1918. After working as a chemist in a factory he enrolled at the new State film school in Moscow, and studied in Lev Kuleshov’s workshop. From an early stage his work in film involved him both as a director and an actor. He acted in two of Kuleshov’s films, the satire *The Extraordinary Adventures of Mr West in the Land of the Bolsheviks* (1924) and *The Death Ray* (1925). He directed the short film, *Chess Fever* (1925), and a documentary about Pavlov, *Mechanism of the Brain* (1926). He then directed his three best known feature films, also acting in the first two: *Mother* (1926), *The End of St Petersburg* (1927), and *Storm Over Asia* (1928).

Pudovkin also published texts on film technique and film acting. His writing style is very lucid and calm. Unlike Vertov, with his declamations and slogans, Pudovkin conveys his theory with textbook-like clarity and confidence. The process of making a film is presented in an orderly manner: ‘first is worked out the action of the scenario, the action is then worked out into sequences, the sequences into scenes, and these constructed by editing from the pieces, each corresponding to a camera angle.’ He provides a generalised solution to a generalised problem. Pudovkin, unlike Eisenstein, does not give a specific problem which he works through to find a specific solution. His approach to a definition of film editing is equally concise: editing ‘is a method that controls the ‘psychological guidance’ of the spectator.’ This is a statement with which both Eisenstein and Vertov would agree.

In his list of various kinds of film editing, Pudovkin gives his reader five types of montage, which he collectively terms ‘relational editing.’ First is editing by contrast, and as an example he gives the representation of a glutton contrasted with the representation of a starving man. Then he mentions editing using ‘parallelism’, in which two simultaneous actions are inter-cut. As an example of this technique he describes the everyday
actions of a factory owner, which are inter-cut with the hanging of one of his employees. Thirdly, to illustrate relational editing using the technique of ‘symbolism’ he cites Eisenstein’s use of images of a bull being slaughtered, which he inter-cuts with the massacre of the workers at the end of *The Strike*. For his fourth technique of film editing, ‘simultaneity’, he gives another example from a well known film: D. W. Griffith’s representation of two actions, which are intercut with increasing speed until they reach a climax, at the end of his filmed epic *Intolerance*. The fifth editing technique Pudovkin calls ‘leitmotif.’ Here he refers to the reiteration of a theme, for example the repetition of the same shot to emphasise a statement.

This five-point approach to film editing is a combination of the montage methods of Griffith, Eisenstein, and Kuleshov. In his text *Beyond the Shot*, published in 1929, Eisenstein mentions Kuleshov’s ‘brick by brick’ montage method, calling it disparagingly the ‘old school of filmmaking.’ To illustrate his point he quotes from Kuleshov’s book *The Art of Cinema*, published in Moscow in 1929: ‘If you have an idea-phrase, a particle of the story, a link in the whole dramaturgical chain, then that idea is expressed and built up from shot-signs, just like bricks.’ Kuleshov’s idea of the ‘dramaturgical chain’ of the ‘idea-phrase’ which is built up from ‘shot-signs, just like bricks’, underlies Pudovkin’s montage method in which a scenario is broken down into sequences, scenes and camera set-ups which provide shots from a certain angle. For Eisenstein this montage breakdown, ‘brick by brick’, is a method which risks becoming a dead formula, instead of a dynamic montage which works not by a process of addition, but a process of collision.24 There is nothing static or formulaic about Eisenstein’s approach to writing about montage. Vertov is also dynamic, but he knows in advance what he is going to write about. Eisenstein’s writing, with its convoluted subordinate clauses, completely lacks Pudovkin’s didactic clarity:

Our present approach radically alters our opportunities in the principles of creating an ‘effective structure’ (the show as a whole) instead of a static ‘reflection’ of a particular event dictated by the theme, and our opportunities for resolving it through an effect that is logically implicit in that event, and this gives rise to a new concept: a free montage with arbitrarily chosen independent (of both the PARTICULAR composition and any thematic connection with the actors) effects (attractions) but with the precise aim of a specific final thematic effect – montage of attractions.25

Pudovkin and Vertov are noting their pre-existing thoughts, whereas
Eisenstein’s writing style is one in continual transition; his thought is developing as he writes.

**A note on source texts**

The characteristics of an extensive range of Eisenstein’s writings – their chaotic, multi-lingual and magma-like quality – make them exciting and full of creative and associative possibilities for the artist. However these same characteristics are also what make his writings bristle with difficulties for the film historian, who is correctly anxious to make the presentation of Eisenstein’s own thinking as close as possible to what is known of the director’s original intentions.

