

**Chapter 1 : Play Reviews - Metacritic**

*The ultimate effect of [Å–stlund's] studied techniques is more restricting than beneficial, which, combined with a protracted running time, faintly self-righteous air and a perplexing, misguided coda, produces a sense of letdown at the end despite the strength of much that has come before.*

Brooks served as executive producers. It was co-produced by Patric Verrone. The show sometimes included appearances of real life critics, such as Gene Shallit , Gene Siskel , and Roger Ebert , who provided their own voices. It was cancelled by the network after half a season, and was then moved onto Fox the following year where it ran for another ten episode season. Around this time, it was included in a "shameless plug" crossover with The Simpsons in their episode " A Star Is Burns " and assumed the timeslot immediately after the show in the TV schedule, in an attempt to popularize it. Also, Fox refused to officially cancel the show until much later. The show returned in Flash-animated webisode form in " , for a third season with 10 three- to five-minute installments. Design[ edit ] Four people have a design credit on the show: Silverman designed the look of Jay Sherman. Moore and Cutler designed the general look of the show including some of the backgrounds and supporting cast. Cutler helped in the hard task of standardizing all these animation styles. Moore was the supervising director, so oversaw a lot of the design process"and was also responsible for how the action would play out, and how each shot would be framed. He was designed as " Kaufmanesque ," and Jim Brooks liked the design, so his design remained much the same for the pilot episode. Moore had his reservations as the character had a "flat head and tiny eyes that were hard to act with", and was composed of shapes that were difficult to turn in a 3D space. It was decided the drawing encapsulated the humanity and reality of the critic, so was left unchanged. Over the course of the two seasons, however, the design was altered slightly. The flat head was made more round, and his eyes became bigger" in order to make Sherman more appealing and more easily animatable. The design team never intended to make the characters too cartoony as it would not have fit tonally with the type of show. The characters were designed via a general think-tank process of "what do we like about the characters and what are we trying to say about them? Quick sketches were completed in front of the full creative team after a discussion about characters, which were then critically analysed. In particular, the design of the parents caused some issues. Jim Brooks described the father as a "crazy wasp. Moore explains that the animation should never "step on the voices or the writing. Nancy Cartwright was eventually given the role. She used a voice very similar to her natural one. Christine Cavanaugh was cast as Marty. Due to the sheer number of film and TV parodies, the team also sought character actors who could play many different roles. During the audition process, they asked them to perform their acts, which Reiss described as "very entertaining. Depending on who could do the voice better, the characters were divided up between Nick Jameson and LaMarche. Each would play about 20"30 characters per show. According to LaMarche, he played twenty-seven characters in one episode. Club says "The Critic made its protagonist the anti- Homer Simpson. Where Homer is a booze-sodden everyman, Jay Sherman is an unabashed elitist. Where Homer is a rudely physical creature, Jay leads a life of the mind. Homer is a slob. Jay is a snob. He claimed that in the public consciousness, this was his show"a direct spin-off to The Simpsons. Scott getting hit in the groin with a football" in the crossover episode. His only line was "Ow, my groin. During an interview with Geraldo Rivera , Jay is asked about talking over the heads of his audience and does just that in his answer. Groening decided to take his name off the credits and did not appear in the DVD commentary. He publicly complained about the episode, which went to air in the end. He said "for more than six months I tried to convince Jim Brooks and everyone connected with the show not to do such a cynical thing, which would surely be perceived by the fans as nothing more than a pathetic attempt to But his behavior right now is rotten. In the episode " Hurricane Neddy ," he was in an insane asylum apparently unable to say anything more than his catchphrase Doctor: Jay is always awakened by a disquieting phone call or radio news report, and eventually watches a clip that parodies a well-known movie before delivering the same negative opinion: Themes[ edit ] One of the main elements featured on The Critic is the lampooning of the entertainment industry. Club explains "Mike Reiss and Al Jean-written episodes of The Simpsons are often

