ON CLASSICAL HOLLYWOOD CINEMA: BEYOND THE CLASH BETWEEN STYLE AND CANON

JOSE MARÍA GALINDO PÉREZ

The expression "the norm in classical Hollywood cinema"—very aptly used in the title for this monographic section of the journal—raises some very interesting questions. It may perhaps be appropriate to begin this paper by pointing out one in particular that effectively encompasses all the others: behind its apparent objectivity, this six-word phrase conceals a number of problems related to apparently neutral concepts. Some of these concepts, such as *style* (also mentioned in the call for papers for this issue), *classicism* (and the many derivatives of the term *classical*) and *norm* (a term itself associated with the controversial notion of *canon*), will be discussed in this article, which takes the following idea as its starting point: that the norm in classical Hollywood cinema is inextricably intertwined with the very idea of deviation or transgression. In other words, the descriptive dimension of this particular film genre contradicts its prescriptive dimension, which has established a canon of films and filmmakers based

precisely on the subversion (to varying degrees of intensity and explicitness) of the style described.

This working hypothesis is based on the recognition that while different studies of the concept of classical Hollywood cinema identify particular features of this filmmaking tradition, attempts at canonisation—in the secular sense that Kermode (1988) and Harris (1998) give the term—such as film analysis, anthologies or bio-filmographies, focus their attention on films and filmmakers who are worthy of attention because, among other reasons, they push the boundaries of those very same features associated with the classical style.

In analysing how the classical Hollywood style has been established in the imaginary of the film world, it is revealing to consider some of the most important authorities, at least in the academic context. Noël Burch, famous for having coined the concept of the IMR or Institutional Mode of Representation—a notion hazardously inseparable from classical cinema—claims that the IMR

has the single effect of "embarking the spectator on that 'motionless voyage' which is the essence of the institutional experience," and he identifies the "constant identification with the camera's viewpoint" (Burch, 1990: 249) as a fundamental feature of that experience. André Bazin suggests that American cinema "had visibly reached well-balanced maturity" (Bazin, 2016: 88), referring to the traditional distinction between content and form. With respect to content, we can recognise a model based on "well-tried genres, governed by carefully worked-out laws, capable of entertaining the largest possible international public"; as for form, "the photographic and narrative styles were perfectly clear and they conformed with their subject: a total reconciliation of sound and image" (Bazin, 2016: 88). Taking up Bazin's propositions, Santos Zunzunegui speaks of the "strict respect for the dramatic and psychological determinations of the scene" and of the "construction of an ideal spectator for whom the deconstruction of the scenic space must never endanger its credibility" (Zunzunegui, 1996: 118).

To conclude this necessarily brief review of the literature, it would be impossible to overlook David Bordwell, for whom "the principles which Hollywood claims as its own rely on notions of decorum, proportion, formal harmony, respect for tradition, mimesis, self-effacing craftsmanship, and cool control of the perceiver's response" (Bordwell, Staiger & Thompson, 1985: 3).

It is thus fair to say that there is a certain consensus on what "classical Hollywood cinema" refers to: a cinematic style characterised by its use of every resource of cinematographic language to construct an intelligible story, aimed at a spectator for whom the diegetic order is what matters most. This simple definition, unfortunately, elides an essential discussion of terms that are constantly present but rarely analysed carefully. These terms are *style*, *classical* and *canon*. Any examination of the norm in classical Hollywood cinema should at least include a consideration of a set of terms used so profusely—and sometimes confusedly.

CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS IN EVERYDAY EXPRESSIONS

When using certain terms there is always a danger of imprecision. In everyday conversation this does not generally constitute a problem, but in academic discussion it is hazardous to use a term without first setting some clear boundaries of meaning.

Let us begin with the concept of the *classical*. Shifting the focus slightly from film studies, Henri Peyre, in his analysis of French literature, offers a clear synopsis of the three main uses of this term: first, to define "authors for use in schools and by scholars" (Peyre, 1996: 32), who are chosen "more for the purpose of educating our youth" (Peyre, 1996: 33); secondly, "authors whom students are made to read because they are considered the best", thus entailing a "value judgement, acclaim, the proclamation of superiority" (Peyre, 1996: 33); and thirdly, to refer exclusively to "writers of Classical Antiquity" (Peyre, 1996: 34). In other words, the adjective *classical* is used chiefly in three senses: a moralising sense, an aesthetic sense, and an historical sense.

