

ECHOES OF THE PAST: UKRAINIAN POETIC CINEMA
AND THE EXPERIENTIAL ETHNOGRAPHIC MODE

by

J.J. Gurga

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University College London (UCL)

September 2012

DECLARATION

I, JJ Gurga, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

ABSTRACT

This thesis introduces the concept of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode to describe fiction film in which a particular approach is adopted during the filmmaking process, one which involves time spent on location and close collaboration with local residents. This filmmaking process forms an integral part of the filmic product, which seeks to evoke within the viewer a sense of the filmmakers' experience of *being there*. The Experiential Ethnographic Mode is elaborated according to its three basic components – time, space and sound – which are fundamental to the experience of *being there* and, of course, to the cinematic medium. In order to explain the concept of the mode, this thesis takes as its illustrative example the school of Ukrainian poetic cinema. The Experiential Ethnographic Mode is offered as a defining characteristic of this school, and its identification enables a new interpretation of the films. These films, produced principally in the 1960s at the Dovzhenko Studio in Kyiv, are characterized by a blend of fiction and non-fiction; the use of local, non-professional actors and experimental soundtracks; and a concern with the issue of cultural heritage. The works can be connected to the traumatic events of the country's recent past, events which transformed the relationship between the people and the land. Rather than seeing the films as oriented on the past and a lost way of life, however, this thesis shows how they are anchored in the present and assert the continuity of traditions. Employing Marianne Hirsch's notion of 'postmemory' to describe the relationship of the second generation to the trauma of the first, it is argued that the films, through their use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, can be seen to engage in 'postmemorial work' and attempt to rebuild intergenerational connections.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people without whom this thesis would not have been possible. I would like to thank my supervisors at UCL, Dr Philip Cavendish and Prof. Julian Graffy, for their support, advice and encouragement throughout the research, writing, and editing process. In addition, a number of colleagues, academics, and conference and seminar participants have provided insightful comments, feedback and assistance in the process of completing this thesis, for which I am grateful. In particular, I would like to thank Marta Jenkala at UCL for her endless support, enthusiasm for the project, and advice with translations.

My studies would not have been possible without the financial assistance of the Arts and Humanities Research Council, not only through their initial funding of this PhD but through the awarding of a travel grant to cover the costs of field trips to Russia and Ukraine in 2010. The UCL SSEES Excellence Scholarship also provided much needed funds in my final year.

In Russia, I would like to thank the staff at Gosfil'mofond; the Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv kinofotodokumentov; and the Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva. In Ukraine, my thanks go to the staff at the Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy; the Natsional'nyi tsentr Oleksandra Dovzhenka; and the Dovzhenko Film Studio, in particular Raisa Prokopenko at the Dovzhenko museum. A number of other individuals have assisted me during the research for this thesis; these include Alison Kahn, Larysa

Briukhovets'ka, Roman Balaian, Evgenii Margolit, Ivan Zelenchuk, Oleh Biliak, and Roman K.

On a personal note, I would like to thank my family and friends for their generosity and patience throughout this process. My parents, Judith and Mark, have been unwavering in their support, without which this thesis would not have been completed. Special mention must go to Chris, who has not only provided guidance, support and inspiration, but who has travelled with me on this journey – most memorably through the Carpathians in a Škoda. It was there that we met the people of Hutsul'shchyna, who breathed life into this project and to whom this thesis is dedicated.