defined by a high number of parodies, spoofs and homages. In their episodes, the Simpsons are always watching television or going to the movies. It proved the perfect delivery system for an endless series of clever, bite-sized spoofs. The process involves making the films "more attractive to a contemporary audience" by "inserting computer-generated happy endings. It was so well written because it really understood movies, celebrities, Hollywood and humour. But if you were, you understood the references and saw the effort the writers and animators put in, to recapture the movies you grew up loving and remembering. But the best element of this show was that Jay Sherman would review films honestly. It was the only television series they ever reviewed. Gene Siskel said, "if The Critic is gonna succeedâ€”and I hope it doesâ€”it desperately needs to refocus itself on the movies and the way critics interact with them. He added he would like to see Jay watch television to allow the show to satirize that medium as well. This would focus the show on the media, and not let it become another show about a man and his problems. Siskel said the writers should keep Jay as a smart critic. The Critic, in which they analyzed the cancellation of the show. It said "The creators and Lovitz seem to [care about the show], as there are always talks cropping up of a revival of The Critic, either as an animated project, or possibly a live-action one. There are fan sites out there, but as time passes with no new material, many of these are becoming floating time capsules". The Critic was in its time, one of the greatest animated shows ever made and one of the funniest shows period on television. He may never find anything in live action that serves him quite so well. Rewatching it now, The Critic seems most similar stylistically to the more recent series Family Guy , with its frequent cutaway gags The Simpsons introduced these qualities in moderation; The Critic and Family Guy are addicted to them, sometimes to a crippling degree. Too often the writers rely on audience familiarity with popular movies.

**Chapter 2 : Adapting plays to movies: Critic's Notebook - latimes**

*Ben Brantley, Charles Isherwood and other New York Times Critics on the plays and musicals currently open in New York City.*

This author remembers the first time he discovered Tyler Perry. The year was , and the author worked as an assistant at a Hollywood talent agency. The building was spectacular, the suits were sharp, and movie stars graced the halls. Agents hammered out multimillion-dollar deals with studio execs in corner offices. Being an assistant was considerably less glamorous. It involved answering two dozen phone calls a minute, shuffling nonfat soy lattes into meetings, dodging flying office supplies, and swerving through traffic to get scripts to studios. A typical workday started at 7, ended around 9, and paid eight bucks an hour. But of all the trials the job demanded, one was particularly onerous: Every other Saturday, the author dragged himself into the building before 6am. There, he awaited a top-secret fax yes, a fax with a dump of raw data: Through a haze of hangover and sleep deprivation, he put those numbers into a spreadsheet. Then he picked up the phone, connected to voicemail, affected his best Tom Brokaw voice, and recorded the report as an outgoing message to the entire company and its A-list clients. There was no room for error. It was like living a really bad James Bond movie. Harrowing as the experience was, it was educational. In sorting through the numbers, one gained an appreciation for the business of filmmaking. Ninety percent of the time, which movies cracked the top ten was predictable. But on any given Saturday, a surprise could pop up on the charts. One of the biggest surprises crinkled its way through the fax machine on the morning of February 26, *Diary of a Mad Black Woman*, a film by an obscure director named Tyler Perry, opened at 1 that weekend. Most critics savaged *Diary*. Over the next decade, he continued to churn out hits in the *Madea* franchise. That differential has not narrowed as Perry has gained commercial success and mainstream recognition. Most of the critics writing for mainstream American magazines, newspapers, and review sites are white. Other prominent and successful African-American filmmakers have done just fine by Ebert and his contemporaries. Furthermore, Tyler Perry is not a stand-in for all African-American filmmakers. He is just one filmmaker of many. His audiences are not the set of all African-American moviegoing audiences; they are a subset. Perhaps they are even a very unique subset. The difference of opinions between Tyler Perry Critics and Tyler Perry Fans is best explained by the dynamics of niche cultures. Perry makes an idiosyncratic type of movie, and in the context of Tyler Perry Fans, he makes that type to near perfection. The Tyler Perry genre “no matter which races, backgrounds or creeds it appeals to” appeals to a lot of people. Niches like Tyler Perry Fans exist throughout the moviegoing landscape. Perry succeeded by identifying an underserved niche, recognizing its buying power, and meeting its needs on a consistent basis. Other niches have risen to significance through similar circumstances. Critics disrespect many of these niches the same way they do Tyler Perry Fans. Critics who wish to remain relevant in the niche-powered future need to take a closer look. Is it entertaining, or is it a complete waste of time? And what gives a critic the right to make those calls? Scott, the chief film critic for the *New York Times*, and easily one of the most prominent movie journalists of our day. Power to do what? Kael enjoyed a tenure longer than almost any print reviewer in the 20th century. In her prime, *The New Yorker* was considered the highest authority in the country for serious movie reviews. She counted among her readership the cream of American intellectuals and high society. On the other side of the spectrum, critics like Roger Ebert and Gene Siskel spoke to the common man. Engaging movie fans “be they highbrow, lowbrow, or somewhere in between” means serving in two capacities: Speaking for and to an audience is easy when the critic and the audience share the same tastes, run in the same cultural circles, and come from the same backgrounds. Readers opted into the papers, magazines, or broadcast shows of their choice. If they were moviegoers, they listened to Ebert. They might have had a few other choices perhaps the local papers , but not much more than that. The movie studios, in turn, used the critics as sounding boards and public relations channels. As media channels were far more concentrated than they are today, studios could reach big audiences through a handful of reviewers. But technologies like Netflix, streaming video, file sharing, and iTunes have leveled the costs of importing and distributing content to anywhere around the world. The