Based on this triad, we could draw the following conclusion: "classical" may designate a creator or object worthy of imitation, whether on moral or aesthetic grounds, and may also refer to a particular historical period in the evolution of an expressive medium. "Classical" could thus be said to encompass both the prescriptive element associated with the concept of a canon and the descriptive element associated with the concept of style. What is interesting here is the point that these two dimensions share: the criteria that underpin them depend on the discourses developed, basically, within the field of cinematic culture.[1] In the case of classical Hollywood cinema, how does the label *classical* function to define this specific mode of representation? Returning to some

"CLASSICAL" COULD THUS BE SAID TO ENCOMPASS BOTH THE PRESCRIPTIVE ELEMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONCEPT OF A CANON AND THE DESCRIPTIVE ELEMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE CONCEPT OF STYLE

of the observations made above, the classification of certain Hollywood films as "classical" is intended to refer, in its descriptive dimension, to the substance of the story, its adherence to a series of psychological and dramatic rules in the interests of narrative verisimilitude or of a particular, imprecise expressive containment, among other features. In its prescriptive dimension, it alludes to what Alonso refers to somewhat derisively as "cinema-cinema" (Alonso García, 2010: 34): the real way to make a film, which every filmmaker should be aiming for one way or another.

The second concept to be considered is that of *style*. It is remarkable that a concept so widely used in film studies has not been as productively developed[2] as it has, for example, in art history or literary studies. Panofsky (2000) demonstrates this when he considers the concept of style from three perspectives: the perspective of historical and geographical coordinates (based on the Baroque style), the perspective of aesthetic forms or genres (based on the idea of cinematographic style), and the national perspective (based on the so-called "English style"). According to this analysis, style can be identified as a loosely defined concept that refers to a particular expressive manifestation entailing a set of formal features that make it recognisable. This is also how Umberto Eco understands it when he suggests that "style becomes synonymous with 'writing' and therefore with the way one expresses oneself in literary terms" (Eco, 2005: 161), or when he suggests that "speaking of style means discussing how the work of art is made" (Eco, 2005: 163).

Panofsky hits the nail on the head when he speaks of the excessively ubiquitous use of the concept of style, something that could be resolved with Eco's proposition, albeit at the risk of excessive generalisation. Wölfflin agrees with this all-encompassing definition of the idea of style as both the "expression of an era and a national sentimentality, as well as the expression of a personal temperament" (Wölfflin, 2016: 32). Antal, a notable figure in the sociology of art, incorporates yet another dimension when he argues for the "consideration of the social factors and political ideas which formed the background to these artistic currents" (Antal, 1966: 25), and also advocates a notion of style "not being restricted to formal features, but including subject-matter" (Antal, 1966: 179).

To sum up, when speaking of style we need to consider formal elements, content and its nature as a vehicle of expression. This raises the question of where to locate the classical Hollywood style, because ultimately there is one big problem posed by all the observations reviewed above: whether style is individual or collective. Bordwell claims that classical cinema is an example of a "group style" (Bordwell, Staiger & Thompson, 1985: 2). But how is such a style established? This question can only be answered with a two-way response: style is an expressive construction conditioned by all the contexts in which it occurs, influencing the creators—in this case, filmmakers—who make their works; and, at the same time, style is the rather heterogeneous combination of all the individual styles that appear at a particular point in space and time. This would be an appropriate way of understanding the notion of style in classical Hollywood cinema, although always bearing in mind something that by this point can be seen to be a constant: the importance of the canon in the historiographical construction of a given style. As Charles Rosen suggests:

What makes the history of music, or of any art, particularly troublesome is that what is most

exceptional, not what is most usual, has often the greatest claim on our interest. Even within the work of one artist, it is not his usual procedure that characterizes his personal "style", but his greatest and most individual success. This, however, seems to deny even the possibility of the history of art: there are only individual works, each self-sufficient, each setting its own standards. (Rosen, 1971: 21-22).

AND IT IS THIS POINT THAT FORMS THE BASIS OF THE KEY CRITICISM PUT FORWARD IN THIS PAPER: THE NORM DESCRIBED DOESN'T REFLECT THE FEATURES OF THE FILMS THAT CONSTITUTE THE CANON

This leads us to the concept of the *canon*. A preliminary definition would refer to "those works that a community sanctions as especially valuable and worthy of transmission" (Galindo Pérez, 2013: 142). If a literary work, painting or film is worth passing on from one generation to the next in a community, it is because that community has identified it as a standard or, in other words, as "a norm established [...] for communicative practice" (Alonso García, 2008: 273). This brings us to an idea that underpins this article: that the canon, that list of creators and works, is the concrete crystallisation of the norm for a communicative practice. In the case of cinema, the norm in classical Hollywood cinema (which the so-called experimenters and/or innovators depart from or transgress) would be the classical Hollywood film canon. Or to put it more simply: the canon is not only a repertoire of the most highly valued works, but also, for that very reason, a work standard to be adhered to or deviated from. And it is this point that forms the basis of the key criticism put forward in this paper: the norm described doesn't reflect the features of the films that constitute the canon.