NOTE ON TRANSLATION AND TRANSLITERATION

In this thesis I have used the Library of Congress system of transliteration (without ligatures) to render the quotations from Russian and Ukrainian into Latin script. Where Russian or Ukrainian words appear in English language quotations or sources, I have kept the transliteration system used by the authors. At the time of writing, the state language in Ukraine is Ukrainian and so place names in Ukraine have been transliterated in Ukrainian (e.g. L'viv not Lviv or Lvov, Kyiv not Kiev, and Odesa not Odessa). Similarly, the names of individuals from Ukraine have been transliterated from the Ukrainian language. Clearly there are limitations to this approach and it is not always possible to ascertain an individual's country of origin. Nonetheless, the intention is to provide some degree of consistency rather than to ascribe a national identity or linguistic preference to any individual. One obvious exception to this approach is the decision to follow common practice in referring to Sarkis Paradjanian as Sergei Paradzhanov, using the Russianized version of his name. The titles of films made at the Ukrainian studios have been transliterated in Ukrainian. For consistency, this applies even in those cases where it has only been possible to locate the Russian-language version of the film. Where provided, all translations are my own unless otherwise stated.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Derzhkino	Derzhavnyi komitet URSR po kinematohrafiï (State Committee of Cinematography of the Ukrainian SSR)
Goskino	Gosudarstvennyi komitet SSSR po kinematografii (State Committee of Cinematography of the USSR)
RGALI	Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (Russian State Archive of Literature and the Arts)
SK	Soiuz kinematografistov SSSR (Union of Cinematographers of the USSR)
SRK	Stsenarno-redaktsiina kolehiia, Derzhkino (Screenplay-Editorial Board, Derzhkino)
SPKU	Spilka pratsivnykiv kinematohrafiï URSR (Union of Workers in Cinematography of the Ukrainian SSR)
TsDAMLMU	Tsentral'nyi derzhavnyi arkhiv-muzei literatury i mystetstva Ukrainy (Central State Archive-Museum of Literature and the Arts of Ukraine)
TsKKPU	Tsentral'nyi komitet Komunistychnoi partii Ukrainy (Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine)
VGIK	Vsesoiuznyi gosudarstvennyi institut kinematografii (All-Union State Institute of Cinematography)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION	2
ABSTRACT.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
NOTE ON TRANSLATION AND TRANSLITERATION.....	6
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	7
INTRODUCTION	10
Part One: Ukrainian Poetic Cinema: Framing the Subject.....	16
Part Two: Film, Ethnography and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode.....	34
Structure of the Thesis	57
CHAPTER ONE – Fiction, Film and Ethnography: The Making of <i>Tini zabutykh predkiv</i>	62
Ukrainian Culture in the 1950s and 1960s and the Dovzhenko Film Studio.....	63
Shades of <i>Shadows</i> in Paradzhanov’s Early Work	79
Making Shadows	88
Conclusion	124
CHAPTER TWO – Time and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode.....	126
Temporal Multiplicity	129
Temporality of the Recording	140
Performing One’s Past	152
Conclusion	160
CHAPTER THREE – Space and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode	164
Mapping Space: Establishing a Geographical Locale.....	166

Constructing Space: Inside, Outside and In-between Spaces	171
Shaping Space: Camera Angle, Focus and Depth of Field in Outside Spaces	177
Colouring Space: Engaging the Viewer in the Creation of Filmic Spaces	182
Clothing Space: Materials, Textures and Memory	189
‘Seeing is believing, but feeling is the truth’	195
Conclusion	203
CHAPTER FOUR – Sound and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode.....	204
Part One: Layers of Sounds in <i>Tini zabutykh predkiv</i>	208
Part Two: Acousmatic Sounds in <i>Tini zabutykh predkiv</i>	235
Conclusion	248
CHAPTER FIVE – Casting Shadows: The Poetic School and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode.....	250
Going Round in Circles to Identify the School.....	254
<i>Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh</i>	258
<i>Kaminnyi khrest</i>	274
<i>Bili khmary</i>	293
Conclusion	303
CONCLUSION.....	306
FILMOGRAPHY.....	320
BIBLIOGRAPHY	324

INTRODUCTION

On 4 September 1965, the audience at the Ukraina cinema in Kyiv bore witness to two extraordinary dramatic performances, pivotal to understanding (and shaping) the cultural context of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic at the time. This was the official premiere of Sergei Paradzhanov's *Tini zabutykh predkiv* (Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors), a film which not only marked a significant departure from Paradzhanov's earlier work, but which also went some way towards restoring the reputation of the Dovzhenko Film Studio in Kyiv, where the film was produced, and which spurred a style of filmmaking there which has since become known as the school of Ukrainian poetic cinema. During the course of 1963 and 1964, Paradzhanov had filmed *Tini zabutykh predkiv* in the villages of Verkhovyna and Kryvorivnia, in an area of the Carpathian Mountains known as Hutsul'shchyna; the customs and traditions of the Hutsul people who live there, and who took part in the film's making, form the basis of its narrative. The film was completed in September 1964 but received its official premiere in Kyiv one year later, a delay which was caused by the director's steadfast refusal to dub the Hutsul dialect of the Ukrainian language into Russian for the film's release onto Soviet screens.¹ Speaking at the film's official premiere, Paradzhanov referred to his struggle to maintain the original soundtrack, following which the writer Ivan Dziuba took the microphone. Dziuba began by offering some words of praise for the film, but quickly took advantage of the situation in order to inform the audience of a recent spate of arrests amongst the Ukrainian

