

Film Literary Criticism and Image Aesthetics: around Film Criticism

Yunning Wang^{1,*}

¹Multimedia Television and Film, Sungkyunkwan University, 00382, Korea

Abstract: Film criticism has been carried out in the form of activities since its inception, in which many outstanding intellectuals and artists have participated. Especially in this respect, European intellectuals can contrast with American intellectuals, who have long held films in contempt. "In Europe, intellectuals have been fascinated by filmmaking since the beginning of their media," writes Tim Bewart and Thomas Szobak. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the 1920s, throughout Europe, Paris, Berlin, Moscow, a group of intellectuals dedicated to all corners of the art and other artists on the same basis as art, came together to discuss and write about film. "Unlike the U.S., where movies were excluded from intellectual reflection until the late 1950s, film criticism was a battleground for intellectuals in France.

1 Introduction

Film criticism is the academic practice of applying the principles and methods of humanities and social sciences and film theory to analyze film works and film phenomena. At the beginning of the 20th century, avantgarde film theorists advocated film criticism, promoting various avantgarde films such as impressionist, pure, abstract, Dadaist and surrealist. Musinac's *On the Rhythm of Movies* (1923) and Leschel's *A New Realism* (1926) reflect the original concept of film criticism. With the development of film creation, film criticism has experienced the process from the early scattered impression criticism to the establishment of film criticism system. Traditional film criticism incorporates the concepts and categories of aesthetics, psychology and philosophy ontology, reviews film works and guides film creation practice. The Chinese left-wing progressive film criticism in the 1930s and 1940s, Andre Bazan's film criticism articles in the 1940s and 1950s and the film criticism activities in the French *Film Manual* magazine are examples of film criticism leading to film creation. Film critics include films and film phenomena. Film criticism is fundamentally different from film theory and film history in functionally. Criticism must be combined with the actuality of the film, with specific relevance and practicality. But sometimes the theory must be separated from the concrete work to a certain extent, and with the concrete pertinence and practicality to maintain a certain distance. This limits the direct significance of theory to art practice. Critics are more likely to appreciate the guiding significance of theory than practitioners. To some extent criticism is the medium through which theory directs practice, so the significance of theory to criticism is more direct than that of

practice. The emphasis on combining theory with practice often leads to the development of theory towards criticism. The theory itself may not develop at all. Theory and criticism have two important functions: practical function and cognitive function. Although the ultimate goal of both is for the practicality of society, there are still criticisms that attach importance to the function of practice and theory to the difference of cognitive function.

2 Film and Aesthetic Art System

The artistry of film, as a call sign of "art", is derived from the unique visible form of film (i.e., "mobile image") and the particularity of its unique technical equipment. As part of Lonsler's critique of modernism, it deduces film as an artistic norm from film's unique material of expression and "production mode", especially the non-historical and utopian ideas of avant-garde aesthetic origin in 1920s and 1930s. According to Lonsill, film is "art" because it belongs to a particular era or system, that is, "aesthetic art system", which refers to unique craft products as art and gives them artistic identity. Lanser analyzes the possibility of the aesthetic art system through the most impure characteristics of film, namely the contradiction story and the contradiction story, and how to restore the classical art system through the discord with the system itself. Through the form of "distorted story", film not only shows the characteristics of the art system to which the film belongs, but also the contradictions and paradoxes of the system are the most distinctive art [1].

