

## Introduction 2: The Long Take—Concepts, Practices, Technologies, and Histories

*Steve Neale*

Academic interest in what we now call “long takes” dates largely from the 1970s, when Brian Henderson published his ground-breaking article on “The Long Take” in *Film Comment* (Henderson 1971), when Robin Wood published essays on *Letter from an Unknown Woman* (1948), *Ugetsu Monogatari* (1952), and *Sansho Dayu* (1953) in *Personal Views* (Wood 1976), and when Lutz Bacher published *The Mobile Mise en Scène* (Bacher 1978) and began work on *Max Ophuls in the Hollywood Studios* (Bacher 1996). Although there are traces of the term in critical and industry discourse in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, as we shall see, the mid-1970s was also the point at which journals like *Variety* began to use it on a routine basis and at which Barry Salt began research on his history of film technology and style.<sup>1</sup> When Salt published the first edition of *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis* in 1983 (and when he later published an expanded and updated edition in 1992), he used “long take” as a term, traced the development of longer-than-average shots in the early and late 1930s and at various points thereafter, and

---

S. Neale (✉)  
University of Exeter, Exeter, UK  
e-mail: S.B.M.Neale@exeter.ac.uk

© The Author(s) 2017  
J. Gibbs and D. Pye (eds.), *The Long Take*,  
Palgrave Close Readings in Film and Television,  
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-58573-8\_2

proposed the concept of the “average shot length” (ASL) of films as a measure of this and other stylistic features.

Since then the term “long take” has become more and more ubiquitous—and more and more precisely conceptualised—as an unusually lengthy shot relative to historical or national norms. It has also been identified as an alternative to editing, especially in “sequence shots”: shots that constitute entire scenes, or in extreme cases, such as *Time Code* (2000) and *Russian Ark* (2002), whole films. ASLs are now routinely cited (not least on the Cinematics Database), and there is now an entry on the long take in Wikipedia, complete with a list of directors “who are known for long takes” (among them Robert Altman, Theodoros Angelopoulos, Michelangelo Antonioni, Jean-Luc Godard, Hou Hsiao Hsien, Miklós Jancsó, David Lean, Kenji Mizoguchi, Max Ophuls, Andrei Tarkovsky, Béla Tarr, and Orson Welles). As a result, cinephile websites such as [moviemail.com](http://moviemail.com) and [totalfilm.com](http://totalfilm.com) list their “Top Ten Spectacular Long Takes” and their “18 Coolest Movie Long Takes,” while [youtube.com](http://youtube.com) provides extracts from the “12 Best Long Takes in Film History,” stating flatly that “There’s no greater statement of a director’s prowess than a long shot in a single take.”

The author of this last claim presumably meant that “a director’s prowess” was marked by longer than average shots, not by long shots. (Long shots are shots in which the camera is placed at a distance from the figures, objects, or landscapes that it frames.) Either way, recurrent favourites include the opening shots of *La Ronde* (1950), *Touch of Evil* (1958), *Boogie Nights* (1997), and *Snake Eyes* (1998), the traffic-jam sequence in *Weekend* (1967), and Henry’s entry into the Copacabana nightclub with his fiancée in *Goodfellas* (1990). Some of these use tracks and cranes, others hand-held camera and Steadicams. And in addition, some use photographic technology and some use digital, and these are factors not just in the simulated “long takes” that occasionally mark animated shorts and features both before and after the late 1980s, none of which involves the movement of cameras, but in more conventionally filmed sequences too. Other films and filmmakers eschew (or largely eschew) camera movement altogether, especially radically avant-garde filmmakers in the 1960s and 1970s, and these are cited more rarely. They include Chantal Akerman’s *News from Home* (1976), which consists of “long fixed-camera takes of Manhattan streets and subway cars, intercut with a few pans and two long tracking shots near the end” (Margulies 1996, 151), and also Andy Warhol’s *Empire*, which was filmed between

8:06 p.m. and 2:42 a.m. on the night of 25 July 1964 at 24 frames per second, and which was subsequently projected at 16 frames per second, thus requiring approximately 8 hours 5 minutes to screen approximately 6 hours 36 minutes of footage when viewed complete. A variant includes *Eureka* (1974), a film by Ernie Gehr which extends a 5-minute shot from a cable car taken in the early 1900s to a 30-minute film by multiplying its frames (Sitney 2002, 435), and in turn, in 1993, Douglas Gordon did something similar in making a very long video work of *Psycho* (1960) entitled *24 Hour Psycho*.