The supposed rules of classical Hollywood cinema—narrative transparency, erasure of the markers of enunciation, the spectator's immersion in the story—are not the pillars that underpin the aesthetic and moral value of the films usually included in the lists of the best directors and films of classical cinema. Paradoxically, in discussions of classical cinema, a clear distinction is made between what that expression indicates from the perspective of the description of the style and what it indicates from a perspective of the prescription, inherent in a canon, of the norm established by films and filmmakers.

In this respect, it is highly instructive to examine two works, one a historiography and the other an essay, that analyse Hollywood cinema in the so-called classical period. Tag Gallagher (1996: 311-403) offers an overview of the most significant filmmakers of a period covering the 1930s and 1940s, which includes King Vidor, Howard Hawks, John Ford, Raoul Walsh, Orson Welles, Frank Capra, Charles Chaplin, Alfred Hitchcock, Fritz Lang, Ernst Lubitsch, Max Ophüls, Douglas Sirk, Billy Wilder, William Wyler, Anthony Mann, and Joseph L. Mankiewicz, among many others. These filmmakers, responsible for titles like *City Lights* (Charles Chaplin, 1931), *Bringing Up Baby* (Howard Hawks, 1938), *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* (Frank Capra, 1939), *Stagecoach* (John Ford, 1939), *Citizen Kane* (Orson Welles, 1941), *The Little Foxes* (William Wyler, 1941), *Sunset Blvd.* (Billy Wilder, 1950), *All about Eve* (Joseph L. Mankiewicz, 1950), *Rear Window* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1954) and *Written on the Wind* (Douglas Sirk, 1956), are generally included in any reference work on classical Hollywood cinema. On the other hand, Carlos Losilla (2003) offers a critical review of the concept of classical cinema through a selected list of filmmakers, including Walsh, Ford, Vidor, Hitchcock, Mann, Mankiewicz and Wilder, as well as the likes of Robert Aldrich and Nicholas Ray. Comparing the norms associated with the classical Hollywood style against the pantheon of fil-

mmakers traditionally identified with the period, it becomes clear that few if any actually subscribe to this cinematic model. How can we explain this contradiction? It is a contradiction between corpus and canon that Bordwell already clearly identified: "In most film histories, masterworks and innovations rise monumentally out of a hazy terrain whose contours remain unknown" (Bordwell, Staiger & Thompson, 1985: 10). This is a way of advocating the study of the *typical film* or the *usual work* which, in reality, fails to recognise that the difference between these usual works and the *canonical works* is not their quality, but their basic cinematic form.

ON THE GAPS BETWEEN STYLE AND CANON IN CLASSICAL CINEMA

One very simple way of exploring the tension between style and canon in classical Hollywood cinema is to deny the actual existence of classical Hollywood cinema as usually described. "Hollywood has never existed except in the minds of its inhabitants and of the spectators that it has created" and "Hollywood is also an invention of scholars" (Losilla, 2003: 12) are conclusions that lean in this direction. Losilla defines classical Hollywood cinema as a construction created collectively by cinephiles and academics, whose respective conceptions of the subject are curiously similar despite the disparity of their objectives and methods.[3]

Stopping short of this conceptual extreme, other authors prefer to resolve the friction between style and canon in classical Hollywood cinema by positing particular varieties within the vast corpus that it includes. David Bordwell, conscious of the difficulty entailed in such a broad chronological delimitation like the one he proposes for classical cinema, suggests that some leeway for a more or less drastic departure from the paradigm is itself an integral part of Hollywood's classical style: "Any complete account of Hollywood filmmaking must recognise the deviations from the norm" (Bordwell, Staiger & Thompson, 1985: 72). Bordwell suggests that classical cinema's characteristic features include the capacity to co-opt and control deviations from the norm that nuance rather than undermine the general style, and to this end he posits three categories with different degrees of mutability: devices, systems and relations between systems. It could be argued that what Bordwell does is attribute a *Lampedusian* essence to classical Hollywood cinema, whereby everything seems to change so that, in reality, everything can stay the same. Kristin Thompson takes this theoretical line when she asserts, for example, that "This complex systematic quality of the classical cinema allows Hollywood to experiment in a limited way with new techniques and functions, and to assimilate those which prove useful into its overall filmmaking style" (Thompson, 1993: 188). Vicente Sánchez-Biosca identifies the same tendency: "the co-opting of European minds, including representatives of the avant-garde […] should be seen as a revealing symptom of a deeper phenomenon: the dynamic capacity of the Hollywood system for incorporating different elements, integrating them for its purposes, but also making use of them as instruments of innovation and change" (Sánchez-Biosca, 2004: 139). Rejecting the conception of classical cinema as a construction, other authors do not deny the reality of the phenomenon but explain the obvious heterogeneity of the films included as examples of the general style through mechanisms of aesthetic adaptation based on textual appropriation or on the controlled incorporation of new discourses and individual elements.

