

Close to "Movie Space": as a Way for Film Creation

Tarkovskij 's Film Creation Theory

Shimeng Zhao

Academy of Arts

Communication University of China

Beijing, China 100024

Abstract—"Movie space" is the process by which Tarkovskij explores the possibility of "movie" and is also the process of finding more independence for the film. "Perceived film space" is the essence of "movie space", but it is not the essence. The essence of "movie space" is "time." And the constant presentation of "time" in the "movie space" is the principle that Tarkovskij has always adhered to in film creation. This article attempts to explain Tarkovskij's film creation thoughts and its enlightenment by discussing many problems in "movie space".

Keywords—poetic movie; movie poetry; movie space

I. INTRODUCTION

"Visualized film space" and "perceived film space" are in the state of "communication" all the time. On the one hand, "visualized film space" constantly presents the invisibility of visible objects, and on the other hand, "perceived film space" also presents the visibility of invisible objects. In the endless "communication" of the two, "movie space" is constantly being generated. Even so, it is not easy to regard "movie space" as "pure time". In fact, "movie space" is merely a direct presentation of "the state of time" and "the temporality of film space".

II. CLOSE TO THE MOVIE SPACE: "MOVIE POETRY"

A. "Poetic Movie" and "Movie Poetry"

Tarkovskij's films are often referred to as "poetic" and are defined by "poetic movies." In fact, Tarkovskij once said in "Engraving Time" that "I particularly hate the falsehood of modern 'poetic movies'. They are separated from reality and time realism. "[1] Tarkovskij believes that "poetic movies" is a method of film creation that Eisenstein and other montages insist on. This is a method similar to "literature". The way of film creation becomes "class-like", and the film is languageized (sentenced). Then these "sentences" are arranged and combined using the editing method. This method of "literary literature" is bound to lead the film to "literature." In the "poetic movie", there are a large number of metaphors and symbolic movies, which have become purely visual. The film has fallen into a "chaotic state". The film has the possibility of being symbolized and literated, and the film is gradually in this. In the melee, the "original self" gradually drifted away, which is contrary to Tarkovskij's principle of film creation that presents "time". Tarkovsky once said in "The Time of Engraving" that the

film directly presents the world, which is the same way that literature uses words to describe the world, but literature is indirect, while film is more direct. Therefore, Tarkovskij insisted on the break of film and literature, and broke the way of using literature to explain movies, and sought more independence for the film. Tarkovskij believed that film as an independent art is inevitably, not a simple "mix" of other art. Film is neither "literature" nor "painting". Tarkovsky firmly believes that simply combining literary thinking with the form of painting to create a movie will make the film a mixture rather than art. The thinking of film creation is not literary nor can it be adopted in the form of painting in concrete practice. The film should be its own.

"The language tool that underlies the film is an irrational tool. This illustrates the strong dreaminess of the film, but also illustrates its absolute and inevitable concrete or materialized state." [2] This passage of Pasolini clarifies the "irrationality" of the "basic language" of the film, that is, "poetic". After rejecting the creative method of "poetic movie", Tarkovskij still placed high hopes on "poetic" and then advocated the creation method of "movie poetry". Tarkovsky once said that the logic of poetry is closer to life itself. Tarkovskij's emphasized on "movie poetry" still led to many refutations. Why is it still citing "poetic" after declaring a break with literature? Is there any possibility of "poetic" from "literature"? Where is the difference between "movie poetry" and "poetic movie"? The logic of language creation in "movie poetry" and literature is not the "normative" mode in the real creation of poetry, but the self-owned logic of "poetic", a state of creation when poetry, Tarkovskij here called "poetic" is the "analog". This kind of "logic" belongs to both poetry and film and belongs to all art. It is the "common" logic of artistic creation. In other words, "poetic logic" is the logic closest to life itself, but also the form of life itself, and the "antonomasia" of the creative method of presenting "time." This is not a kind of obedience, compromise, nor fall to any form of art. It forms logic in the self, direct, simple, and not stylized. So "why is the logic of poetry creating poetic logic?" Tarkovskij launched his "movie poetry" through "the logic of dreams". In "Childhood of Ivan" there is a scene of Ivan and the little girl on the truck. This is also a "dreamland" Tarkovskij highlighted in "Engraving Time". This "dream" is still part of life and does not deal with any rational logic. Tarkovskij treated the