Whether these and other examples consist of “takes” in the conventional sense—for example, versions of shots that are filmed more than once—is a moot point. Given that the shots in *News from Home* were all taken at a particular point in time and place, none of them could ever have been precisely retaken, and given that it was filmed only once, the “shot” consisting of ten rolls of 16 mm film in *Empire* is not really a take at all. However, in more conventional art films, and in most commercial studios and industries from the late 1910s on, multiple takes—whether short or long—were the norm. In the principal Hollywood studios these takes would be viewed on a daily basis by production personnel and supervisors, who would often insist on retakes and increasingly on “coverage”: a mix of close-ups, medium shots, long shots, and other “angles” that would be used to punctuate relatively lengthy master takes in order to facilitate visual variety, rhythm, and clarity, and a modulated flow of action, interaction, spectacle, and intimacy.

The provision of coverage was (and still is) a key practice in Hollywood: screenwriting manuals, accounts of individual productions, and manuals of cinematography are all insistent on this, and for this reason most of them caution against the use or specification of long or single takes.<sup>2</sup> However, the provision of over-extensive coverage could be time consuming and expensive. In an interview in Britain in 1930, Alfred Hitchcock stated flatly that every cut “means a new set up. [...] Time is money, as you know, or, rather, as supervisors know” (Blakeston 1930 and reprinted in Gottlieb 2003, 6). Hitchcock was renowned for planning his shots and set-ups in advance. Yet while W.S. “One Take Woody” Van Dyke was reputed to have filmed his set-ups only once or twice, Fritz Lang and others were noted for filming theirs over and over again. Scripts often varied in format and by no means always specified particular types of shot, and supervisory practices differed from studio to studio (and sometimes from producer to producer).<sup>3</sup>

We know far less about the historical procedures and norms governing scripts and the shooting, editing, and supervision of films outside the USA, partly because the documentation of production in a number of countries is scarce; partly because it is so often assumed that directors were solely responsible for matters such as this; and partly because, with the exception of Bernardi, Crisp, and Price, there has been so little interest in these topics.<sup>4</sup> We do know, though, that feature-length films (films of four to five reels or more) had become the norm by the late 1910s; that they had been pioneered not in Hollywood (or the USA more broadly) but in Italy, France, and Scandinavia; and that many of these films were marked by what David Bordwell has called “the tableau aesthetic” (2010), a style originating in the late 1900s and based not on editing, but on deeply staged and carefully choreographed scenes filmed largely from stationary positions and occasionally interspersed with closer views.

### THE TABLEAU AESTHETIC

As Ben Brewster explains, the origins of the tableau aesthetic appear to lie in French Films d’Art productions such as *L’Assassinat du Duc de Guise* (*The Assassination of the Duke de Guise* 1908) and *La Tosca* (1909), both of which were prestigious single-reel films, and both of which drew on a tendency to film basic scene shots from closer to the action (and from a slightly lower position) than had hitherto been the norm. This resulted in a tendency to place actors one behind another and to stage the action “with a certain amount of depth”:

Once this happened filmmakers grasped a difference in principle between staging for the camera and live staging, that all the spectators are seated in the same imaginary space in relation to a projected image, and so one of the main barriers to deep staging in the theater did not exist for film: the whole audience would see every character in the frame visible through the camera lens, no matter how small the angular separation of those characters might have been. This allowed for elaborate blocking of different objects and characters on different planes of the picture, encouraging and even requiring a more and more precise *mise-en-scène* than had ever prevailed on the live stage. (Brewster 2005, 606)

For a short period, this aesthetic marked a number of films from the USA as well as Europe. Yet editing and alternation largely prevailed in the former, and by the end of the 1910s editing and scene dissection became the norm:

“long shots” became “establishing shots” and most of the action in a scene would be in closer shots framing one or two characters, often both at the same distance from the camera. In either case, what depth there was became a matter of a spectacular setting for the action [...] while the action itself was relatively shallow. (Brewster 2005, 607)