*dearmydorothy@gmail.com

3 Discussions on Film—Film Criticism and Film Aesthetics

Film talk came about at the same time as the invention. With the development of film media in various directions, the discussion about film has also developed after countless experiments, differentiation and integration. The development of film discourse can be compared with the development of other forms of art discourse. For example, literary discourse, which originated in the same period as literary works, has been formed by clearly delineating two directions. Annotations, explanations or analyses of individual literary works constitute one direction of discussion of literature, and reflections on literature itself constitute another direction. Philology and literary criticism are extensions of the first discourse, while literary theory or literary aesthetics inherit the second discourse. The two kinds of discourse centered on literature can be distinguished by the difference between the former and the latter, which focuses on abstract and collective literature itself. Jean-Marie Scheffer pointed out that words of these two nature are usually unfriendly to each other, but each has an indispensable nature. This form of discussion of literature can almost be applied to discussion of films. As with literature, discussion of films is distinctly different from one subject to another. One is the whole film, or as a whole film (cinéma) as the object of discourse, can be referred to as "image aesthetics" (or film aesthetics). The other is the discussion of individual films, which range from mere informative writing to serious analysis of works, but can be called film criticism in a comprehensive sense:

First of all, taking image aesthetics as an example, it is almost impossible to comb the trend of image aesthetics in different contexts. So they later applied the results of other disciplines such as psychology, semiotics, philosophy to their reflections on the film itself. In other words, Rudolf Arnheim is an art psychologist interested in the application of Gestalt's psychological achievements to art or film, Christian Metz is a cinematographer who laid the foundation for the possibility of semiotics. On the other hand, Zigmund Kraskovna Bellabaraz, André Barjón and Jean Mitri have for a long time served as outstanding critics (later or at the same time) of individual films.

Secondly, as far as film criticism is concerned, at the beginning of the invention of film, it has the nature of recording and describing the new technological characteristics of film. After that, it gradually developed into the identification of the aesthetic nature of the works. According to Claude Bailey, the first film criticism beyond simple plot summaries or advertising came after 1908 in France. Film criticism was originally born in the market when it developed into a period of clarification of the aesthetic nature of the works. Later, film criticism was also the work of many film directors, who tried to use film as an art. The new director, who once played the role of a prominent critic, appeared even before his appearance. In fact, good critics play a big role in positioning the film itself as a serious object of thought [2].

In any case, it is important not to confuse the objects and areas of video aesthetics and film criticism. Just as the

discussion of individual literary works is not a substitute for the discussion of literature itself, so is the contrary. On the contrary, the film criticism as a whole can only be applied to individual film criticism in a very comprehensive and indirect way through many detours and media. Of course, this does not mean that an impassable abyss can be created between these two areas and objectives, which can permeate at any time. We will then explore this possibility by taking the French film criticism tradition as an example.

4 The Object and Role of Film Criticism

In fact, not all films need to be reviewed. If film criticism plays a certain role as a medium between the audience and the work, then there are some films that do not need such a medium. In theory, all existing films can be the object of criticism, but in practice, not all films are the object of criticism, nor must they be the object of criticism. Because some films first do not have the need to criticize themselves. Criticism is effective only if it is based on the idea that there is a *décalage* between the creator (and the person who needs to create it) and the viewer (and the person who needs to see it) and that the deviation is valuable. Furthermore, it makes sense to put a little writing between the movie and the audience whenever they can't face each other properly. If writing is born out of a certain need, criticism is born out of a need to be criticized, or must be criticized. According to Darnay, this need arises first in a certain potential "gap" or "biased" between the audience and the work. The conclusion is as follows: "When a spot immediately touches the crowd it is targeting, it no longer requires additional media. This is the morality of visible sex itself, which is completely worthy of respect [3]. On the other hand, films that have room or need to be criticized and films that do not need to be criticized can be distinguished by the quality and manner of time the audience experiences while watching the film. Movies that have a time to treasure, whether through criticism or through physical preservation in museums, become films worth cherishing. This can also be achieved through silence if criticism cannot be excluded from a certain amount of value-évaluation. It is not necessarily the role and task of film critics to add insult to injury. Rather, film critics play a role in reviewing and tracking what happens in movies that achieve great aesthetic achievements.

