A Comparative Study of the Coronation Sequence in Eisenstein's Ivan the Terrible and the Semiotics of Pier Wollen and Roland Barthes

Mansour Hesami[1], Samira Akbarzadeh[2]

[1].*Associate Professor, Painting Department, Faculty of Art, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran.*
[2].*M.A. Student in Painting, Faculty of Art, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran.*

Abstract: Cinema is considered one of the important and influential arts of human society, and any definition of art must be presented as part of a semiotic perspective. Every cinematic frame is a combination of visual elements and movements. Movement signs form an independent system from the system of visual signs. Paying attention to the semiotic nature of images in cinema is the first condition for studying and writing about a film. Sergei Eisenstein's Ivan the Terrible is one of the most important Soviet and world films, and Eisenstein's work in this film demonstrates a self-aware and complete critical examination of the bizarre combination of Stalinist historiography from substitution (concealing) and repetition (commemoration) of previous traditions in historical myths. Thinkers such as Peter Wollen and Roland Barthes have conducted studies on the semiotics of cinema. The main question of this research is: What are the characteristics of the coronation sequence of the Tsar in Ivan the Terrible from the perspective of the semiotics of Peter Wollen and Roland Barthes? Objective: The present study aims to examine the coronation sequence of Eisenstein's Ivan the Terrible and its semiotic features from the perspective of the two thinkers, Peter Wollen and Roland Barthes. Research Method: This research is presented with a historical view and a descriptive-analytical method, and the method of data collection is library-based (documentary). Results: The results of this research indicate that Eisenstein's work on Ivan the Terrible was radical, critical, and subversive; Ivan the Terrible does not allow Ivan to turn into a complete and well-known mythical structure, and the coronation sequence, while the scene is in the cathedral and the walls are filled with Orthodox Christian symbols, highlights an atmosphere full of intrigue, jealousy, and surveillance, with each frame of this sequence being full of signs. Everything that Eisenstein examined in this film contributes to an artistic work. The film has three degrees of meaning, with two degrees of meaning (symbolic and iconic) being more apparent than the third degree.

Keywords: *Eisenstein, Ivan the Terrible, Peter Wollen, Roland Barthes, Semiotics*

I.　　Introduction

Film, as a medium, is a phenomenon similar to language. Film has a system of codes and signs. The most pictorial, narrative, and musical of artistic codes can be incorporated into cinema. The media language of cinema is much more straightforward than written language and has less ambiguity. The audience receives the

---

[1]Associate Professor, Painting Department, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran

[2]M.A. Student in Painting, Faculty of Art, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran

codes of works according to their own intellect. The code is a simplifying yet sensitive tool for understanding a film. Each image is itself a sign, meaning it has meaning and carries awareness. The aesthetics of cinema is based on multiple elements, including photography. Anything that can be photographed exists in a particular way. Concepts in human thought are involved with the structural system of words, meaning each concept is expressed with a word. The aesthetic impact of cinema depends on multiple elements that are all under the command, supervision, and choice of the director. Whether a scene is divided and fragmented into multiple shots, from which angles these shots are recorded by the camera, whether two or more narrative lines are simultaneously and alternately pursued within the scenes (parallel editing), whether an establishing shot or a master shot is used - all these depend on the director's choice. One of the areas that today deals with the applied analysis of cinematic texts in a broader framework than a purely aesthetic view is semiotics. Today, as a result of the extensive efforts of thinkers such as "Roland Barthes", "Christian Metz", "Pier Paolo Pasolini", and "Umberto Eco", semiotics has become a coherent and productive field of study in cinema studies. The works of these thinkers are rooted in the thoughts of the Swiss linguist "Ferdinand de Saussure". Saussure, who founded this science, considers semiotics the study of the life of signs in a social context and views it as a science broader than linguistics, believing that a part of this general knowledge about signs deals with linguistics and its methods (Zamiran, 2003: 193-196). In defining semiotics, one can say that semiotics is the science that examines how meaning is produced in society. Therefore, semiotics equally deals with the issue of processes of signification and communication; that is, it studies the ways of producing and exchanging meaning (Culler, 2000: 104). Now, we should address what a sign is. Various experts have provided different definitions of the sign. The most general definition that can be given of a sign is as follows: A sign is any signifier that signifies a signified, or anything that can substitute for something else and signify a mental concept instead of it. In semiotics, a distinction is made between a sign and an index. An index is more general than a sign. In the sense that all the various phenomena of the world around us that give us information through a material agent, such as heartbeat and pulse, etc., are indices. However, signs are a kind of index. The difference between a sign and an index is that a sign is conventional, like the smoke rising from a fire, which is an index. This index foretells the existence of fire, although we do not see it. However, if we agree with someone that smoke indicates, for example, "a state of war," smoke is a sign. A sign always has a sender of the message and a recipient. An index does not necessarily have a receiver and a sender. In a fire, smoke is an index of fire, but here there is no sender, and no one has sent smoke to convey information (Kondratov, 1984: 13). Semioticians generally aim to create a visual grammar, reducing the cinematic image to a simple sign. This way, both the multilayered richness of an image will be lost and the viewer's desire for revelation will subside. Research to find a combination of art and science led Eisenstein to the conclusion that "language" is a secondary process of thought, and the primary grounds of human thought are feelings and images. He came to the interesting belief that the language of primitive peoples and nations is more pictorial and metaphorical than the language of advanced nations (Signs and Meaning in Cinema: 71). In his article "Principles of Cinema and the Line of Ideogram," he explains how the Chinese ideogram line began as a pictorial language and gradually, by adding two unrelated graphic roles, was able to provide completely abstract words.

II.   Research Method

This research has been conducted with a descriptive, historical, and comparative approach, utilizing library resources and note-taking. The statistical population of this research is the film Ivan the Terrible, which has been analyzed through relevant criteria and a logical and deductive method.

III.   Research Background

To date, a number of semioticians have addressed the aesthetics of Russian cinema from a semiotic perspective. The following introduces the mentioned research. In the article "Ivan the Terrible 1 and 2" (2001), J. Huberman likens the film Ivan the Terrible to a ballet dance that has a magnificent combination, with Eisenstein as its composer. In the article "Allegories of Stalinist Historiography" (2007), Kevin M.F. Platt states that Eisenstein creates his design as an "organism" using a montage of related visual compositions. In his book "From

Subjectivity to Objectivity in Cinema" (1999), Mohsen Hashemi refers to cinema as having its own distinct language. In the book "Cinema from the Perspective of Several Writers" (1979), Virginia Woolf acknowledges that all other arts were born naked; but the youngest art, which is cinema, was born fully clothed. In the book "Cinema and Philosophy" (2016), Paula Marrati states that cinema itself sets images in motion. In the book "How to Read a Film" (2015), James Monaco considers cinema as the director's medium. In the book "Signs and Meaning in Cinema" (1997), Peter Wollen discusses semiotics as a field of study for film aesthetics. In the book "Cinema 1" (2013), Gilles Deleuze refers to a kind of composition in the close-up shot. In the book "Semiotics of Cinema" (2016), Christian Metz speaks of cinema as an anthropological fact. In the book "From Visual Signs to Text" (1993), Babak Ahmadi states that spoken cinema consists of six semiotic systems.