background forest into a "negative film"¹ image effect to create a "dream" "surreal" atmosphere, in order to distinguish between "dream" and "reality." In this paragraph of "Dream", Tarkovskij rarely used "technical means" to deal with "light and shadow" to create "dream poetry", clever use of "natural lightning in the rain" and other natural phenomena to make the turn of "positive film" into "negative film" become possible. This paragraph is a very obvious reflection of Tarkovskij's possibility exploration and attempt for film independence, and also reflects the superiority of "movie poetry" in the more direct presentation of "time".

Therefore, Tarkovskij's "poetic" is not a "poetic movie" but "movie poetry." According to Pasolini, "movie poetry" is a film creation method that "materialized the pure time in appreciation into a movie" and it is an artistic creation method that makes "time" "visualized".

B. The Temporality of "Movie Poetry" and "Movie Space"

"Movie poetry" is Tarkovskij's film creation method. This method of creation determines the "movie space" and determines the relationship between "visualized film space" and "perceived film space." Therefore, "movie poetry" is the premise that "movie space" can present its essential form, and it is also the possibility of "movie as art".

In the above discussion, Tarkovskij rejected the "method of using literary methods to create movies", and when it came to creation, he didn't concealed that Poetry can express the true world. How to understand this contradiction? Tarkovskij had repeatedly revealed his love for "Japanese haiku" in "Sculpture Time". In fact, what Tarkovskij loved is the observation of life in Haiku. "At the end of the month, the full moon could barely be seen, and in the blue waves there was a silver hook. The dew has been condensed, and the buds at the bottom of the hawthorn tree are hanging with small dew drops." [1] In a few short sentences, "Life" has "Ideology" just like the same effect as Ma Zhiyuan's "Tianjingsha: Qiu Si". This is the "observation of life" and the "reality of the world". The real charm of the film is to express the real events (the events in the sense of Deleuze) and to express the real and concrete world itself. Poets often have the pure imagination and perception of children, and the expression of the world is also the most direct. Tarkovskij's "pure observation" of the world when he created the film, furthermore emphasizes that "the most basic element of a movie, is observation." [1] Tarkovskij was more like an enlightened person, presenting his life's understanding in the film, which is the same as the "Zen" said in the way of "cutting wood and carrying water is all for practice." Tarkovskij's "movie poetic" creation method is also a process of enlightenment. In the "poetics of the world", he realized "time" and presented his cognition and understanding of "life".

In the general sense, the role of "music" in the film is to express the inner feelings of the characters in the atmosphere, but in the movie, there is a separate embarrassing situation of "movie" and "music", which also seems to be a support for

calling the movie "comprehensive art." Although Tarkovskij insisted that "movies don't need music," there is "music" in all of his works, and the difference is that Tarkovskij gave "music" a "poetic" way to present. In the "Dream" paragraph of "Sacrifice", "Music and human footsteps and the accompanying voices of the accompanying characters" are mixed together to form the "Voice of the World". "Music" and "movie" in this passage together present the "temporality." The author explores the relationship between "electronic music" and "voice of the world" from this "music". Tarkovskij actually rejected "electronic music" because "electronic music" undermined the independence of the film and led the film to "music narrative." Tarkovskij's "movie music" is "the voice of the world", a kind of "can echo near the earth, full of poetic hints - almost ambiguous, almost sigh." [1] "Voice of the World" is the "essential state" of the world. If we can get close to the real world, then the film will completely get rid of the shackles of music. To this end, Tarkovskij made a lot of attempts in the film, expelling the "chemical" essence of electronic music to capture the world's main tone (time). The grassy grass, the quiet flowing river, and the gasping and sighing of the characters, all the sounds of these natural life are all restored. This is the life of the image, and the world is presented as a "living image." This is the most direct way to present the "time essence" in the Tarkovskij's movies.

