

РЕЦЕНЗІЇ

https://doi.org/10.31516/2410-5325.079.11*

УДК 791.63-028.5"19/20"(049.32)

AUTHOR'S CINEMA IN THE CULTURAL SPACE OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE XX AND EARLY XXI CENTURY

V. Myslavskiy


Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0339-1820>

В. Н. Миславський

Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

cinema2@i.ua



V. Myslavskiy. Author's Cinema in the Cultural Space of the Second Half of the XX and Early XXI Century

Book review: Pohrebniak H. P. Author's cinema in the cultural space of the second half of the XX and early XXI century: monograph. Kyiv: National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, 2020. — 448 p.

В. Н. Миславський. Авторський кінематограф як культурно-мистецький феномен на зламі епох

Рецензія на книгу: Погребняк Г. П. Авторський кінематограф у культурному просторі другої половини XX — початку XXI століття: монографія. Київ: НАКККиМ, 2020. — 448 с.

The relevant task of national cultures in the modern globalized world is the preservation and development of their own cultural heritage, in particular, such an important component as author's

cinema, which acts as a powerful mean of active intercultural communication in the promotion of universal values. In view of the above, the monograph by H. P. Pohrebniak "Author's cinema in the cultural space of the second half of the XX — beginning of the XXI century" is considered a timely and, above all, an extremely interesting research.

The monograph by H. P. Pohrebniak includes the following chapters: "Author's cinema as a unique world model" (p. 9), "The phenomenon of authorship in cinema: the issue of self realization" (p. 64), "Author's creation of reality by the means of cinema art" (p. 134), "Author's cinema at the intersection of creative and production realities" (p. 237), and Conclusions (p. 393).

Admitting progressive vectors in the methodology of involving historical, philosophical, cultural, aesthetic approaches to revealing the essence of authorship in cinema art, the researcher presents a multifaceted work that meets the urgent need for a holistic art criticism study of such a complex and original artistic phenomenon — author's cinema. Demonstrating to readers (both specialists in the field of cinema and a wide circle of its connoisseurs) that the author's cinema embodies the author's individual way of perceiving and organizing the world, while the reality in the cinematographic text appears in a form refracted through the author's consciousness, the art critic meticulously selected and comprehended unique materials, carefully considered iconic figures of the world level in the context of reflections on author's cinema.

* This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

It is worth noting that using non-classical approaches to the study of the figure of the author in cinema as a subject of cinematographic activity, in the monograph "Author's cinema in the cultural space of the second half of the XX — the beginning of the XXI century", H. P. Pohrebniak confidently proves that the author's filmmaking directly related to the worldview knowledge of the author and determined by his worldview consciousness. The researcher convincingly articulates the statement that the author's cinema as a kind of film text of the director-author is anthropocentric in nature and is a complex combination of basic national characteristics that underlie the mental concept of a certain people and the anthropocentric characteristics of the author himself, the creator of the film text, which expresses an individual perception of the world according to using his own cinematic language. At the same time, H. P. Pohrebniak analyzes worldview approaches to the depiction of the world picture and the image of the author not only in cinema, but also in other forms of art related to its synthetic nature, in particular, theater, music, choreography, and visual arts. In addition, the researcher, relying on the analysis of the philosophical basis of the author's world presentation in various forms of art, emphasizes that the author's cinematic world model involves the director's reproduction of the worldview (with an emphasis on his individual and personal perception) with the help of cinematic language, the main structural element of which is a frame (p. 9).

In addition, the researcher's postulation of the statement that the author of the film created a cinematic model of the world with the help of his own means of cinematic language deserves special attention in the monograph. (p. 24).

The fact that in the monograph the researcher, relying on a broad theoretical basis and demonstrating the latest type of scientific thinking, analyzes the films of the authors-directors, revealing the specifics of various author's cinematographic models, thereby proving that the author's cinema art is a multi-vector conglomerate of worldview models. At the same time, H. P. Pohrebniak consistently finds out that the author's cinematographic models, which include national and universal, fix above all the uniqueness of creative subjects — film directors, while the individual-personal component

determines the essence of the author's cinema as an artistic-aesthetic and social-political event. Whereas, from the point of view of scientific significance, the art critic's highlighting and analysis of the author's models in cinema through the prism of worldview approaches in the reflection of reality, where the subject of modeling is the personality of the director, who demonstrates his attitude to the world in an artistic and figurative form (p. 70), deserves attention.