Soviet Cinema

The history of Soviet cinema after the revolution can be divided into three periods. During the period of War Communism (1918-1920), the Soviet Union was in a state of civil war and enduring a difficult time. In this period, the film industry was struggling for its survival. The New Economic Policy, or NEP (1921-1924), was designed to pull the country out of its crisis. During this period, the film industry gradually regained its health, and finally in the period (1925-1933), we witnessed the growth of cinema in the Soviet Union and the export of its products. In this period, film production, distribution, and exhibition expanded. This period also saw the experiments of the Montage movement. However, from 1928 and with the start of the First Five-Year Plan, severe state control was imposed on cinema, which accelerated the end of this movement. (History of Cinema, 160). Goskino, the central film distribution company, showed its inability to organize the country's film industry, so the Soviet government formed a new company in early January 1925 called "Sovkino." Powerful incentives were given to the few remaining film production companies still permitted to operate to help ensure Sovkino's survival. They could invest by purchasing shares in the new company. Goskino also continued to exist for a while and produced films on a small scale. Its most important product was the film Battleship Potemkin, the most famous film of the Montage movement and the first Soviet film to achieve success abroad.

Eisenstein

He was born in Riga, the capital of Latvia (at that time part of the Russian Empire in the Livonian province). His father - Mikhail Osipovich Eisenstein - was of German descent (his father Osipovich Eisenstein was a German Jew who had converted to Christianity), and his mother was of Swedish descent. His mother - Ivanovna Kontskaya - was from a Russian Orthodox Christian family. His father was the chief architect of the city of Riga. At the age of seven, he came to St. Petersburg with his mother. He was the only child of the family, and his only companion during childhood was the nanny who cared for him. At the age of six, on a trip to Paris with his parents, he first became acquainted with cinema. From childhood, he had a great interest in painting, which did not diminish until the end of his life. At the age of eleven, his parents separated, his mother left St. Petersburg, and he was raised by his father's relatives. In 1915, at his father's request, he entered the Institute of Civil Engineering in Petrograd to take up his father's profession, but during his studies, he spent many hours in theaters and cinemas. Eisenstein was deeply influenced by the events of his time. He, who was only nineteen at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, was not ready to deal with the overthrow of the existing social order, the collapse of his culture and ideals, and the disintegration of his family, which had occurred with the exile of his parents. The revolution destroyed him, disrupted his life plan, but at the same time gave him the opportunity to rebuild himself. The revolution erased the bleak prospect of engineering, his father's profession, and opened up new horizons for him. Over the course of ten years, Eisenstein first gained international fame in theater and then in cinema. His genius in filmmaking is evident, and he can be described as often moving on the razor's edge of profound thinking and bewilderment. Eisenstein made films according to the theories he had in mind. To achieve this success, he had to become an intellectual and build for himself a new worldview, a new ideal concept of society and art. For working in cinema, he became a student of aesthetics; he could not accept anything blindly. He was fascinated by art, and during this period, he worked on decorating propaganda trains and helped stage humorous satirical performances for the Red Army. Throughout his life, Eisenstein likened the production of his films to building a bridge (History of Cinema, 171). In 1920, at the end of the civil war,

Eisenstein went to Moscow and joined the Proletkult Theater (short for Workers' Cultural Theater). Here he designed sets for many plays and co-directed performances. In 1921, Eisenstein (along with his friend Sergei Yutkevich, another future director of montage cinema) enrolled in a theater workshop under the supervision of Meyerhold, whom he always considered his mentor and teacher. In 1923, Eisenstein directed his first theatrical work, titled "Every Wise Man is Simple Enough." This was a 19th-century comedy, but Eisenstein staged it like a circus. The actors wore clown costumes and performed in a biomechanical acrobatic style. They walked on a tightrope above the audience's heads and delivered their dialogues while walking on their hands. Eisenstein always said that his transition from theater to cinema took place in 1924, when he directed a play called "The Gas Mask" by Tretyakov, not in a theater but in an actual gas factory. According to Eisenstein, the contrast between the reality of the location and the artifice of the performance was very great. (This play was publicly performed in 1925.) - A film that took place in a factory and was filmed in a factory. - Eisenstein extracted specific moments of crisis from movement or events and turned it into the subject or raw material of the purest example of cinema. This is precisely what he called "pathetic." He chooses the peaks and cries, brings the scenes to their climaxes, and creates clashes between them (Gilles Deleuze, 2013, 13). In his defense, he turns to science, mathematics, and the natural sciences. This does not mean lowering the dignity of art, because cinema - like painting - must create a spiral that is suitable for the theme while accurately choosing the points of pause.