In the "reflexivity" of "physical space", "movie space" and "music space" are generated. "Movie space" and "music space" are two parallel and independent "spaces". Therefore, Tarkovskij said that the world described by the film has something in common with the world of music. The two are different, but the world in which the film is assembled is musical. In other words, real music is the real world in the sense of Tarkovsky. Thinking from the "ontology" level, "movie" and "music" are the "artistic ontology" that can not be separated and generated together. No matter "movie" or "music" has "temporality" on the ontological level. So on the ontology level, the movie "has "musicality" and "music" also has "the essential of movie". Here Tarkovskij said that "its essential has musicality" is actually talking about "the temporality of music." Therefore, "movie poetry" is to present "the temporality of the movie space." The "movie space" is generated in the constant "communication" of "visualized film space" and "perceived film space". This is the "temporality" of "movie space" itself, which is the essence of the "film space" presentating time. Therefore, "movie space" is not "time". It only has "temporality." "The invisible connection between the body and the world becomes visible in this way, showing a 'non-conceptual aggregation' between them." [3] In the "communication" of "physical space", "time" becomes visible. "Non-conceptual aggregation" is the "time" in the film. They are free irrational logic and therefore they are "poetic". This is the reason why Tarkovskij's films have a large proportion of "dreams" and "memory", and it is also the reason why "natural objects" in movies can appear in movies at will. "Movie poetry" presents the "free life of the existence of things", that is, "the state of time," which is the essence of "movie space." In the previous chapter, it was mentioned that "physical space" is the beginning of the film's ontology, and it is the matrix of

¹ The film of the unprocessed film, black and white, the negative color is opposite to the actual color.

"movie space", and the "movie poetry" here is the method of presenting "movie space". Using the method of "movie poetry" to create a film is Tarkovskij's method of "resolving the mystery", which is also the way he presented "time." The purpose of "movie poetry" is to "present the essence of time", and this purpose directly determines the form of "movie space."

Therefore, "movie poetry" is Tarkovskij's film creation method. The film creation is the process of "poeticization" and also the way he "close to the film space". The purpose is the possibility of exploring the state to present the "the essence of time" more directly. "Movie poetry" is the revelation of Tarkovskij's film creation.

III. MOVIE SPACE AND TIME-SPACE

Tarkovskij has been looking for more possibilities for "maximizing the 'essence of time'", but even then he still can't present the whole picture of "time". He can only approach the "movie space" in "movie poetry".

Tarkovskij once compared the "self" to a "sculptor". The film creator, like a sculptor, already has an "image" in his heart, and the creative work actually removes useless things. In the "world", Tarkovskij constantly "swept time" and "sculpted time" to maximize the "essential form of time". People are always in a world that is constantly being created. People are connected with people and things in the world. This is what Tarkovsky thinks is the meaning of the film. It is also the meaning of art. For Tarkovskij, artistic creation is a process of constantly understanding the world (the process of communicating with the world and itself), and generating works of art in the realization of the world. There is a noteworthy question. The "artist" can be called "artist" when "snake time" and "sculpt time", and "art work" has become an "independent and complete life" when it is called "art work". When the "artist" is separated from the "artwork" he is creating, it means that "artist" and "artwork" are no longer "symbiotic states". This separation directly leads to the "temporary existence" of the two. Therefore, in the following, it is called "artist" only in the state of creation, and is called "art creator" in the state of non-art creation. Therefore, compared with the "artist", Tarkovskij should be a "philosopher."