In contrast (and as is demonstrated at greater length in Brewster and Jacobs 1997), the tableau aesthetic marked a number of pioneering feature-length European films, such as France’s *Germinal* (Abel 1913; directed in France by Albert Cappellani), *Ma l’amor mio non muore!* (1913; directed in Italy by Mario Caserini), and *Ingeborg Holm* (1913; directed in Sweden by Victor Sjöström). It also marked two- and three-reel European “features” such as *Balletdanserinden* (*The Ballet Dancer*, 1911) and *Ved faengslets Port* (*Temptations of a Great City*, 1911; both directed in Denmark by August Blom), and feature-length episodes of serials such *Fantômas* (1913–1914), *Les Vampyres* (1915–1916), *Judex* (1917), and *Ti Minh* (1919), all of which were directed in France by Louis Feuillade.<sup>5</sup>

## THE 1920S AND 1930S

Although traces of the tableau style can be found in scenes in European films as late as the mid-1920s—*Klovnene* (1926) provides a number of examples—it appears largely to have waned by the late 1910s. Other styles evolved, among them French Impressionism and Soviet Montage, both of which entailed striking passages of editing, and German Expressionism, whose films often contained lengthy shots but tended to lack the precise and complex blocking and staging that were hallmarks of the tableau style. Otherwise, “camera mobility” became a minor trend in Germany and France—and a minor trend in Hollywood too—in the period between 1926 and 1928 (Salt 1992, 157). Examples of the latter can be found in *Sunrise* and *7th Heaven*, both of which were released in 1927, and *The Crowd*, released in 1928. Various forms of experimentation also emerged in the USA and Europe as alternatives to mainstream

cinema in the late 1910s and 1920s, but most of these deployed rapid editing or the construction of changing abstract patterns (Thompson and Bordwell 2003, 173–184).

The advent of sound technologies led initially to a wider set of practices and styles, both in Hollywood and elsewhere. Experimentation continued outside the mainstream in the USA in the 1930s, and in Hollywood in the early 1930s, multiple cameras offering a means of providing coverage and visual variety prior to the point at which “music, voices and sound effects could be registered separately and later mixed onto one track” in 1932 (Thompson and Bordwell 2003, 241). There was a vogue in Hollywood for lengthy mobile shots, as is evident in *The Singing Fool* (1928) and *Applause*, *Chinatown Nights*, and *Sunnyside Up* (all 1929), and in or by 1932, the 1931 version of *The Front Page* and the 1932 version of *Back Street* were marked by ASLs as long as 23 seconds (Salt 1992, 206). However, by the mid-1930s, Hollywood films were dominated by standard scene dissection, “classical continuity editing,” relatively rapid cutting rates (which reached a peak in 1937), and ASLs of approximately 9 seconds (Salt 1992, 214; Thompson and Bordwell 1993, 109–141). There were some exceptions, most notably in the films directed by George Cukor and John Stahl. And although British and Soviet films were even faster cut, Mizoguchi began to pioneer his distinctive long take style in Japan in the mid to late 1930s, and ASLs in continental Europe were maintained at around 12 to 13 seconds.<sup>6</sup>

### THE LATE 1930S AND THE EARLY TO MID-1940S

By 1939, there were signs of a trend towards long (or longer) takes among a number of Hollywood directors (Salt 1992, 231). In addition to Cukor, the directors who contributed to this trend included Howard Hawks, Max Ophuls, Orson Welles, and William Wyler, and the cinematographers they worked with included Stanley Cortez, Tony Gaudio, Franz (Frank) Planer, Gregg Toland, and Joseph Walker. In *His Girl Friday* (1940), Hawks and Walker tended to use pans, occasional tracks, and passages of fast-paced dialogue interspersed with fast-paced action (and occasional passages of quiet reflection or conversation; Jacobs 1998; Salt 1992, 231). In the four-minute take in *The Letter* (1939), on the other hand, Wyler and Gaudio stage and film a key conversation scene in a continuous and delicately modulated set of two-shot and single-shot framings. Other directors and cinematographers mixed these techniques