Problem With Mainstream Netflix believes this author would fail a drug test. A typical search results page resembles this one: After watching these titles, many members consume Funyuns and Chex Mix. Image taken from Netflix. These nine films follow an almost identical pattern to the one we observed in the nine Tyler Perry films we analyzed earlier. Others, like *The Big Lebowski*, were fairly well received upon release, but grew quickly in the home video and VOD market into subcultures in and of themselves. *Lebowski Fest*, an annual fan gathering that started in , has toured in over 30 cities; its online forum boasts over , members. Critics evaluate these movies based on their ostensible merits as pieces of mainstream entertainment “ but Stoner culture is, if anything, a rejection of the mainstream. Take the case of Nicholas Sparks, bestselling author of 18 and counting romance novels adored by legions of predominantly female fans. Do critics care about Nicholas Sparks movies? Have they adapted their considerations of the category to reflect widespread audience acceptance? In the eyes of a few critics and, perhaps, to many viewers outside the Sparks niche , these movies are formulaic, emotionally manipulative tearjerkers. But to millions of fans “ the target audiences, the ones who care, the ones who pay “ these movies are romantic, cathartic, rewarding experiences. Those fans would be better served by critics capable of judging the latest Sparks adaptation from their perspective. As for everyone outside the Sparks niche? So an outside critic, trashing the movies for the benefit of opted-out audiences, is probably wasting his words. Are Critics Themselves a Niche? Do critical favorites impact audience reception? Is a critical darling necessarily an audience favorite? Were American audiences entertained as predicted? With the exception of *Intouchables*, which American audiences actually liked more than critics did, most of the films exhibited a significant gap. The Riches of Niches For most of movie and TV history, small niches were commercially risky propositions for studios and distributors. International content, for example, was once hard to come by because localization was expensive, and the addressable markets seemed tiny. Physical distance between viewers often kept some niches geographically constrained. And few big companies were willing to take commercial risks on content with no proven track record or audience size. Micro-independent filmmakers and distributors had to fill the gaps. But their reach was still small, and their access to distribution channels such as theater chains and TV syndication was almost nonexistent. Consider the example of Czech cinema. Still, the author suspects few American readers will be able to name more than two of his movies if that many. Almost no Americans know the movies he made before coming to Hollywood. But outside of the United States, Czech New Wave cinema is often considered one of the most influential film movements of the s. Forman and his contemporaries won multiple Academy Awards for Best Foreign Film, but few of those movies were imported or distributed in significant quantity to the United States. They would have been positioned as arthouse fare, presumably subtitled, and referenced cultural norms like critiques of life under Communism with which American audiences were unfamiliar. Access to previously unreachable or hard-to-come-by content can grow the size of a niche exponentially. Consider some recent examples: *Who Has Been a Hit in Great Britain* since it first aired in . But in all the ensuing years, it never rose above the status of minor cult curiosity in the US. In , with exposure to new audiences on Netflix , the show started breaking viewership records for BBC America. It continues to do so year over year. The low barriers to financing and filming a documentary, combined with the dramatically lowered barriers to distributing documentaries online, have resulted in a growing library of films catering to a growing niche audience. Niches are fairly easy to market to, thanks to concentration in online forums, conventions, browser cookies, purchase histories, and other retargeting mechanisms. The relative simplicity of reaching and engaging a niche audience helps defray the risks associated with marketing a new property. Conversely, for a mainstream film, a studio will need to blast all channels and airwaves with expensive, shotgun-style advertising. Studios, both independent and major, have begun to take notice and to adapt their strategies accordingly. Comic-Con , once a geeky gathering on the fringes of popular culture, is now a must-stop tour for major movie studios looking to showcase their upcoming titles. But critics are struggling to keep up.