In the constant appreciation of "time", Merleau-Ponty once said that "My perception of myself reveals to me an invisible abyss that is always imminent but cannot be reached." [3] In this "always" imminent state, there is only an infinite proximity to "time." Therefore, in "art creation", Tarkovskij said that The creator constantly makes himself a relationship with the world, infinitely close to the world itself, trying to express the most realistic life. "The reason why the "perfect classic" is not available is that "the time is inexhaustible", which is also "Cezanne's doubts" and can even be said to be "all the common doubts of art creators."

Merleau-Ponty said in "Cézanne's Doubts" that Cézanne's work is constantly approaching the world. The works are the starting point rather than the end point. Each piece contains the infinite possibilities of becoming a work

of art. It can only be approached to the "time" infinitely close to the "art space", and all the art is only close to their attempts. "Kant's definition of 'aesthetic concept' (or sensibility) in verse 49 of *Kritik der Urtheilskraft* (Critique of Judgment): The aesthetic concept arises from the artist's imagination, embodied in the beauty of the art work he creates, which 'causes a lot thinking', but not fully understood or expressed in any concept." [3] Kant's passage just utters the "unreadableness" of "artwork" - a "time secret" that lies within the work of art. No language or concept can fully express "artwork" and can only be "close" infinitely. This is the tacit understanding of all "art creators". When Cézanne's paintings were changed and they refused to give up, Tarkovskij's "Mirror" was generated over and over again. This is "the doubts of Cézanne and Tarkovskij" and the common "doubt". All artistic creations are "knowing that they can't do it but still trying", and they are all attempts to approach the "ontology." Here, it is said that artistic creation and the meditation of the Zen are the same, and in the understanding of the world will transform "Tao" into various art types and art forms. Zhuangzi said in *Great Master*: "Tao' is true and conclusive, but it is inaction and intangible; 'Tao' can be perceived but not dictated and can be understood but not seen." [5] Laozi said that "the 'Tao' that can be said is not the normal 'Tao'" [6]. The visible things that can be "spoken" are not "time". They are the invisibility of visible objects, that is, "reflexivity" or "temporality", so it is said that "movie space has temporality" but not "time." All artistic creations are "saying unspeakable things", which is also the driving force and source of art exploration.

Therefore, in the creative process, "movie space", "time" and "space" are independent concepts. Putting these three concepts into the context of "art creation", does "space" have the possibility of being alone? From the ontological level, "time" is the "one" of the universe, and time dominates space, so it is said that "space" has "temporality." The "artist" in the creative state becomes "physical space" (ie, the physical field) in "reflexiveness". At this time, the "artist" does not completely dispel its subjectivity, which is just the independence of "space". This provides a strong evidence for the independence of "space". "Space" belongs to "body", and "movie space" is generated in the "reflexivity" of "physical space". Because of the "physical space", "movie space" is an extremely complicated "physical space". In other words, in the art creation, the "movie space" is generated as the "physical space of the movie." Therefore, as mentioned above, "movie space" is not "time" but a "temporal space" pattern of "temporality", which presents "the essence of time". From the perspective of the creative level, "space" and "time" are "existing" in different states, and "space" is the way that "time" becomes "visible", or in the understanding of "time" The "space" is possible, which means that in the process of artistic creation, "space" has the possibility of "independence". In the state of creation, the "artist" acquires the ability to describe "time", and the "existence" of "space" also has the infinite possibility of "making 'time' become art". "Time leads the space", everything is "made", "space" must be in "time." But at the creative level, "space" is not confused with "time", they exist at different levels. "Time" does not dispel the independence

of any "existing" things. Everything is in "time". "Time" constantly becomes "self" in everything, so the existence of "time" and "space" It is: "the difference in unification" or "unification in difference."

IV. CLOSE TO THE FILM SPACE: THE THIRD ROAD CREATED BY TARKOVSKIJ

There are countless paths to the "movie space". If it is needed to be classified, it can roughly be divided into the two types from the "creation method". The first thing need to do is to introduce "movies" into the whirlpool of "story". This kind of film creation emphasizes "story" and "comprehensiveness", focusing on "telling the story in the audiovisual language of the film", which makes the film "categorization" and couldn't get rid of the fate of "homogeneity" in the end; second, "movie" is "signifying" and "symbolic". With Eisenstein as the main representative, focusing on "movie montage" and advocating that "editing" can be taken as a method of creating a film, this is bound to make the film into an extremely "symbolic" road, and the film becomes a simple "symbol" of "encoding-decoding".