or used dollies, crane shots, and tracking shots as well: in *Double Indemnity* (1944), Billy Wilder and cinematographer John F. Seitz prolonged their shots by moving the actors on set while the characters converse (Salt 1992, 234–235); and in *Laura* (1944) and *Fallen Angel* (1945), Otto Preminger began to develop a fluid camera style based initially on relatively assertive, autonomous movement. However, thanks largely to the writings of André Bazin, the best-known examples of what we now call “long takes” in the early 1940s are probably those that occur in *Citizen Kane* (1941) and *The Magnificent Ambersons* (1942), which were both directed by Welles and which were photographed by Toland and Cortez, respectively.

For Bazin, classical *découpage* and editing had reached their peak—and hence the limits of their capacity to engage with space and time—by the late 1930s (Bazin 1967, 30–33). Although *Kane* and *Ambersons* were both marked by passages of montage (and although *Ambersons* was heavily truncated and re-edited while Welles was away in South America), both films flouted a number of classical norms and both used deep staging, deep-focus cinematography, and lengthy sequence shots in order to explore and represent space (Bazin 1967, 33–37; 1978, 68–95). These and other aspects of *Kane* were discussed in two separate but similar articles written by Toland in 1941, one in *American Cinematographer*, the other in *Popular Photography Magazine*. And in the former, considerable attention is paid to the fact that “we tried to plan action so that the camera could pan or dolly from one angle to another whenever this type of treatment was desirable. In other scenes, we pre-planned our angles and compositions so that the action which ordinarily would be shown in direct cuts would be shown in a single, longer scene” (Toland 1941, 40).<sup>7</sup>

In addition to the fact that “scene” is used as a synonym for “shot” here (a terminological conflation that dates back to the 1900s when scenes usually consisted of single shots) and that it can be found in scripts and treatments as late as the 1950s, it should be noted that Toland does not use the term “long take,” which appears to emerge later on in the 1940s, as we shall see.<sup>8</sup> It should also be noted that Welles and Toland were given carte blanche by RKO and were allowed to do as they liked. Yet when Jean Renoir, who had used long takes when making *La Règle de Jeu* in France in 1938, expressed a wish to film one of the scenes in *Swamp Water* (1941) “in a single mobile shot,” Darryl Zanuck,

Renoir's producer at Twentieth-Century Fox, dissuaded him from doing so (Renoir 1974a, 183).<sup>9</sup>

*Kane* and *Ambersons* were by no means the only films to adopt the use of lengthy shots or high ASLs in Hollywood in the early to mid-1940s. Salt cites Henry King, George Marshall, and Edmund Goulding, and notes that “the mean ASL for a large sample of Hollywood production went up from 8.5 seconds in the late thirties, to 9.5 seconds in the period 1940–1945” (Salt 1992, 231). Although Salt does not discuss any of these films at length, he notes the extent to which one among a number of approaches “involved increasing mobility.” Here, he argues, “the leading figure was Vincente Minnelli, and the key work was *The Clock* made in 1945. With an ASL of 19 seconds, this film naturally has many takes that are minutes long, and these are mostly covered with camera movement, even including the use of a crane to this end, possibly for the first time in a non-musical film” (231).

At this point in his career, Minnelli was largely associated with musicals. So too was Busby Berkeley. Renowned for the staging and editing of spectacular song-and-dance sequences in the early to mid-1930s, Berkeley directed numerous musicals during the course of the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. In 1943, and doubtless aware of the trend towards long takes, he directed *The Gang's All Here*, a film that opens with a pair of numbers (“Brazil” and “You Discover You’re in New York”) separated half way through the latter by a dialogue sequence involving relatively short conventional shots. These numbers were filmed in lengthy takes—running at 3 minutes 14 seconds and 2 minutes 8 seconds, respectively—and their cinematic articulation is anything but conventional in according the camera “the arbitrary power to fashion and refashion space, twisting and expanding and contracting and flattening it at will”:

The film opens in a void, with a half-lit face of a male singer (crooning “Brazil”) that looms out of blackness as the camera cranes in. Without a visible cut, the camera pulls back to its original position, but the foreground is now occupied by bamboo poles that form a pattern of diagonal lines across the frame. This opening configuration moves the visual fields from nothingness to abstraction. It also establishes the camera’s power to conjure up spatial elements out of thin air [...] The camera continues moving laterally to the left, revealing the prow of a full-size cargo ship standing in real water. The shot cranes up, over, and around a roomy set representing a dock, passengers disembarking, cargo being unloaded, and the New

York skyline in the background. A panning movement down an enormous load of fruit reveals Carmen Miranda standing underneath. As Miranda launches into “You Discover You’re in New York,” the camera pulls back to disclose a strolling Latin band behind her, then moves right to show Phil Baker pulling up in a car. The shot follows Baker as he joins Miranda, then cranes rapidly away back to disclose that this entire panorama has purportedly been taking place on the tiny stage of a nightclub. (Rubin 1993, 165)

### THE LATE 1940s AND 1950s

The fluidity of camera movements in Hollywood in the late 1940s was augmented by the introduction of the Houston crab dolly (in 1946) and the Selznick crab dolly (in 1948), and these were particularly important to directors such as Preminger and Hitchcock. Tracks and cranes, on the other hand, were particularly important to Minnelli and Ophuls (Salt 1992, 307; Bacher 1996, *passim*). For Bacher, who details the production of the latter’s Hollywood films, Ophuls’s style is marked by some specific features. These include the use of “rhythmic” takes, which involve travelling past foreground or background elements, and “expressive” takes, which involve varying angle, height, or distance for the purposes of emphasis, “variation of character dominance,” and the establishment of relationships between characters and/or between characters and objects. These takes were usually used when introducing a new character or setting or when seeking to develop “strong emotional expression.” Shot-reverse-shot patterns, on the other hand, were usually reserved for passages of tension, conflict, or deceit (Bacher 1996, 5, 6).

These stylistic features were unusual, and the use of lengthy mobile shots was often resisted by Hollywood supervisors; in consequence Ophuls moved to France, where he went on to direct *La Ronde*, *Le Plaisir* (1952), *Madame De...* (1953), and *Lola Montès* (1955) in long take style. However, long take filmmaking in Hollywood reached an extreme stylistic peak with *Rope*, which was directed by Alfred Hitchcock in 1948 and was much discussed in the trade and newspaper presses. Having already experimented in *The Paradine Case* (1948) with what Bart Sheridan called “The Three and a Half Minute Take...” (Sheridan 1948), Hitchcock determined to outdo himself (and everyone else) by making a film that purported to contain “no time lapses—a picture in which the camera never stops” (Hitchcock 1948). Although aiming

initially to produce an eight-reel 80-minute film (and although C.A. Lejeune, a British film reviewer, referred to the “celebrated nine-minute Hitchcock take” as its key stylistic feature; Lejeune 1948 and reprinted in Lejeune 1991, 235), the eventual duration of the shots, of which there were ten in all, varied from 4 minutes 37 seconds to 10 minutes 6 seconds, and four of them began with unmasked cuts.<sup>10</sup> However, while Lejeune and Sheridan came close to using it in and around this period, the “long take” remained elusive as a term. The only example I have come across is in Adolphe Menjou’s autobiography, which refers in retrospect to the fact that each of the six-minute “scenes” in the 1931 version of *The Front Page* was “a hell of long ‘take’” (Menjou and Musselman 1948, 20). Nevertheless, long take filmmaking continued to flourish, albeit in less extreme forms than *Rope*.

The overall profile of Hollywood ASLs in the early 1950s was similar to that of the late 1940s, but the “peak number of films with high ASLs” was reached in the period between 1952 and 1957.<sup>11</sup> This was due in part to the introduction of Cinemascope, which was first used in *The Robe* (1953) and was initially perceived as a “theatrical” format necessitating lengthy takes, “long-shot framings, frontal staging, and simple cutting” (Thompson and Bordwell 2010, 331). However, Cinemascope was also used by established long take directors such as Cukor, Minnelli, and Preminger, who deployed it in a number of distinctive ways.<sup>12</sup> Despite these developments, the term “long take” was still extremely rare. In 1951 *Daily Variety* (25 July 1951, 4) reported on “the fouling up of a long take” in the production of *The Tanks Are Coming* (1951), and in 1955 *Variety* reported a contretemps over the extent to which Hitchcock had used as many “long, interminable takes” in *Dial M for Murder* (1954) as he had in *Rope* (19 July 1955, 24). Yet aside from an item on the filming of a “10 minute and 20 second take” for an episode of *Gunsmoke* (*Daily Variety*, 20 July 1955, 14), the only other uses of the term were those that focused on the necessities and difficulties of filming “live action” television plays with multiple cameras in the late 1940s and early 1950s.<sup>13</sup>