The Film Ivan the Terrible
Ivan the Terrible is a two-part epic biographical-style film, with the first part released in 1943. The film is about Ivan the Terrible, who was admired by Joseph Stalin and with whom he felt a close connection. For this reason, he ordered it to be made. The second part of the film was shelved until 1985 and not allowed to be screened. Eisenstein had expanded the screenplay to three parts, but the second shelving halted his work, and whatever had been produced for the third part until then was destroyed. Sergei Eisenstein's Ivan the Terrible, influenced by how narration was established in silent cinema, relied more on imagery and depiction than sound and dialogue in storytelling. A point that can be grasped from the very beginning of the film, aided by the spatial constructions that occur through photographic long shots, is a camera that, in almost all of its static, silent, and focused positionings, is immersed within the space and situation, not disrupting the stability and solidity of the pictorial narrative with unnecessary movement, and theatrical performances that are so evident and tangible in the visual expression of states and actions and reactions that watching the story's narrative becomes almost unnecessary for an audience literate in visuals. And the first structural feature that catches the eye is the rapid rhythm of editing and the commitment to multiple and varied shots of situations, characters, and spaces, not only for visual scene-setting but also for shaping and advancing the pictorial story; and this means that the narrative storytelling still occurs through performative narration. From the beginning to the end of the film, Ivan exploits people as tools of abuse, a perspective that was in keeping with the historical conditions of the making of Ivan the Terrible. Despite this, Ivan extends his confrontation with the feudal nobility at the heart of this situation, a confrontation that does not turn into a personal duel in the Griffith style; rather, it begins with a political compromise and leads to social and physical destruction and demolition (Cinema 1, 58). He constructed a superficial narrative that was politically acceptable; with recognizable elements of socialist realist narration and then saturated this narrative with a misdirected orientation, contradiction, and visual style that constantly invited the viewer to look beyond appearances. Eisenstein used every tool at his disposal to undermine the Stalinist celebration of Ivan and, by extension, Stalin himself. He challenges us to consider why Ivan is alone, why everyone betrays him, has Ivan caused his own loneliness? (Kevin M.F. Platt, 4) Eisenstein's photographic narrative in **Ivan the Terrible**, compared to the "photo albums" of the narrators in his films **Battleship Potemkin, Strike,** and **October**, has also undergone some changes in structural details; so much so that this time it seems to be influenced by the nascent talkies and the accommodation of sound and dialogue in narrative storytelling, and the overall increase in narrative material in films compared to before, the performative duration of each frame as a photograph (despite the film being more of a storyteller compared to Eisenstein's earlier works) has increased relative to its counterparts in silent cinema; that is, the rhythm of editing and, consequently, the rhythm of photography have slowed down, and fewer but longer-lasting images

have been used for the performative narration of the film's story; performative pauses that result in almost every sequence forming a chapter, and the entire film is a collection of these relatively long chapter-sequences; the most important of which are the coronation chapter-sequence of the "Tsar", the marriage and consolidation chapter-sequence, the chapter-sequence where the "Tsar" apparently dies but actually intends to test the court's loyalty to him, and the mourning chapter-sequence of the "Tsar" for the death of his wife "Anastasia" and his own recovery after defeat in the Baltic War; the same chapter-sequences that, due to their narrative continuity and performative cohesion, subsequently shape the elegiac nature of the work in terms of narrative and story, and the theatrical nature of the work in terms of performance and depiction (Photographic Narrative of Ivan the Terrible, Kaveh Ghaderi). Ivan was both a magnificent state-builder and a bloody regime.