¹ TsDAMLUMU, f. 655, op. 1, d. 309, l. 244.

intelligentsia. Dziuba was removed from the stage, but his protest was supported by the poet Vasyl' Stus and the political activist V'iacheslav Chornovil, who called out: 'Khto proty tyranii – vstan'te!' (All those against the tyranny stand up!).² Although the authorities soon arrived to break up the impromptu meeting which ensued, the link between Paradzhanov's film – and later, the poetic school more generally – and the cultural politics of Ukrainian nationalism had been established.

This link has proved persistent, and has shaped the way in which the films have been perceived. The critical studies which have appeared hitherto have focused on how Ukrainian national identity is represented in the films, with two characteristics of the school being frequently highlighted: a tendency for the films to be set in the past; and an attention to detail in the portrayal of the local way of life, which has led to the frequent use of the word 'ethnographic' when describing the films. The combination of these two characteristics has led to the argument that the films are not relevant to contemporary life, are concerned with dead traditions, and revert to an 'archaic' mode of cinematic representation. This critical approach stems from an article by Mikhail Bleiman which was published in *Iskusstvo kino* in 1970, but which continues to be echoed in more recent assessments, for example Bohdan Nebesio's article for the *Canadian Slavonic Papers* in 2000.³ Characterizing the

² Cited in Ol'ha Stroievus, 'Vasyl' Stus u shistdesiatnyts'komu rusi', *Ukraina – Ievropa – Svit: Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*, 2 (2009), 223–29 (p. 225) <http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/Ues/2008_2009/Articles/2/Stroievus.pdf> [accessed 28 July 2012].

³ Mikhail Bleiman, 'Arkhaisty ili novatory?', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1970.7, 55–76; and Bohdan Nebesio, 'Questionable Foundations for a National Cinema: Ukrainian Poetic Cinema of the 1960s', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 42 (2000), 35–46.

school as ‘a period of interesting experiments and memorable moments’, Nebesio nevertheless finds that it has little to offer today’s viewer.⁴

The poetic school continues to occupy a prominent position in representations of the Ukrainian film industry, however, and it displays a certain level of popularity. The website of the Ukrainian Mission to the EU, for example, makes considerable mention of the poetic school in its introduction to Ukrainian film.⁵ In 2009, a poll on the website of *Kul'turnyi L'viv* found that thirty-five per cent of respondents named *Tini zabutykh predkiv* as their favourite Ukrainian film, with only ten per cent choosing the more recent, and arguably more ‘relevant’ to contemporary life, *Pomerancheve nebo* (Orange Sky), a film released in 2006 and directed by Oleksandr Kyrylenko.⁶ A more representative survey of over two thousand individuals across all regions of Ukraine was conducted towards the end of 2011. This poll found that twenty-three per cent of respondents considered *Tini zabutykh predkiv* to be the most successful Ukrainian film of all time.⁷

The main contributions of this thesis are to move beyond previous analyses of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and the poetic school, and to introduce the concept of the ‘Experiential Ethnographic Mode’. It offers a more rigorous consideration of the applicability of the term ‘ethnographic’ to what are, after all, fiction films. Behind the term ethnography lies an understanding of certain methodological approaches, including, fundamentally, a period of research in the field, during which the

⁴ Ibid., p. 46.

⁵ See <<http://www.ukraine-eu.mfa.gov.ua/eu/en/publication/content/303.htm>> [accessed 2 July 2012].

⁶ See <<http://infolviv.net/kino/novyny-kino/233-ukrajinske-kino-buty-chy-ne-buty.html>> [accessed 2 July 2012].