In the meantime, in the mid-1950s, Robert Aldrich and Delmer Daves helped inaugurate a trend towards Cinemascope films with shorter-than-average takes and ASLs as low as 5 to 7 seconds, thus paving the way for a slow decline in ASLs in general in the USA during the course of the late 1950s and 1960s (Salt 1992, 246, 249, 265), and also for what Bordwell has called “intensified continuity,” a set of

related stylistic traits in films marked by ever-decreasing ASLs from the 1960s on (Bordwell 2008). However, in Europe, the 1950s and 1960s witnessed a wide array of what were often dubbed “art films,” many of which drew on the protocols of modernism. Seeking to challenge classical norms, and to cater to a growing number of well-educated film devotees, these films often generated puzzles, inviting their spectators to speculate on their meanings as they did so, and many of them involved long takes. Among them were *Ordet* (1954) and *Gertrud* (1964), which were scripted and directed by Carl Theodor Dreyer in Denmark (Bordwell 1981, 144–190); *L’Avventura* (1960), *La Notte* (1963), and *L’Eclisse* (1963), co-scripted and directed by Michelangelo Antonioni in Italy (Thompson and Bordwell 2003, 426–427, and Nowell-Smith, *L’Avventura*, 1997); and *The Round-Up* (1965), *The Red and the White* (1967), and *Silence and Cry* (1968), directed by Miklós Jancsó in Yugoslavia (Bordwell 2005, 156–157).

### THE 1970S AND BEYOND

During the 1970s, Jancsó continued his experiments with long takes in films such as *Technique and Rite* (1971) and *Rome Wants Another Caesar* (1973), and at the same time, in Greece, Theo Angelopoulos directed similar types of film in *Reconstruction* (1970), *Days of ’36* (1972), and the four-hour *The Travelling Players* (1975).<sup>14</sup> Also in 1975, Chantal Akerman produced and directed the 201-minute *Jeanne Dielman, 23, Quai du Commerce, 1080 Bruxelles*, which featured very long takes; later, in Yugoslavia, Béla Tarr produced and directed *Šatántangó (Satan’s Tango)* (1994), a seven and a half hour film which is still one of the longest feature films ever made.

In the meantime, Hollywood had already begun to inaugurate several changes and practices as the old studio system finally gave way to a series of new ones; as the decades wore on, ASLs became shorter and shorter. Bordwell points out in detail in *The Way Hollywood Tells It* that a number of mid to late 1960s Hollywood A-films “contain ASLs of between 6 and 8 seconds,” and the “pace accelerated in the 1970s.” At this point, “three-quarters of films had ASLs between 5 and 8 seconds, and we find a significant number of still faster ones,” and midway “through the decade most films in any genre included at least a thousand shots.” In the 1980s, “the tempo continued to pick up, but the filmmaker’s range narrowed dramatically,” double-digit ASLs “virtually vanished from

mass-entertainment cinema,” and most mainstream films were marked by “ASLs of 5 and 7 seconds,” “many averaged 4 and 5 seconds,” and “today, films are on average cut more rapidly than any time in US studio filmmaking” (Bordwell 2006, 121–122).<sup>15</sup> Digital technology plays a part here.<sup>16</sup> However, long takes remained a mark of quality outside the USA, and in Taiwan, Hou Hsiao-hsien followed his early teenage musicals with contemplative de-dramatised films such as *A Time to Live and a Time to Die* (1985) and *Dust in the Wind* (1986), both of which were marked by “extreme long shots, long takes, static framing, and almost no shot/reverse-shot cutting” (Thompson and Bordwell 2010, 653); these ingredients were included in his later films as well.<sup>17</sup>

The long take retains its fascination as a mark of quality and directorial bravura despite the fact that many long take films are now shot digitally. Aside from other studies on long take films in small or poor countries, further research into ASLs would help augment the study of these as well as middle-range countries and their histories.