Semiotics of Cinema

Cinema was the art of the twentieth century and is still considered one of the most important and influential arts in human society. It is no wonder, then, that cinema has become one of the most significant bodies and arts studied by various approaches and disciplines, including semiotics. The presence and influence of cinema in contemporary human society is so profound and widespread that no approach can ignore it. The volume of research conducted by various approaches in the last century in the field of cinema is unparalleled by any other field. Semiotics soon turned its attention to this art and attempted to analyze it. However, it faced a few fundamental problems along the way. First, twentieth-century semiotics was heavily language-centric and resistant to other systems, hardly paying them any heed. Second, even when it did venture into other systems like cinema, it often, if not always, made the linguistic model its center and benchmark, paying little attention to the inherent potential of these arts. This is why a language-centric thinker like Barthes did not achieve much success in the realm of cinema, which he himself acknowledged, writing: "[This] may be because I have not succeeded in subsuming cinema into the realm of language, which I assessed in its pure, introspective state, not as an analyst" (Barthes, 2005: 83). Semiotics of cinema truly began to grow when it independently viewed the language and expression of cinema.

It is worth noting that the analogy between cinema and language preceded semiotic studies of cinema. The authors of "An Overview of Semiotic Studies of Cinema" introduce D.W. Griffith as the first person in this field, stating: "D.W. Griffith, the American filmmaker who advocated for the importance and dignity of film, was one of the first to use the linguistic model in his words: 'Moving images could have recorded the situation of the Tower of Babel at the time of its construction'" (Alisahor and Pope, 2004: 20). The Russian Formalists also used the linguistic model to explain cinema. This equation with the paradigm of structuralism and the domination of linguistics intensified and took on new dimensions. No longer satisfied with a broad parallel, this parallel extended to the very elements and components of cinema. On this basis, for instance, a single shot is compared to a word in a sentence, and a sequence is considered a sentence. This equation leads to the prescription of linguistic methods and linguistics as an appropriate model for the study of cinema and its elements.

Fortunately, over time, semiotics broke free from the dominance of linguistics and, with a fresh outlook, was able to view the differences between the verbal system and other systems like cinema not as a weakness of these systems in the face of language, but rather to look at them independently and understand and then analyze their potential and advantages. Alisahor and Pope write: "Cinema as an art form, a medium of communication, a mode of representation, and, most importantly in this context, as a particular form of signification" (ibid: 9). In fact, cinematic expression and language are far more complex than verbal language, as cinema is a multi-system and multi-code art. In addition to the verbal system, cinema employs other systems such as visual ones, including moving images, music, and sound effects, which makes purely linguistic analysis of this art highly challenging. Indeed, the linguistic analysis framework is too small and limited for cinematic analysis.

Semioticians who studied cinema fell into two categories: first, those with a semiotic background who also addressed cinema in their works, such as Roland Barthes and Umberto Eco; and second, those whose origins lay in film studies and who regarded semiotics as a fresh, distinct approach to the study and analysis of cinema,

such as Christian Metz, Alisahor, and Pope. They refer to film theorists who have explored linguistics and semiotics, saying: "Film theorists and filmmakers, from Boris Eichenbaum, Roman Jakobson, and Sergei Eisenstein to Jean-Luc Godard, Christian Metz, Umberto Eco, and Pier Paolo Pasolini (almost inspired by Saussure and sometimes Peirce), and more recently Chomsky, sought structural explanations of language for patterns that could explain the semantic understanding of film. The study of any image – still or moving – raises the issue of 'resemblance' between what is expressed and what expresses it; an inevitable analogy. Christian Metz has written: 'Semiotic work can only begin beyond analogy. There are codes that add things to the picture and codes that dissolve into the picture'" (Babak Ahmadi, 1992: 126). While "reading an image," we constantly substitute its elements with "other concepts." In fact, what we see on the cinema screen is a set of visual units (as Pasolini called them, "cinems") and their movement. We recognize the sign that clarifies the relationship between the signifiers or units of the image and their mental meaning as the foundation of the image.