While these are interesting propositions, the discussion is not limited to them alone. Jesús González Requena (2006), for example, addresses the limitations that he identifies in cognitive and semiotic studies of classical cinema arising from the common difficulty in distinguishing between narration and story. González Requena

identifies three modes—classical, mannerist, and post-classical—the first two of which are of relevance to this study. Classical Hollywood cinema is defined, according to this author, by the predominance of the story over the representation, with the narrative act itself playing the leading role in the classical style. The mannerist style observes a "validity" and a "sophisticated enhancement of the formal procedures introduced by the classical style" (González Requena, 2006: 19), together with a "distancing from and growing distrust of the symbolic universe—and the order of values—of that style" (González Requena, 2006: 19). González Requena's argument could be summed up as follows: classical cinema focuses on the story it is depicting, while mannerist cinema, without giving up altogether on stories, focuses on the act of writing that representation itself. The main contribution here is this concept of *mannerist cinema*, a type of filmmaking that "appropriates both the main narrative forms and the creative procedures that characterise the classical film" (González Requena, 2006: 581), but that exhibits a "weakening of its symbolic density" and employs certain "procedures of classical writing with an extreme virtuosity" (González Requena, 2006: 581). Mannerist cinema[4] is thus a kind of virtuoso variant of classical cinema, which gives less weight to the story and focuses more on exposing the nature of film representation itself.

The constructivist position, the *Lampedusian* position and the mannerist variant all coincide on one point: they all recognise a discrepancy between the classical Hollywood style and the definition of the canonical norm of classical cinema based on films and filmmakers. The commentary on this situation is clear: the authors who analyse classical cinema, acknowledging this almost primordial friction, have developed specific theoretical responses that attempt to contextualise the issue.

At this point, a recapitulation is in order. The description of the classical Hollywood style consists of a series of characteristics related to varying degrees to the importance of the story over the representation, to the weight given to the psychological construction of the characters, to the configuration of the filmic form in relation to the privileged gaze of the spectator, and to the widely discussed but even more ambiguous notion of transparency. On the other hand, the actual expression of this style in specific films and filmmakers occurs, paradoxically, in directors and works commonly highlighted as examples of how that style can be subverted. This conceptual disconnect between style and canon is acknowledged by different authors and scholars who have made classical Hollywood cinema their object of study. But the responses of these analysts have not been aimed at exposing or questioning this friction, but at offering theoretical propositions that fall into two basic categories: to deny the existence of classical cinema outside the imaginary worlds of cinephiles and academics, or to uphold its existence by means of conceptual nuances to explain the many varieties of expression found within the genre.

These theoretical responses are certainly very enriching, given the quantity of conceptual debates and theoretical explorations they have given rise to. Their analytical and historiographical value is beyond question. But it is perhaps their very richness, their intellectual depth, that constitutes the risk they pose: it seems that after all these proposals, there is little to be added to the debate. And

---

Y AND THIS IS WHERE I INTEND TO POSITION THIS ARTICLE: IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE GAP THAT EXISTS BETWEEN STYLE AND CANON IN CLASSICAL HOLLYWOOD CINEMA, AND AN ATTEMPT TO OFFER A DIFFERENT THEORETICAL RESPONSE TO THOSE OFFERED UP TO NOW

---

this is where I intend to position this article: in the identification of the gap that exists between style and canon in classical Hollywood cinema, and an attempt to offer a different theoretical response to those offered up to now.

In what sense is this response different? Basically, in its exploration of the ideological foundation that underlies this glaring discrepancy between style and canon, in order to propose a new historiographical premise that might better and more closely reflect our understanding of the kind of cinema produced in Hollywood.

THE IDEOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF THE DICHOTOMY

Behind the friction between style and canon in classical Hollywood cinema lies a tension that can be traced back much further in time: the dispute between artists and craftspeople. Although Larry Shiner (2004) examined how this distinction was constructed historically in eighteenth-century Europe through a series of specific cultural, social and economic processes, the dichotomy between those who mechanically follow the rules of a trade (craftsmen) and those whose expressiveness is not subject to any rules other than the limits of their own genius (artists) continues to hold a prominent place in the popular imagination.