## NOTES

1. *Variety*, 26 March 1975, 26; 7 May 1975, 6; and 4 June 1975, 18.
2. See Cromwell (1937, 61), Arnold (1937, 167–169), Bauchens (1937, 200–204), Schary (1950, 86–92, 105–108, 179–181), Herman (1952, 107–108), Mascelli (1965, 75–81).
3. See Bernstein (1994, passim), Neale (2012, passim), Price (2013, 140–162, 182–188), Schatz (1988, passim).
4. See Bernardi (2001), Crisp (1997, 266–323) and Price (2013, 99–119, 163–181).
5. For more on Feuillade and on the tableau aesthetic in general, see Bordwell (1997, 175–198) and Bordwell (2005, 43–82).
6. See Bordwell (1997, 215–217), Thompson and Bordwell (2005, 94–123), Kirihaara (1992), and Salt (1992, 214–216).
7. See also Bordwell (1985, 346–349) and Carringer (1996, 72–85).
8. For more information on this shot/scene conflation, see Esenwein and Leeds (1913, 167, 200, 310–351) and Price (2013, 63, 153–155).
9. My translation: the English-language edition (1974, 199) is slightly misleading in using “plan” as a synonym for “take” rather than “shot.”
10. For more information, go to <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki>. See also Bordwell (2008, 32–43).
11. See Salt (1992, 240, 249).

12. See Bordwell (2008, 303, 304, 309–310), Fujiwara (2008, 158–160, 171–172), Gibbs and Pye (2010, 71–80), and Salt (1992, 247).
13. See *Variety*, 22 February, 8 March and 17 May 1950, 30, 1 and 6, respectively.
14. See Thompson and Bordwell (2003, 566–567). For more on Angelopoulos, see Bordwell (2005, 140–185).
15. See also Thompson and Bordwell (2010, 673–675).
16. See Thompson and Bordwell (2010, 713–730).
17. For more on Hou’s films, see Bordwell (2005, 186–237).

**Acknowledgements** I would like to thank John Gibbs and Douglas Pye for inviting me to write this essay and David Bordwell for sharing a number of sources, suggestions and ideas.