Peter Wollen's Semiotics
In his book Signs and Meaning in the Cinema, Peter Wollen addresses several interrelated topics in the field of cinema, devoting one chapter specifically to "The Semiotics of Cinema". In this chapter, he takes an analytical approach to examining the views of theorists such as Roland Barthes, Christian Metz, and André Bazin. It is these very analyses and critiques that transform Wollen from a historian of cinema semiotics into an author and theorist himself.

Regarding Barthes' views, while acknowledging the prominence of his ideas on the semiotics of cinema, Wollen also critiques his extreme language-centrism, writing: "Barthes ultimately concluded that semiotics could be better viewed as a branch of linguistics, and vice versa. This seems a disheartening conclusion. A system called 'language' emerges as the 'most complex and universal' system of expression, subsuming everything within it. The experience of cinema shows that the remarkable complexity of meaning can be expressed through images." (Wollen, 2010: 125)

Like Umberto Eco, Wollen also tries to benefit from not only the achievements of Saussurean semiotics and its followers, but also Peircean semiotics and its adherents. It is here that Wollen emphasizes Peirce's triad and employs iconic signs for the study of images, especially cinema. In this regard, he points to the type of relationship between the iconic sign and its object, writing: "According to Peirce, an icon is a sign that depicts its object based on similarity; the relationship between the signifier and signified is not arbitrary, but rather based on resemblance." Wollen writes: "In fact, the aesthetic richness of cinema stems from the fact that in cinema all three dimensions of the sign are possible; 'indexical, iconic, and symbolic'. The great weakness of almost everyone who has written about cinema is that they have considered one of these dimensions and made it the basis of their aesthetics and the 'essential' dimension of the cinematic sign, while ignoring the rest. This diminishes cinema. Moreover, none of these dimensions can be regarded as insignificant: they co-exist. Only by considering the interplay of these three different dimensions can we understand cinema's aesthetic impact." (Babak Ahmadi, 1992: 45)

Roland Barthes' Semiotics
Roland Barthes, the prominent French semiotician, while considering the verbal system as the most complete communicative system, also paid special attention to visual systems such as photography and commercial advertising. His book on photography and his article entitled "Rhetoric of the Image" are considered foundational and influential works in this field. Barthes' direct writings on cinema are scarce. However, his collected works have formed a small book. The book "Barthes and Cinema" is considered a good reference in this area. In this work, in addition to the semiotic approach of all the articles, an article entitled "Semiotics and Film" also stands out. These not-so-many writings of Barthes are so profound and influential that analytical books on the semiotics of cinema cannot ignore them. Barthes is a language-oriented semiotician, although he is considered one of the designers of the rhetoric of the image, photographic criticism, and the semiotics of cinema. "During his research on the language of clothing, Roland Barthes concluded that escaping the dominant presence of spoken language is impossible" (Wollen, 2010: 122). In "Semiotics and Film," he refers to the resistance of linguists and language-oriented semioticians to other communicative genres and different sign

www.ijassjournal.com

systems, but he says that some of these systems, especially in film, can possess specific semiotic features. "In a film—this is a viable hypothesis—there is an analogical representation of reality, but insofar as this utterance is received by society, this representation includes elements that are not directly symbolic but are interpreted, culturalized, and conventionalized. These elements can shape secondary signification systems that are overlaid on the analogical utterance—we can call them rhetorical elements or elements of connotation. They thus create an analytical object for semiotics" (Barthes, 2005). Film can create its own specific expression, expand cultural signs, and make its language layered and conventional. In this case, it will be considered one of the suitable bodies of knowledge for semiotics.