A critic is a *passer* who guides the way between poles. There is something between the creator and the observer. What must be known here is where the priorities are. It seems to me that critics will first write an open letter to the writer, which will then be read by an audience worthy of watching the film. Following the critics represents the "creator" understanding of the non-creator. He is a lawyer in this field. In my view, this is normal and moral. But for others, the opposite is true. Critics target creators and represent the audience's understanding. In this regard, he is a judge. According to the fashion critic's model, he can choose between "popular" and "unpopular" and in some cases, he has worked well enough. Whether it's true or imitative,

whether it's true or imitative, these are just consumer guides.

5 Film as a Research Object— Characteristics of Film Text

Scientific research must first encounter the characteristics of the film text. As an object that exists only in the time of appreciation and passes in front of the eyes, the film text shows a unique aspect compared with other art. Compared with other artistic fields such as literature, drama, art and music, the reason for the relative lag in film research is the characteristics of film texts.

At the human level, it is difficult to quote. First of all, the score shows strong heterogeneity to the means language of the object studied, but it can be quoted at all. The problem is that "the score is not performance, we can't quote sound" and "the score is fixed, but the performance is changed". In some modern music, the differences between score and performance tend to grow, but the problem is much more complex. In this regard, Beirou noted that the textual nature of music is weaker than that of literature and painting. As a performing art, drama—music and drama are largely similar to music—has also appeared as undecipherable and invocable as music. But when it comes to citability, the most serious thing is the film text. According to Beiru, scripts are only avant-texts and should therefore be largely excluded from the issue of references. Because the nature of the script is completely different from the musical score or drama, and it is more like a drawing. He divided the five forms of expression that make up the film according to Christian Metz's division. It is mainly in the form of le sonétique, captions, music, les brutes, and l'image photographique mouvante. Phonetics and subtitles do not raise much questions about citation, but in the case of phonetics, "tone, intensity, tone, pitch, pitch" may be raised as in theatrical performances. If noise can be distinguished between motivated noise and arbitrary noise, and the former can be evoked by words anyway, then the latter cannot be put into words at all. In addition to the original questions raised by the music text, the music in the film also presents extremely complex patterns based on the combination of different images.

Of these elements, the essence of the film is the image. The most complicated aspect of film image is that it unfolds in time and space first. The particularity of the image of this movement makes the writing of the film take on the form of content or theme analysis to a large extent, but it is out of the essence of the film, so it cannot be said to be a serious criticism seriously. Whether out of a critical or aesthetic interest, it raises questions that film researchers have to face in advance, reminding them of the problems they should constantly be aware of.

6 Take the French Film Criticism Tradition as an Example

The relationship between film and film criticism began and developed in different ways from other arts. It was at

the same time that the modern film, which began to appear in the media, was born that it attracted media attention. On December 28, 1895, two days after the Lumière brothers announced the birth of the film, *Le Radical* and *La Poste* published an article focusing on the wonderment of the world as depicted in the *Atlas of the Movie* and its incorporation into a new dimension of human existence. This can be said to be the starting point for movies to establish a strong relationship with the media and magazines. Shortly after the birth of the film, magazines such as *Misofuann Miseaupoint 8* (1897) and *Le Fascinateur* (1903) marked the beginning of the professional film magazine. In proportion to the increasing influence of film as a mass media, the number of film magazines is increasing, and the influence of film on the public is increasing. Since Ricciotto Canudo, one of the earliest film theorists, named the film "The Seventh Art", formal writing has focused on the promotion of film to art. From then on, it was no longer a literary magazine or a daily film section, but a magazine in the form of a periodical. Then there is Louis Deluc, the birthplace of French film critics and film directors who founded the *Ciné-club*, which laid an important foundation for film criticism. Since then, countless film magazines have appeared in the French film industry.

From this point of view, it is not difficult to deduce that without the accumulated results of French film criticism, the broad philosophical reflection of the film itself would not have been easy. The role of film criticism in the establishment of video aesthetics can be paid attention to from many aspects.