⁷ This was the fourth highest rating. See <<http://tsn.ua/kultura/ukrayinci-vvazhayut-naykraschim-vitchiznyanim-filmom-u-biy-idut-odni-stariki.html>> [accessed on 2 July 2012].

ethnographer lives amongst the group in question in order to yield a deeper understanding from *being there* and participating. This experience in the field is an integral part of the ethnographic process which underpins the resultant work – the ethnographic film. One way in which the term ethnography can be instructive with regard to fiction film, therefore, is to account for cases where the filmic product is informed by a particular approach to the filmmaking process. The Experiential Ethnographic Mode is offered in this thesis as a means of considering such fiction film, of which the Ukrainian poetic school, it is argued, is an example. Here, the word ‘experiential’ refers to the ways in which the audio-visual elements of cinema are employed to stimulate a multi-sensorial perception – to encourage within the viewer a sense of the experience of being there; and the word ‘ethnographic’ signifies the inter-relationship between the filmmaking process and the filmic product, one which is informed by a particular methodological approach, and which involves time spent on location, living amongst the filmic subjects.

This thesis shows how the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is a defining characteristic of the poetic school. In the chapters which follow, the mode is elaborated in detail, according to its three basic components (time, space, and sound), which are fundamental to the experience of *being there* and, of course, to cinema itself. It can here be summarized as a particular treatment of time, space, and sound which establishes a relationship between the filmic subjects, the story that is performed, and the place of its performance; which asserts the coexistence in time and space of filmmakers and filmic subjects; and which seeks to evoke in the viewer

the experience of *being there* herself.⁸ The concept is elaborated initially with reference to a single film – *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the film which initiated the poetic school and which lies at its heart. This concentrated focus provides an even basis upon which to first establish the three components of the mode. Moreover, much like Paradzhanov had to immerse himself in Hutsul'shchyna in order to create *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the approach adopted in this thesis provides the necessary depth in order to apprehend fully the nature of this style of filmmaking. Only with this achieved, is it then possible to turn to the subsequent films of the poetic school.

In Chapter Five, it is shown how the identification of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode generates fresh insights into this body of work. In highlighting the treatment of space within the films, the mode demonstrates how these works, which are often discussed within the concept of 'nation', take a more localized view and are concerned with the specificities of a particular place. The sonic dimension of the mode counters the ocularcentrism of previous analyses of the school which, in their focus on visual imagery, have overlooked the importance of sound in these films. It is in augmenting our understanding of the films' treatment of time, however, that the mode proves most illuminating. By definition, the mode highlights the interaction between filmmakers and filmic subjects, and thus the filmmaking present. Yet the films of the school are wholly, or partly, set in the past. The Experiential Ethnographic Mode enables the films to portray the past as something that is being performed in the (filmmaking) present. The activation of the past within the present

⁸ Despite relying on a methodology which insists on the coexistence in time and space of the anthropologist and subject, historically the account of that fieldwork has not always foregrounded this, a denial which Johannes Fabian has termed 'allochronism'. See Johannes Fabian, *Of Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object* (New York: Colombia University Press, 1983).

is, of course, an act of memory, and so the films subvert the notion of lost traditions and forgotten ancestors with which they are ostensibly concerned. Rather than seeing the films as oriented towards the past, this thesis demonstrates how they are anchored in the present and assert the continued remembrance of traditions. The films and, by implication, the filmmakers are primarily occupied with the issue of memory and the ways in which knowledge of the past is transmitted to the present. To some extent, this reading of the films helps to account for their continued resonance for today's viewer in independent Ukraine, where similar questions prevail in relation to the legacies of the past.

Although the films of the school tackle different issues, they are united in their concern with the dramatic and traumatic events of the recent past, events which affected the relationship between the people and the land on which they live. These events happened before or shortly after the filmmakers' birth; the films act as testimony to the ways in which echoes of the past continue to resonate within the present. In this respect, Marianne Hirsch's notion of 'postmemory' proves enlightening.⁹ Postmemory, as will be discussed in greater detail below, describes the way in which traumatic events are experienced by the second generation, and provides an overarching framework within which the films will be approached.