In cinema, this dichotomy has been re-defined on the basis of the contrast between two major movements in film history: Hollywood movies and modern (mostly European) cinema. The popular notion of the *auteur*[5] contributed considerably to the development of an aesthetic cult of personality around particular filmmakers (the canon) who stand out above a way of making films often characterised for its simplicity and lack of expressive ambition (style). This confrontation between craftsmen and artists relies basically on two discursive constructions that operate more as naturalised (and therefore indisputable) ideas rather than theoretical concepts for debate.

The first cliché or myth relates to style, specifically to the style of classical Hollywood cinema. A prevailing notion in the imaginary of what Metz (2001) identifies as the three main sectors of cinematic culture—filmmakers, spectators and scholars—is that the Hollywood cinematic form is characterised by expressive transparency and narrative efficiency. This reduces the style of classical Hollywood cinema to a vehicle for storytelling, through a production method that unashamedly conforms to industrial practices like *Fordism* or *Taylorism*. Classical Hollywood cinema is thus portrayed as a trade to be performed, *trade* being the operative word in this case, because it refers to a standardised set of rules applicable to the production of a culturally accepted and acceptable product, a practice presented as being clearly antithetical to artistic genius. Any filmmaker identified with this style, which is often presented as the simple application of formulas, is added to the list of "craftsmen".

The second cliché or myth relates to the canon, made up precisely of those filmmakers who somehow manage to achieve the rank of artist. The issue in this case is how the filmmaking artist obtains this title: through a process of breaking the established rules uniformly associated with the classical style. Filmmakers who, even while working within the parameters of classicism, manage to disengage themselves from this collective style and to build a body of work that reflects a personal style are deemed to be artists. Based on this idea are two others that are of great interest for explaining the friction between style and canon in classical Hollywood cinema: firstly, the difference between craftsman and artist can be determined by the degree of obedience to a set of rules that constitutes a group style; and secondly, the clash between the classical Hollywood style and its canon can be explained in terms of the tense coexistence between the group style and the different individual styles.

THE CONCEPT OF THE ARTÍFICE MAKES IT POSSIBLE TO EVADE THE HEAVY IDEOLOGICAL CHARGE OF THE ARTIST/CRAFTSMAN DICHOTOMY

Contained in these ideas is a theoretical and historiographical problem that is presented as solved. However, this assumed solution is erroneous, as it masks and oversimplifies an issue which, as can be seen, leaves numerous questions unanswered. How can we cut a new path for the study of classical Hollywood cinema, and specifically the tension between style and canon? This question can be answered with recourse to a terminological redefinition.

Richard Sennett (2009) offers an analysis of the concept of *craftsman* that is extremely useful in this respect. In his study, Sennett attributes two decisive features to the concept: "an enduring, basic human impulse, the desire to do a job well for its own sake" (Sennett, 2008: 9) and the fact that people know how to do something, but cannot verbalise what they know (Sennett, 2008: 94-99). Craftsmen are categorised on the basis of their commitment to what they do (which, among other things, implies the skill necessary to carry out their task) and the supposed *craftsman's problem* (the craftsman knows how to do something but finds it much more problematic to convey that knowledge). Developing these perspectives, Sennett concludes with an issue that is of significance for this article: he suggests that the craftsman is not the flip-side of the artist, efficient, but lacking in inspiration, and he rejects the idea that creativity is a concept associated exclusively with artistic genius. The craftsman, as someone responsible for a task, is also creative. Sennett thus points to a new conception of the craftsman.

The craftsman/artist dichotomy is reflected in the Spanish language's most authoritative dictionary. According to the *Diccionario de la Real Acade-mia Española*, an *artesano* (craftsman) is a "person who practices a merely mechanical art or trade" (Real Academia Española, 2001). We can see here how the language acts as a sounding board for the dichotomy, and thus a re-conceptualisation based on Sennett is perhaps not enough. Essentially, the problem is reflected in the Spanish translation of the title of Richard Sennett's book: *El artesano*. Indeed, *artesano* is the usual Spanish translation of the English word "craftsman", but it is likely that the Spanish word that best fits Sennett's explanation is *artífice*, which is defined in the Spanish dictionary as "a person who executes a work with ability or skill" (Real Academia Española, 2001).

The concept of the *artífice* makes it possible to evade the heavy ideological charge of the artist/craftsman dichotomy. And it may be this very term, whose multiple derivations have been explored by Ezio Manzini (1992), among others, that can provide the basis for a new line of historiographic and analytical research into classical Hollywood cinema that will turn the spotlight on some traditionally overlooked perspectives.