## Chapter 3 : Critic Reviews for Play - Metacritic

*Plays, Movies, and Critics* opens with an original play by Don DeLillo. In the form of an interview, DeLillo's short play works as a kind of paradigm of the theatrical or cinematic event and serves as a keynote for the volume.

Writing the Introduction The introduction should include the following: The title of the play, the name of the playwright, and any pertinent historical information regarding them other similar works from this period? The name of the director, the place and date of the production you attended, and the name of the production company again, do you know of any previous work by this company? The thesis of your review, which should include possibly in more than a single statement the following: A general impression of the relative success or failure of the production, based on what you actually saw and on your initial impression of how the play should have been performed. Note that even if the production did not exactly coincide with your own conception of the play, you should not feel obliged to condemn the performance outright. Be open-minded and willing to weigh pros and cons. Note that this thesis asserts that Papp captured the essence of what is in the text itself -- the expectations set up by the thesis are that the reviewer will then analyze the methods by which the director achieved this effect. Without that sympathy, the play would have been reduced to pure chaos and would have failed to portray an American ideal of freedom. Since you will not be expected to discuss all aspects of the production, focus your thesis on one or two major concerns that the performance has or has not addressed. Read your assignment carefully to find out which aspects of the performance are to be emphasized in your review. You can include this summary in the introduction; or, if you wish to expand the summary, include it in a separate paragraph following the introduction. Writing the Body of the Paper: The Review Remember that in the body of the paper you are obliged to deal specifically with each element of the production that you mentioned in the introduction and thesis. In order to give your review a tight internal logic and cohesiveness, you should also discuss these elements in the order that you outlined in the introduction. For each element that you discuss: In as brief and precise a manner as possible, describe in detail the physical aspects of what you saw performed. Keep in mind at all times that whatever you include must in some way contribute to the assertion you made in your introduction and thesis. Focus on particular scenes or performances that will provide the evidence for your final evaluation of the play. The tempest scene in *Lear* utilized a particularly hostile set in order to universalize the suffering depicted throughout the play. The lights were dimmed and the backdrop was flat black. Against this backdrop were propped, in no particular order, seven skulls that looked out over the events to come. Note the vivid description of what was seen, and the use of detail to convey that vividness. The passage will work nicely as evidence for an overall, positive evaluation of the production. This part of the paper requires the most thought and organization and consequently receives the most attention from your reader. After you have finished describing important elements of the production, proceed to evaluate them. For example, you would need to answer the following questions regarding the last description of *Lear*: Why were the lights dimmed at the beginning of the scene? Why was the backdrop painted black? Why was there no order to the skulls? In the evaluation, you are given the opportunity to attack as well as commend the performance; if the production fails to answer questions that you feel need answers, then say so. If the question or problems are relatively minor, ignore them. Writing the Summary and Conclusion Your conclusion should not merely recapitulate your thesis in a mechanical way. Rather, you should try to show why your response to the play is valid and significant, based on what you have described in the body of the paper.

## Chapter 4 : Movie & TV Critics - Rotten Tomatoes

*Plays, Movies, and Critics Reflections on The Sheltering Sky / Jody McAuliffe What the Streets Mean: An Interview with Martin Scorsese / Anthony DeCurtis.*

## Chapter 5 : Plays, Movies, and Critics by Jody McAuliffe

*Critics for The New York Times on Sam Shepard's Plays, Books and Movies. Plays. Image. Terry Kinney, left, and James Gammon in a Broadway revival of the Shepard work "Buried Child."*

### Chapter 6 : Critic's Choice () - IMDb

*Meet the critics whose reviews contribute to the Rotten Tomatoes Tomatometer, the most trusted measurement of quality for Movies & TV.*

### Chapter 7 : Literary Analysis Papers: How to review a play

*Film critics view movies with a critical eye. They consider artistic composition, acting, and other elements when evaluating a movie. And their opinions matter. Critics can influence consumer.*

### Chapter 8 : Review of Rampage () by Frank Ochieng for The Critical Movie Critics | Cinafilm

*Critics disrespect many of these niches they same way they do Tyler Perry Fans. In fact, the mathematical differential we saw in Tyler Perry's case plays out almost identically across many categories of film - categories that, like Perry's, carry significant cultural and commercial cachet.*

### Chapter 9 : Plays, Movies, and Critics: Jody McAuliffe: racedaydvl.com: Books

*Roger Ebert on James Ivory's "Howards End". Ballad of Narayama "The Ballad of Narayama" is a Japanese film of great beauty and elegant artifice, telling a story of startling cruelty.*