In a conversation with Jacques Rivette and Michel Delahaye published in the magazine Cahiers du Cinéma, Roland Barthes emphasized that "signs in cinema" and television are not simple, but always exist in combination, and their main characteristic is the nature of combination, and this point makes it difficult to compare semiotic units in cinema with linguistic signs. Barthes stressed that if we do not intend the term "filmic language" to be a metaphorical expression, we must be able to study "an entire film" in a completely non-analogical way: "That is, to apply the structural method, we must be able to isolate the elements of the film from one another, and understand what signification each acquires in each case, then construct classifications, systems, and relationships from these elements." In 1970, in an article entitled "The Third Meaning," Barthes selected sixteen shots from the film "Ivan the Terrible" and analyzed them on three levels of meaning. The first level is informational and lies at the level of communication, and is analyzed by semiotics. The second level is symbolic and lies at the level of meaning, and is analyzed by the science of symbols (by science of symbols, here Barthes refers to psychoanalysis, economics, and dramaturgy). The third level, which Barthes calls the "obtuse meaning" (as opposed to the obvious meaning), refers to that added meaning that cannot be set aside by the other two levels. This level of "exorbitance" (as Christian Thompson has called it) is the most difficult and indescribable part for many critics who equate film with story and interpretation, and therefore fail to recognize and confirm that this third meaning can actually belong to any level. Barthes finds this level in his mental observations of such details as the ugliness of the character (Euphrosinia) that transcends the narrative and its deviation becomes a frankness of meaning. Barthes explains: "Let us imagine not following this figure of Euphrosyne, not even the character as a diegetic element (or symbolic element), not even the 'wicked mother' face, but just seeing, in this face, this look, this black veil, this harsh and ugly coldness. You would then have a completely different temporal segment. A meaning without any development. The obtuse meaning can only come and go, appear and disappear." (Rosenbaum, 2019: 120-121)

The research is presented in a tabular form for a general description and better understanding. (Table 1)

Elements	Title			
Human	Tsar	Soldier	Soldier	
Objects	Crown	Coin	Tsar's scepter	Bowl
Posture	Tsar	While holding the royal scepter in his right hand and the imperial orb in his left, he stands facing forward with a direct gaze.		
	First Soldier	Standing to the right of the Tsar, with eyes full of cunning and intrigue, he looks straight ahead.		
	Second Soldier	Standing to the left of the Tsar, he pours the coins with a downward gaze, devoid of any emotion.		

	Crown	The Tsar's crown, symbolizing the sovereignty, culture, and spirituality of that time.
	Coin	A symbol of power, sovereignty, and abundance, being poured over the Tsar's head.
	Bowl	Large, round bowls filled with gold coins that are poured over the Tsar's head during the coronation ceremony.

Comparative Table Between Two Studies (Table 2)

Article No. A	The coronation sequence in Eisenstein's film Ivan the Terrible and the semiotics of Pier Wollen and Roland Barthes
Article No. B	A comparative study of the place of cypress trees in Safavid and Qajar carpets from the perspective of Sheila Canby and Arthur Upham Pope

Comparative Points	Article No. A		
	Low	Medium	High
Presence of myth in the sign system			*
Dynamic and kinetic composition			*
Use of historical events and occurrences to create the work			*
Utilization of native and national symbols			*
Influence of the artist by political and social conditions			*
Depicting the artist's political views in the created work		*	
Displaying power and dominance of the government in the works in question			*
Influence of the artist by other artworks for creating the		*	

	Low	Medium	High
work in question			
Use of religious signs and symbols in the works			*
Depicting overt and covert chaos and violence			*
Utilization of explicit and implicit connotations in the works in question		*	
Comparative Points	**Article No. A**		
	Low	**Medium**	**High**
Presence of semantic continuity in the sign system			*
Ability to divide the visual sign system into smaller units			*
Presence of signs that entail opposing meanings			*
Existence of aesthetic codes due to visual expression			*
Narrative quality of the works			*
Color variety and utilization of color effects in the works	*		
Use of perspective and visual effects			*
Text-oriented and structuralist approach	*		
Using images with symbols of the enemy			*

Table 2 (author)