A NEW HISTORIOGRAPHIC HORIZON AS A POSSIBLE CONCLUSION

The use of the concept of the *artífice* is not a mere lexical change. It is not just the substitution of one term for another in the interests of greater semantic precision, but the activation of a notion that entails a necessary ideological shift. In this case, it represents the elimination of the confrontation between artists and craftsmen, expressed in the disconnect between two concepts that should complement rather than contradict one another: style and canon.

Examples that could be cited include Heinrich Wölfflin's insistence on the need for "an art history that, rather than only portraying individual artists, shows the unbroken succession from a linear style to a painterly one, from a tectonic style

to an atectonic one, and so on" (Wölfflin, 2016: 19). What Wölfflin calls for is an art history without names, not based on a pantheon of great men, but on the identification of styles.

A similar view is taken by George Kubler, who de-personalises art history with the proposition not of a *history without names*, but of a *history of things*: "the 'history of things' is intended to reunite ideas and objects under the rubric of visual forms" (Kubler, 1962: 9).

The elimination of names from film history would compel us to choose a different methodology, and even epistemology, that would organise historical knowledge of the cinematic phenomenon on the basis of other conceptual principles. While in the field of art Wölfflin's and Kubler's propositions are based on the concepts of style or of material objects, in the field of cinema what would be needed is a history that shifts away from the more or less typical review of great filmmakers and masterpieces[6] that stand out over a style that seems to serve only as a frame of comparison for these essential milestones. This shift needs to take into account one fundamental element: the centrality of the film, the finished product, as the privileged object of study in film history and theory.

History, theory and analysis, the traditional branches of film studies, have focused on the picture as the object of their reflections, as reflected in the studies of Allen & Gomery (1995) and Zumalde (2006; 2001). However, it is important to point out an ongoing and increasingly pronounced shift notable for one basic characteristic: from the film text itself to its reception, to the question of the spectator, a shift observable in studies by Palacio (1995), Pujol Ozonas (2011), and Elsaesser & Hagener (2015). This movement from film to spectator, from text to reception, highlights an element that has often been overlooked: creation, the cinematic process that results in a product. This process, while it has been worthy of the attention of some specialist literature, has not been

a central focus in complex considerations of the cinematic phenomenon.

It is here that the concept of the *artífice* could prove useful in film history and, specifically, in studies of classical Hollywood cinema. The *artífice*, as someone who makes films, has to be integrated into the filmmaking process. And the reason for this is far from trivial: the way that films are made needs to be contextualised in a specific culture that conditions (and at the same time is conditioned by) its textual forms and social practices. The way films are made is directly related to the end product of those films and the way they are viewed and interpreted.

THE WAY FILMS ARE MADE IS DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE END PRODUCT OF THOSE FILMS AND THE WAY THEY ARE VIEWED AND INTERPRETED

In order to bring about this epistemological shift—the inclusion of the filmmaking process in studies of film history—the film historian's practice is in need of a methodological change. To this end, it is essential to create the specific tools needed to integrate filmmaking praxis into film history. Two of these tools would be the ethnographic perspective and the film archive perspective: direct observation of the work of filmmakers; and archival research to track down cut-out footage, as opposed to the footage that was ultimately used.

By way of conclusion, what all the above points to can be summed up as follows. An analysis of the norms of classical Hollywood cinema, and the deviations from and subversions of those norms, brings to the fore a notably complex theoretical problem: the divergence between the descriptive dimension of classical cinema (style) and its prescriptive dimension (canon). This is significant, as these two levels should operate to reciprocally reinforce one another. Various authors

have acknowledged this friction and have proposed theoretical mechanisms (such as the concept of "mannerist cinema") in an attempt to address it. The clash between style and canon, and the ways in which scholars have sought to explain it, reflects another dilemma that encompasses not only cinema but the whole world of the arts: the dichotomy between artist and craftsman. Finally, this analysis of the problem points to a potential new horizon for research in studies of film history and of classical Hollywood cinema in particular: the integrated study of creative processes, whereby the analysis of film footage and the observation of the creators at work would lead to an understanding of the filmmaking phenomenon in which the finished product would be considered in conjunction with its necessary complement, i.e. the processes that lead to it. In this sense, classical Hollywood cinema offers a relevant and convenient object for the development of a historiography of cinema re-defined on the basis of the key principles set out above. ∎

NOTES

1　For an exploration of the basic components of every field of cultural production and their working dynamics, see Rivas (2007) and his astute application of the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu's cultural fields to an analysis of the world of cinema.