Tarkovskij insisted on the creative method of "movie poetry", with the main purpose of directly presenting the "essential form of time", and constantly approaching "movie space" in "engraving time". The method of film creation in Tarkovskij is "the way to re-recognize the world" and this is the way to understand "time." In the eyes of Tarkovskij, "the world" is like "prose", and what he wanted to present in the film is "the prose of the world." Therefore, Tarkovskij kept asking "What is my purpose? What elements distinguish movies and other art? What do I think of its unique potential?" [1] Throughout his life, he explored the many possibilities of "movie as an independent art."

Because of Tarkovskij's "movie poetry" creation method, many people define his film as "religious film" and regard "Andrei Rublyov" as strong evidence supporting this view. In fact, Tarkovskij's films are not "religious films", they only have "religionization." In the film "Andrei Rublyov", there are indeed "things" with "dominant" religious elements, such as "church", "believers" and "image painters". However, Tarkovskij did not use the "religious story" to educate the "audience", nor did it fall into the "religion" to find all kinds of possibilities related to "religion". Tarkovskij looked for a "religious state.". The spiritual state reached by art and religion is the same, but art is not religion. Tarkovskij's "belief" of "time" makes "art" and "religion" being possible to communicate, in other words, Tarkovskij saw "art" and "religion" from the "ontology" level. Both "art" and "religion" can achieve a "reflexive" state, which is the way to "recognize and appreciate" the world. The difference between the two is that "religion" has the purpose of "education", changing "people's" recognition to "world" through "religion", and it is "opening within restrictions". "Art" is completely "open", and it becomes "self" in constant opening up. The difference between "religious film" and "Tarkovskij's film" is also the same. "Religious film" is mainly for the purpose of presenting "religious stories" to praise "God", while Tarkovskij's film is the search for "artistic ontology".

V. CONCLUSION

Tarkovskij's "movie poetry" creation method provides more possibilities for "movie as an independent art", highlighting the superiority of the film in "direct presentation" and "the essence of time". Tarkovskij's "Engraving Time" is also "stunning time". He walked too far on the road of film creation, so that it is too hurry to follow up his steps. When being shocked, it can be realized that "movie poetry" is "intriguing."

The world is a "living image", and the filming of "the image of life" is the way Tarkovskij "thought of" the world and it is also the method of film creation. "Movie poetry" "directly presents the essence of 'time'", which has important implications for exploring "art ontology" and also offers more possibilities for "movie as an independent art".

REFERENCES

- [1] [the Soviet Union] Andrej Tarkovskij, *Engraving Time* [M]. Chen Guili, Li Yongquan, trans. People's Literature Publishing House, ver. 2003. (in Chinese)
- [2] Pasolini, *Poetic Movie* [A]. *Foreign Film Theory Anthology* [C]. Shanghai: Shanghai literature and Art Publishing House, 1995. (in Chinese)
- [3] [France] Mauro Carbone, *La chair des images. Merleau-Ponty entre peinture et cinéma* [M] Qu Xiaorui trans. East China Normal University Press, 2016, 06. (in Chinese)
- [4] [France] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *L'oeil et l'esprit* [M] Liu Yunhan trans. Zhang Zhiting, ed. China Social Science Press, version 1992. (in Chinese)
- [5] [Qing Dynasty] Guo Qingfan, *Explanation of Zhuangzi*, (1) [M] Wang Xiaoyu ed. Zhonghua Book Company, version 2012. (in Chinese)
- [6] [Wei Dynasty] Wang Bi, *New Compilation of Philosophies: Laozi Morality Notes* [M] Lou Yulie, Zhonghua Book Company, version 2008. (in Chinese)