IV. Conclusion

In the present study, we examined the coronation sequence of the Tsar in the film Ivan the Terrible from the semiotic perspective of two thinkers, Peter Wollen and Roland Barthes. In the coronation sequence of Ivan the Terrible, two courtiers perform this ceremony. At the informative level of meaning, which is the presentation of information, meaning what semiotics considers its task to examine (Shamili), the viewer becomes aware of

details such as the way of dressing, the decor, and the relationship between the characters. At the second level of meaning, the symbolic level, at the level of signification, which is understood through "semiotic sciences such as psychoanalysis, economics and dramaturgy", the viewer becomes familiar with the ceremony and tradition of "pouring gold over the Tsar's head"; implicit meanings of gold, wealth, and royal authority are formed. The semiotic signification of this level of meaning is much greater than the first. However, these two levels do not encompass all the meanings of the few frames. The third meaning can be attached to each frame; it can also be understood from a set of images, the way the courtiers style their faces and hair, the foolish nose of one courtier and the downcast gaze of the other, whose pale face, these are unnamed elements that are a set of interrelated images.

References

[1] Ahmadi, Babak. 1992. From Visual Signs to Text, Tehran: Markaz Publishing.

[2] Arbabi, Mahmoud. 2008. Collection of Articles on Cinema and Literature Symposium, Tehran.

[3] Barthes, Roland. 2005. Barthes and Cinema, Selected Articles and Interviews of Roland Barthes on Cinema, translated by MaziyarEslami, Tehran: Gam-e No Publishing.

[4] Haji Hoseinnezhad, Gholamreza. 1992. Aesthetics of Image, Tehran: Tarbiat Publishing.

[5] Hashemi, Mohsen. 1999. From Mentality to Objectivity in Cinema, Tehran.

[6] Arnheim, Rudolf. 1982. Film as Art, translated by Fereydoun Moezzi Moghaddam, Tehran: Amir Kabir Publishing.

[7] Bordwell, David. 2004. Film History, translated by Robert Safarian, Tehran: Markaz Publishing.

[8] Brecht, Tolstoy, Dreiser, Sartre, Shaw, Faulkner, Woolf. 1979. Cinema from the Perspective of Several Writers, translated by Omid Roshanzamir, Tehran: Payam Publishing.

[9] Jickens, William. 1985. The Place of Cinema in Humanities, translated by Mohammad Taghi Ahmadian, ShahlaaHakimian, Tehran: Soroush Publishing.

[10] Deleuze, Gilles. 2013. Cinema 1 (Movement-Image), translated by MaziyarEslami, Tehran: MinooyeKherad Publishing.

[11] Metz, Christian. 2022. Semiotics of Cinema, translated by Robert Safarian, Tehran: Sina Publishing.

[12] Monaco, James. 1977. How to Read a Film, translated by Hamid Reza Ahmadi Lari, Tehran: Farabi Publishing.

[13] Wollen, Peter. 1997. Signs and Meaning in Cinema, translated by Bahman Taheri, Tehran: Soroush Publishing.

[14] Bayramian, Shant. 2017. "Subversive Affirmation In Sergei Eisenstain's Ivan the Terrible", Groningen University of Amsterdam.

[15] Bordwell, David. 1993. "The Cinema Of Eisenstein", Harvard University, Pragmatics.

[16] Khitrova, Daria. 2011. "Eisenstein's Choreography in Ivan The Terrible", University of Chicago.

[17] Kleiman, Naum&Somaini, Antonio. 2016. "Sergei M.Eisenstein Notes For a General History of Cinema", Amsterdam University.

[18] Pezzini, Isabella. 2017. "Semiotics As a Critical Discourse: Roland Barthes' Mythologies", Sapienza University of Rome.

[19] Platt, M.F. Kevin. 2007. "Allegories Of Stalinist Historiography: Eisenstein's Ivan the Terrible", Ab Imperio.

[20] Vassilieva, Julia. 2021. "Eisenstein's "Magic of Art"", Sciendo.