Above all, film criticism plays a big role in moving movies to serious humanistic objects. This is because, as has been pointed out, film criticism has the nature of "intellectual competition" in Europe, which involves many intellectuals and artists. Film criticism plays an important role in describing the problems raised by film as problems and transferring them to thinking objects.

7 Conclusion

Although film criticism and film aesthetics have different specific concerns and research objects, they play a complementary role to each other. Image aesthetics opens up a whole, systematic and fundamental world of thought, which is rare in the examination of individual films. However, this kind of image aesthetics work is based on the serious contact with individual film works and the numerous film criticisms that follow the happenings of film works keenly. The role of film criticism in the establishment of video aesthetics can be paid attention to from many aspects. Above all, film criticism plays a big role in moving movies to serious humanistic objects. This is because, as has been pointed out, film criticism has the nature of "intellectual competition" in Europe, which involves many intellectuals and artists. Film criticism plays an important role in describing the problems raised by film as problems and transferring them to thinking objects. It can be pointed out that film criticism has a certain media nature. Image aesthetics is related to the outstanding film works that constitute the core of the

world film history, although it is only an indirect way. Although the relationship between individual film works and film aesthetics is rare and direct, it is usually indirect and media. Film criticism can be said to play a role in the media of audiences and works on the one hand, but also in the media of individual films and video aesthetics on the other. Image aesthetics and film criticism have a relatively clear distinction between objects and fields, but not insurmountable relationship. Because, as mentioned above, although the two words of image aesthetics and film criticism are not friendly to each other, there is inevitable tension in this respect, but fundamentally, they are indispensable to each other. If film criticism is defined as bottom-up aesthetics and image aesthetics as top-down aesthetics, then at any rate, the two trends meet in one place, and the real concrete reflection and the real abstract reflection can be said to agree. The place where both energetic and creative thinking begins is where the two kinds of words are actively communicated. There is no doubt that both film and television aesthetics and film criticism are based on the intense humanistic spirit. This humanistic spirit includes not only a comprehensive vision of film and art, but also a comprehensive basic knowledge of philosophy, history and social sciences, and above all, the ability to think about the image of film. But in film aesthetics and film criticism, exposure to the humanistic spirit of poverty risk is relatively large film criticism. Here, we decided to replace the conclusion by looking at the inappropriate relationship between film criticism and so-called "grands discours" of which image aesthetics certainly forms a part. Film criticism, which is based on the perspective and reflection of individual films, presupposes a careful face-to-face approach to the works that have become the subject of study. Such a job is not to blindly apply "fashionable" grandiose words to the interpretation of individual film and television works and other methods can replace. As a general discourse of the whole film, image aesthetics is relatively susceptible to the influence of other humanities such as philosophy. In fact, some works are written under this influence. For example, Bellabarraz's film: It is not difficult to read the influence of limpidism from the nature and development of new art (1948). The problem arises when these words are applied directly to the analysis and interpretation of individual film and television works. This attitude of looking not for the foundation of criticism within the work but for externalities and applying them to individual applications is fatal to criticism itself.

References

1. Zhang Zhaoao. Narrative Aesthetics and Cultural Criticism of 'Desktop Cinema'[J]. *Film Literature*, 2021,000(004):43-47
2. Yang Chijing. Critical reality in the space-time alternation of films[J]. *Journal of Sui Institute of Chemistry*, 2021,041(008):86-88
3. Cao Jingbo, Dong Yuhong, Liu Wei. Aesthetic Traceability, Automatic Mechanism and Aesthetic Reflection of Screen Films[J]. *Film Literature*, 2021,000(013):34-39

4. Li Lei. Bella Barraz's Classic Theory of Film Aesthetics and Formalism [J]. *Film Review*, 2021,000(015):62-65
5. Ma Pengcheng, Wang Chunqiao. French Film Education: Filmmakers for All[J]. *Invention and Innovation Educational Informatization*, 2018,000(010):17-18