2　Of course, significant contributions in this respect, like those of Salt (1983), should not be forgotten. The dearth of conceptual development referred to here in comparison with other disciplines is quantitative rather than qualitative.

3　Carlos Losilla (2009), in an anthology he edited, also stresses the impure nature of classical cinema—referring in this case to the fact of the influence of European filmmakers on the development of the classical form of expression.

4　The term *mannerist cinema*, used by Jesús González Requena (1986) in his analysis of the films of Douglas Sirk, has been well-received in the world of film stu-

dies, as demonstrated by studies from other latitudes (cf. Campan & Menegaldo, 2003; Carrega, 2012).

5　For a more detailed analysis of the development and ramifications of the notion of the *auteur*, see Galindo Pérez (2015).

6　The proposition of a new methodology for studying film history is not a novel idea. Numerous authors have contributed to a very necessary debate, resulting in a deeper and clearer understanding of the filmmaking phenomenon. In the case of this article, it is important to acknowledge the inspiration of Santos Zunzunegui's work on Spanish cinema of the 1960s, in which he sought to combat the historiographic tradition relying on "a picture that takes a so-called New Spanish Cinema as a *figure* [...] which would come to be cut out over the *background* of a standardised production made up of sub-genres and co-productions of nothing more than purely statistical interest" (Zunzunegui, 2005: 29). As can be appreciated, different elements discussed here (such as the core dilemma of style vs. canon) were already present in Zunzunegui's work.

REFERENCES

Allen, R., Gomery, D. (1995). *Teoría y práctica de la historia del cine*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Alonso García, L. (2008). *Historia y praxis de los media: elementos para una historia general de la comunicación*. Madrid: Laberinto.

— (2010). *Lenguaje del cine, praxis del filme: una introducción al cinematógrafo*. Madrid: Plaza y Valdés.

Antal, F. (1966). *Classicism and Romanticism: With Other Studies in Art History*. New York: Basic Books.

Bazin, A. (2016). *¿Qué es el cine?* Madrid: Rialp.

Bordwell, D., Staiger, J., Thompson, K. (1985). *The Classical Hollywood Cinema*. London: Routledge.

Burch, N. (1990). *Life to Those Shadows*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Campan, V., Menegaldo, G. (eds.) (2003). *Du maniérisme au cinéma*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Carrega, J. (2012). Um período manierista na obra de John Ford. *Revista Comunicación*, *1*(10), 775-786. Retrieved from http://revistacomunicacion.org/pdf/n10/

mesa4/061.Um_periodo_maneirista_na_obra_de_John_Ford.pdf

Eco, U. (2005). *On Literature*. Orlando: Harcourt Books.

Elsaesser, T., Hagener, M. (2015). *Introducción a la teoría del cine*. Madrid: UAM.

Galindo Pérez, J. (2013). El canon cinematográfico español: una propuesta de análisis. *Archivos de la Filmoteca*, *71*, 141-154. Retrieved from http://www.archivosdelafilmoteca.com/index.php/archivos/issue/view/21

— (2015). Del autor en la historia del cine. Revisiones y nuevas vías. *ZER. Revista de Estudios de Comunicación*, *20*(39), 49-66. Retrieved from http://www.ehu.eus/ojs/index.php/Zer/article/view/15517/14496

Gallagher, T. (1996). Directores de Hollywood. In E. Riambau & C. Torreiro (eds.), *Estados Unidos (1932-1955)* (pp. 311-403). Madrid: Cátedra (Collection Historia general del cine, Vol. 8).

González Requena, J. (1986). *La metáfora del espejo: el cine de Douglas Sirk*. Valencia: Instituto de Cine y Radio-Televisión.

— (2006). *Clásico, manierista, postclásico: los modos del relato en el cine de Hollywood*. Valladolid: Castilla.

Harris, W. (1998). La canonicidad. In E. Sullà (ed.), *El canon literario* (pp. 37-60). Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Guerif, F. (1988). *Formas de atención*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

Kubler, G. (1962). *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Losilla, C. (2003). *La invención de Hollywood*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Losilla, C. (ed.) (2009). *En tránsito: Berlín-París-Hollywood. Más allá de la historia del cine*. Madrid: T&B.

Manzini, E. (1992). *Artefactos: hacia una nueva ecología del ambiente artificial*. Madrid: Celeste y Experimenta Ediciones de Diseño.

Metz, C. (2001). *El significante imaginario. Psicoanálisis y cine*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Palacio, M. (1995). La noción de espectador en el cine contemporáneo. In M. Palacio & S. Zunzunegui (eds.), *El cine en la era del audiovisual* (pp. 69-100). Madrid: Cátedra (Collection Historia general del cine, Vol. 12).