Divided into two parts, this introductory chapter will develop a theoretical model for the analysis of the poetic school. The first part introduces the school and the varied receptions which the films have received. The second part sets out the theoretical framework which informs this analysis of the films. In this latter part, a consideration of the term 'ethnography' within the field of visual anthropology is

⁹ Marianne Hirsch, 'The Generation of Postmemory', *Poetics Today*, 29 (2008), 103–28.

provided, from which the concept of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is developed. It is then shown how and why Hirsch's concept of postmemory, which undergirds the thesis, can explain the significance of the new interpretation of the films which the mode enables. Finally, the overall structure of the thesis is outlined.

Part One: Ukrainian Poetic Cinema: Framing the Subject

The school of Ukrainian poetic cinema consists of a body of work produced at the Dovzhenko Film Studio in Kyiv, principally during the 1960s. This was the era of the *shestidesiatniki / shistdesiatnyky* (generation of the sixties), a term used to describe those born after the Revolution and Civil War who grew up under Stalinism and came to prominence in the 1960s during and in the wake of the cultural 'Thaw' associated with the rule of Nikita Khrushchev. Broadly speaking, the filmmakers of the poetic school belong to this generation of *shistdesiatnyky*.¹⁰ The films reflect their concerns with disruptions in the flow of traditions and memory between generations. Often based on literary works, the films are wholly or partly set in the past. They are characterized by a blend of fiction and non-fiction; the use of local, non-professional actors and experimental soundtracks; and a concern with the issue of cultural heritage and the relationship between people and the land. The term 'poetic school' intentionally invokes the filmmaking style of Oleksandr Dovzhenko, with whose works the films of the school clearly enter into dialogue. Undeniably, the relationship between cinema and poetry has a far greater history, yet in the Soviet and Ukrainian

¹⁰ Most of the filmmakers (directors, screenplay writers and camera operators) were born between 1936 and 1941. Paradzhanov belongs to a slightly older generation, having been born in 1924. On the concept of generations and the difficulties of defining them, see Susan Rubin Suleiman, 'The 1.5 Generation: Thinking About Child Survivors and the Holocaust', *American Imago*, 59.3 (2002), 277–95.

context it was particularly associated with Dovzhenko.¹¹ Dovzhenko's poetry lay in his particular blend of documentary realism and highly expressive lyricism, along with an interest in folkloric motifs. These characteristics are particularly evident in his so-called 'Ukrainian trilogy', *Zvenyhora* (1927), *Arsenal* (1928), and *Zemlia* (Earth, 1930), which form a conscious point of reference for the later poetic school. An intertextual relationship can be discerned in particular between the works of the school and *Zemlia*, which was itself produced at the Kyiv studio. As we shall see, given the school's interest in the relationship between the people and the land on which they live, this connection is quite logical.

The term 'Ukrainian school of poetic cinema' was first used in an article by the Polish film critic Janusz Gazda in 1970.¹² Commenting upon a creative surge at the Dovzhenko Studio in the wake of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Gazda drew attention to the following films which, he suggests, constitute a school of work: *Tini zabutykh predkiv*; Leonid Osyka's *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more* (She, Who Enters the Sea, 1966), *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'* (Love Awaits He, Who Returns, 1967), and *Kaminnyi khrest* (The Stone Cross, 1968); *Vechir na Ivana Kupala* (On the Eve of Ivan Kupala, 1968, directed by Iurii Illienko); and *Sovist'* (Conscience, 1968, directed by Volodymyr Denysenko). He also mentions *Bili khmary* (White Clouds, 1968, directed by Rolan Serhiienko); *Zlodii* (The Thief, 1969), a six-minute graduation piece by Roman Balaian; and *Den' iak den'* (it is not known to which film this refers). In many

¹¹ For more on the use of the term 'poetic' in relation to Dovzhenko's works see: Joshua First, 'Ukrainian National Cinema and the Concept of the "Poetic"', *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 9 (2009), <<http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/first.shtml>> [accessed 15 July 2012].