## WORKS CITED

- Arnold, John. 1937. “Shooting the Movies.” In *We Make the Movies*, edited by Nancy Naumberg, 16–31. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Bacher, Lutz. 1978. *The mobile mise en scene*. New York: Arno Press.
- . 1996. *Max Ophuls in the Hollywood Studios*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Bauchens, Annie. 1937. “Cutting the Film.” In *We Make the Movies*, edited by Nancy Naumberg, 199–215. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Bazin, André. 1967. “The Evolution of Film Language.” In *What is Cinema? Volume 1*, translated by Hugh Gray, 23–40. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- . 1974. *Jean Renoir*. London: W.H. Allen.
- . 1978. *Orson Welles: A Critical View*. Translated by Jonathan Rosenbaum. London: Elm Tree Books.
- Bernardi, Joanne. 2001. *Writing in Light: The Silent Scenario and the Japanese Pure Film Movement*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Bernstein, Mathew. 1994. *Walter Wanger: Hollywood Independent*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blakeston, Oswald. 1930. “Advance Monologue.” *Close-Up* 7 (2): 146–147.
- Bordwell, David. 1980. *The Films of Carl-Theodor Dreyer*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: California University Press.
- . 1985. “Deep-Focus Cinematography.” In *The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960*, edited by Bordwell, David, Janet Staiger, and Kristin Thompson, 581–592. London, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- . 1997. *On the History of Film Style*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: California University Press.
- . 2006. *The Way Hollywood Tells It: Story and Style in Modern Movies*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- . 2008. *Poetics of Cinema*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2010. "The Tableau Aesthetic." <http://www.davidbordwell.net/essays/nordisk.php>.
- Bordwell, David and Kristin Thompson. 1993. "Technological Change and Classical Film Style." In *Grand Design: Hollywood as a Modern Business Enterprise, 1930-1939*, edited by Tino Balio, 109–142. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Brewster, Ben. 2005. "Staging in Depth." In *Encyclopedia of Early Cinema*. Edited by Richard Abel. New York: Routledge.
- Brewster, Ben, and Lea Jacobs, eds. 1997. *Theatre to Cinema: Stage Pictorialism and the Early Feature Film*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carringer, Robert L. 1996. *The Making of Citizen Kane*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: California University Press.
- Cormack, Mike. 1994. *Ideology and Cinematography in Hollywood, 1930-39*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Crisp, Colin. 1997. *The Classic French Cinema, 1930-1960*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press; London: I.B. Tauris.
- Cromwell, John. 1937. "The Voice Behind the Megaphone." In *We Make the Movies*, edited by Nancy Naumberg, 53–63. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Esenwein, J. Berg, and Arthur Leeds. 1913. *Writing the Photoplay*. Springfield Massachusetts: The Home Correspondence School.
- Fujiwara, Chris. 2008. *The World and Its Double: The Life and Work of Otto Preminger*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Gibbs, John and Douglas Pye. 2010. "Preminger and Peckinpah: Seeing and Shaping Widescreen Worlds." In *Widescreen Worldwide*, edited by Belton, John, Sheldon Hall, and Steve Neale, 71–90. New Barnet: John Libbey Publishing.
- Gottlieb, Sidney, ed. 1995. *Hitchcock on Hitchcock*. London: Faber and Faber.
- , ed. 2003. *Alfred Hitchcock Interviews*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Henderson, Brian. 1971. "The Long Take." *Film Comment* 7 (2): 6–11.
- Herman, Lewis Helmar. 1952. *A Practical Manual of Screen Playwriting for Theater and Television Films*. Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company.
- Hitchcock, Alfred. 1948. "My Most Exciting Picture." *Popular Photography*, November: 48–51, 96, 98, 100, 103–104.

- Jacobs, Lea. 1998. "Keeping Up With Hawks." *Iris* 32: 402–426.
- Kirihara, Don. 1992. *Patterns of Time: Mizoguchi and the 1930s*. Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Lejeune, C.A. 1948. "Rope." *The Observer*, 21 November.
- Lejeune, Anthony, ed. 1991. *The C.A. Lejeune Reader*. Manchester: Carcanet.
- Margulies, Ivone. 1996. *Nothing Happens: Chantal Akerman's Hyperrealist Everyday*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Mascelli, Joseph V. 1965. *The Five C's of Cinematography: Motion Picture Techniques Simplified*. Hollywood: Cine/Grafic Publications.
- Menjou, Adolphe, and M.M. Musselman. 1948. *It Took Nine Tailors*. New York: Whittlesey House.
- Neale, Steve, ed. 1912. *The Classical Hollywood Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey. 1997. *L'Avventura*. London: BFI.
- Price, Steven. 2013. *A History of the Screenplay*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Renoir, Jean. 1974a. *Ma Vie et Mes Films*. Paris: Flammarion.
- . 1974b. *My Life and My Films*. London: Collins.
- Rubin, Martin. 1993. *Showstoppers: Busby Berkeley and the Tradition of Spectacle*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Salt, Barry. 1983. *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*. London: Starword.
- . 1992. *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*. London: Starword.
- Schary, Dore. 1950. *Case History of a Movie*. New York: Random House.
- Schatz, Thomas. 1988. *The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Sheridan, Bart. 1948. "The Three and Half Minute Take...." *American Cinematographer* 27 (9): 304.
- Sitney, P. Adams. 2002. *Visionary Film: The American Avant-Garde, 1943-2000*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, Kristin, and David Bordwell. 2003. *Film History: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- . 2010. *Film History: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Toland, Gregg. 1941. "Realism for Citizen Kane." *American Cinematographer* 22 (2): 54–55, 80–81.
- Wood, Robin. 1976. *Personal Views: Explorations in Film*. London: Gordon Fraser.



<http://www.springer.com/978-1-137-58572-1>

The Long Take

Critical Approaches

Gibbs, J.; Pye, D. (Eds.)

2017, XVII, 263 p. 38 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-137-58572-1

A product of Palgrave Macmillan UK