One should only admire how H. P. Pohrebniak comprehensively analyzes the problem of the author in cinema art, pointing out the dual status of the author in cinema, due to the realities of cinema production. Accordingly, the recognition of the dual status of the author of the cinema is for the researcher a point of reference when formulating her own concept of author's cinema.

It is interesting that pointing out that the author's cinematographic models are based on the personal world feeling, world perception, world comprehension, worldview of the director-author, the scientist notes that filmmaking involves the collective nature of screen creativity, where a significant share belongs, for example, to the artistic director as a subject of copyright of the cinema product. H. P. Pohrebniak rightly emphasizes that the plasticity of the screen image, loaded with a certain set of meanings, is one of the most important and complex spheres of cinematic expressiveness in the author's work and is represented in the compositional structure of the frame, motion dynamics of the camera and the shooting angles; cutting approaches; sound, light, color solutions, subject-material environment of the frame; mise-en-scène.

In addition, it should be noted that, applying an interdisciplinary complex approach in the monograph, H. P. Pohrebniak points out that film production involves the coordinated and consistent work of a creative team, whose representatives, although connected to various spheres of artistic activity, are for a certain time involved in a project to produce a joint audiovisual product. At the same time, the researcher focuses on the fact that the collective nature of creativity in the process of creating a film raises the question of authorship, individual, personal creativity of each of the

filmmaking participants in a new way (p. 124). In the mentioned monograph, H. P. Pohrebniak convincingly shows that each member of the creative team of like-minded people contributes to the creation of a complete artistic image of the film and in this respect is one of the authors of the film, for example like a composer.

Considering the phenomenon of “directors-authors as active individuals of cognition and reflection of the world and at the same time subjects of cinematographic activity”, H. P. Pohrebniak highlights the features of the author’s creativity in the space of the stage and determines the specifics of the expressive means of stage art in screen works. The art critic rightly proves that the symbiosis of theater and screen art contributed to the powerful revelation on stage and on the screen of the talented masters who formed their own worldview models: I. Bergman, A. Vaida, L. Visconti, K. Zanussi, R. V. Fassbinder, M. Forman and others (p. 236). It is noteworthy that the scientist finds in the film and television works of the above-mentioned directors the use of a palette of stage art techniques, while in the theatrical productions of the masters she outlines a number of visual images of the action and the use of numerous screen means and techniques.

The flow of artistic techniques from one art form to another noted by H. P. Pohrebniak is quite representative for author’s cinematography and, of course, enriches both theater and cinema at the

same time, contributes to the emergence of notable author’s cinema works, exerts a significant influence on theatrical direction, which was distinguished by the search for visualization of scenic images. An important aspect of this study was the reasoned conviction of the researcher that an author’s film can be created only by like-minded people in art, who together solve the tasks set by the author-director, creating with the help of screen language a certain cinematographic model that simultaneously reflects the subjective and general, imaginatively highlighted sides of the phenomenon in all its various and complex properties (p. 69).

To sum up, I would like to note that the fundamental research of H. P. Pohrebniak “Author’s cinema in the cultural space of the second half of the XX — beginning of the XXI century” is aimed at solving questions not only of a theoretical nature, but also of a practical order, which consists not only in the generally accepted use of the materials of the monograph when teaching the lecture course, and the fact that this work can be used as expert support for the functioning of the cinema industry. In addition, it should be added that the scientific results obtained by the author of the monograph “Author’s cinema in the cultural space of the second half of the XX — beginning of the XXI century” have a high level of validity and accuracy. This is the uniqueness of the research reviewed by us.

V. Myslavskiy, assistant professor, Doctor of Art Criticism, Head of the Department of Film and Television Directing and Screenwriting, Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine

В. Н. Миславський, доцент, доктор мистецтвознавства, завідувач кафедри кінотелережисури і сценарної майстерності, Харківська державна академія культури, м. Харків, Україна

Надійшла до редколегії 21.11.2022