In order for me to attempt to capture as closely as possible the spirit of Eisenstein’s writings on audiovisual cinema, as well as to try to give a sense of the artistic and cultural contexts from which his ideas grew and developed, I have relied as much as possible on texts translated from primary sources. My main source has been the four volumes of the English edition of Eisenstein’s writings. This edition, under the direction of Richard Taylor, the leading authority on Soviet cinema, is internationally known as being the closest to what can be called a definitive collection of Eisenstein’s writings in English translation. The proximity of the scholars to the Eisenstein papers in the State Archives of Literature and Arts in Moscow (TsGALI), its detailed and scholarly accounts of the primary sources and their presentation, the care which has been taken with the translations, have all contributed to its status. This edition has also benefited from the support and encouragement of Jay Leyda and close collaboration with Naum Kleiman, the Eisenstein scholar of international standing.26

The first volume, published in 1988, comprises a selection of important writings from 1922 to 1934, arranged in chronological order. The second volume, published in 1991 and entitled *Towards a Theory of Montage*, mostly drops the chronological approach. Richard Taylor explains why: Eisenstein’s writings on montage from the 1930s and the 1940s are very extensive and at times fragmentary, unfinished, and interwoven from different periods.27 Eisenstein wrote *Mise en scène*, the first volume of his work *On Direction*, in the early 1930s. Before he could begin the second volume, *Mise en cadre*, Eisenstein started filming *Bezhin Meadow* in 1935. In 1937, his work on this film was stopped by the authorities, and he resumed the writing of several texts on montage including the extensive *Montage 1937*. After his work on directing *Alexander Nevsky*, in 1938 Eisenstein wrote *Montage 1938*, which was based on materials for *Montage 1937*. *Montage 1938* is followed by *Vertical Montage* (originally entitled *Montage 1939*). *Montage 1937* was first published in the journal *Iskusstvo kino*.
in 1939; in 1940 and 1941, *Vertical Montage* appeared in two parts in the same journal. In 1940 Eisenstein wrote texts he entitled *Montage 1940*. Taylor explains that these texts were revised as *Once Again on the Structure of Things*, which Eisenstein later included in his book *Nonindifferent Nature*. Other texts from 1940 became part of his writings on colour.

The third volume, published in 1995, returns to a chronological presentation of Eisenstein’s writings, from 1934 to 1947. This volume’s collection features texts which have a strongly political dimension, and which reflect the turbulence of the times in which they were written: the period of Stalin’s tightening grip on power, the terror of his purges, and the Second World War. Some texts are transcripts, for example of conference speeches (from the 1935 conference of Soviet film-workers), and of a meeting held by Stalin in February 1947, with Molotov and Zhdanov, Eisenstein and Cherkasov, about the second part of *Ivan the Terrible*. In addition we get a sense of Eisenstein as a lecturer (about music and colour in *Ivan the Terrible*, in 1947), and of his pedagogical aims in his teaching programme for his Direction course at the State Institute for Cinema in 1936.

The fourth volume, published in 1995, comprises an extensive collection of Eisenstein’s autobiographical writings, the complex and meandering history of which is lucidly described in the *Foreword*, by Naum Kleiman. Written mostly during the director’s convalescence from his major heart attack in 1946, none of these writings were published in Eisenstein’s lifetime. In addition I have made use of Jay Leyda’s own translations of Eisenstein’s writings: *The Film Sense* (1942) and *Film Form* (1949). Leyda was a former student of the director, and he worked closely with Eisenstein on these collections, though *Film Form* was published after Eisenstein’s death. *The Film Sense* is largely based on Eisenstein’s text *Vertical Montage*, and Leyda has included some very useful primary material, and illustrations, not available elsewhere in English. I have also referred to Leyda’s *Eisenstein at Work* (1985), as well as his *Eisenstein on Disney* (1988), for the same reason.

The *Notes of a Film Director* collection of Eisenstein’s writings (edited by R. Yurenev, and published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in 1958) was useful for texts I could not find anywhere else in English translation. An example is the translation of Eisenstein’s last text, on which he was working just before he died in February 1948: his unfinished letter to Lev Kuleshov, about colour film. Another example is his text P-R-K-F-V, about his collaboration with the composer.

For the same reason of availability, I referred to Herbert Marshall’s

Another source text is Marie Seton’s long and at times extremely subjective book: *Sergei M. Eisenstein, A Biography* (1952). On the few occasions I have referred to it, I have given details of the source of her information, or provided an additional and alternative source. In two cases, I feel that her descriptions of Eisenstein’s activities in London and Chicago do tally with the type of research activities he describes himself as undertaking.

Anne Nesbet, in her study of Eisenstein’s thought, *Savage Junctures: Eisenstein and the Shape of Thinking*, mentions Eisenstein’s concept of writing a book of his ideas on film which he imagines would be in the shape of a sphere: ‘for everything I do touches everything else: the only form capable of satisfying this condition is a sphere: from any meridian transition is possible to any other meridian.’ This structure is analogous to the one I describe at the beginning of this introduction, where I mention the inter-reflecting facets of Eisenstein’s thought. I hope that these patterns of his ideas will emerge throughout my text, as it is being read and thought about.
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