Panofsky, E. (2000). *Sobre el estilo: tres ensayos inéditos*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Peyre, H. (1996). *¿Qué es el clasicismo?* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Pujol Ozonas, C. (2011). *Fans, cinéfilos y cinéfagos. Una aproximación a las culturas y los gustos cinematográficos*. Barcelona: UOC.

Real Academia Española (2001). *Diccionario de la lengua española* (22nd edition). Retrieved from http://www.rae.es/diccionario-de-la-lengua-espanola/presentacion

Rivas, V. (2007). Nuevos conceptos teóricos para reflexionar sobre la institución cine. In À. Quintana (ed.), *Cinema i modernitat: les transformacions de la percepció* (pp. 273-280). Girona: Museu del Cinema/Ajuntament de Girona.

Rosen, C. (1971). *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. New York: Viking Press.

Salt, B. (1983). *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*. London: Starword.

Sánchez-Biosca, V. (2004). *Cine y vanguardias artísticas*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Sennett, R. (2008). *The Craftsman*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

— (2009). *El artesano*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Shiner, L. (2004). *La invención del arte: una historia cultural*. Barcelona: Paidós.

Thompson, K. (1993). The Limits of Experimentation in Hollywood. *Archivos de la Filmoteca*, *14*, 186-201. Retrieved from http://www.archivosdelafilmoteca.com/index.php/archivos/article/view/342

Wölfflin, H. (2016). *Conceptos fundamentales de la historia del arte*. Barcelona: Austral.

Zumalde, I. (2006). *La materialidad de la forma fílmica. Crítica de la (sin)razón posestructuralista*. Bilbao: Universidad del País Vasco.

— (2011). *La experiencia fílmica: cine, pensamiento y emoción*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Zunzunegui, S. (1996). *La mirada cercana. Microanálisis fílmico*. Barcelona: Paidós.

— (2005). *Los felices sesenta. Aventuras y desventuras del cine español (1959-1971)*. Barcelona: Paidós.

ON CLASSICAL HOLLYWOOD CINEMA: BEYOND THE CLASH BETWEEN STYLE AND CANON

DEL CINE CLÁSICO DE HOLLYWOOD: MÁS ALLÁ DEL CHOQUE ENTRE EL ESTILO Y EL CANON

Abstract

This paper explores the clash between the style of classical Hollywood cinema and the canon of films and filmmakers associated with it. It considers how other authors have sought to resolve this issue, what is really concealed behind the tension, and how film historiography can address it with a view to developing a deeper and clearer understanding of cinema in general and classical Hollywood cinema in particular. The divergence between the descriptive dimension, associated with style, and the prescriptive dimension, related to the canon, is thus revealed to be an enriching source of discussion in the interests of refining the methods used to analyse classical Hollywood cinema.

Resumen

El presente artículo centra su atención en el choque que se da entre el estilo del cine clásico de Hollywood y el canon de cineastas y películas asociados a él. De esta manera, se podrá comprobar cómo otros autores han tratado de resolver la cuestión, qué se oculta realmente bajo esta tensión, y cómo la historiografía del cine puede afrontarla para generar un conocimiento sobre el cine, en general, y el cine clásico de Hollywood, en particular, mayor y más profundo. La divergencia entre la dimensión descriptiva, vinculada al estilo, y la dimensión prescriptiva, relacionada con el canon, se revela, de esta manera, como una fuente enriquecedora de discusión para refinar los métodos de análisis del cine clásico de Hollywood.

Key words

Classical Film; Hollywood; Style; Canon; Classicism; Mannerism; Artist; Craftsman.

Palabras clave

Cine clásico; Hollywood; estilo; canon; clasicismo; manierismo; artista; artesano.

Author

Jose María Galindo Pérez (b. Madrid, 1987) holds a PhD in Audiovisual Communication and is Professor of Transmedia Storytelling at CSEU La Salle. He has authored numerous works included in anthologies, academic journals and international conferences. His main research interests include the analysis of filmmaking and the concept of the film canon.Contact: josem.galindo@lasallecampus.es.

Autor

Jose María Galindo Pérez (Madrid, 1987) es doctor en Comunicación Audiovisual y profesor de Narrativa Transmedia en el CSEU La Salle. Autor de numerosos trabajos en volúmenes colectivos, revistas especializadas y congresos internacionales, algunas de sus principales líneas de investigación son el análisis de la praxis fílmica y el concepto de canon cinematográfico. Contacto: josem.galindo@lasallecampus.es.