¹² Janusz Gazda, 'Ukrains'ka shkola poetychnoho kino' [1970], in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Larysa Briukhovets'ka (Kyiv: ArtEk, 2001), pp. 184–86.

respects, the identification of an artistic school or movement is something that can only be achieved in retrospect. This is especially true of the Ukrainian poetic school, of which many of the films – assuming production had not already been halted by this stage – were banned from release upon completion or received a limited distribution. Gazda's list, for example, does not include Illienko's *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* (A Well for the Thirsty), which remained shelved until 1987, despite having been made some twenty-two years earlier. A more recent filmography has been provided by Larysa Briukhovets'ka in her 2002 edited volume *Poetychne kino: Zaboronena shkola*, which collated a number of key works about the school, and which marked a definitive step in its analysis.¹³ Briukhovets'ka's filmography of the school lists the following fourteen films (these, one assumes, are to be taken as her demarcation of its boundaries): *Tini zabutykh predkiv*; *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*; *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more*; *Khto povernut'sia – doliubyt'*; *Sovist'*; *Kaminnyi khrest*; *Vechir na Ivana Kupala*; *Idu do tebe* (I Come to You, 1971, directed by Mykola Mashchenko); *Bilyi ptakh z chornoju oznakoiu* (The White Bird with the Black Spot, 1971, directed by Illienko); *Zakhar Berkut* (1971, directed by Osyka); *Vsuperech us'omu* (In Spite of Everything, 1972, directed by Illienko); *Vidkryi sebe* (Open Yourself, 1973, directed by Rolan Serhienko); *Propala hramota* (The Lost Letter, 1973, directed by Borys Ivchenko); and *Vavylon XX* (Babylon XX, 1979, directed by Ivan Mykolaichuk).¹⁴ This is a welcome step in analysing the school because, naturally, in order to understand the phenomenon its parameters have to be agreed upon. Definitions remain indistinct, however, and there is no clear rationale for the inclusion of these

¹³ *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka.

¹⁴ Larysa Briukhovets'ka, 'Fil'mohrafiia', in *ibid.*, pp.459–61.

fourteen films, or the absence of other works, for example *Bili khmary*. Indeed, in a subsequent article for the journal *Kino-Teatr*, Briukhovets'ka lists a slightly different fourteen films as falling within the scope of the poetic school.¹⁵ Despite this lack of clarity over what constitutes the school as a whole, one thing upon which most (if not all) critics would agree is that *Tini zabutykh predkiv* lies at its heart. Briukhovets'ka, for example, finds that *Tini zabutykh predkiv* 'established the aesthetic principles of Ukrainian poetic cinema' (sformuvav estetychni zasady ukrains'koho poetychnoho kino); and Sviatoslav Ivanov, former head of Derzhkino, calls the film a 'virus-stimulus' (*virus-zbudnyk*) for other directors, such as Illienko and Osyka.¹⁶ This thesis therefore takes *Tini zabutykh predkiv* as its central focus, and Chapters One to Four provide a close analysis of the film. The insights yielded by this detailed examination of the film and its usage of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode provide the necessary foundation from which to build an understanding of the school that emerged in the wake of this film. Chapter Five sets out the defining characteristics of the school and proposes that it be conceived of as a series of concentric circles, with *Tini zabutykh predkiv* located at its middle. Situated closest to this central point are the films *Kaminnyi khrest* and *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*. Together, these three films constitute the core of the poetic school, around which is located another cluster of films that share a number of their aesthetic and thematic concerns, and that are

¹⁵ Briukhovets'ka substitutes *Komisary* (The Commissars, 1970, directed by Mykola Mashchenko) for the previously listed *Khto povernets'ia – doliubyt'*. See Larysa Briukhovets'ka, 'Proryv do vichnoho', *Kino-Teatr*, 2008.5, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=814> [accessed 13 August 2012].

¹⁶ Larysa Briukhovets'ka, *Ivan Mykolaichuk* (Kyiv: Atlant UMC, 2007), p. 20; Sviatoslav Ivanov, 'Ukrains'kyi khudozhnii fil'm 60-kh rokiv', in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 229–43 (p. 229).

themselves encircled by a further periphery of works which more loosely display those characteristics.

Having positioned *Tini zabutykh predkiv* at the heart of the poetic school, it is appropriate that one of the first critiques of this film – Dziuba’s ‘Den’ poiska’, published in *Iskusstvo kino* in May 1965 – draws attention to many of the key elements that will come to define the school as a whole in later criticism.¹⁷ Dziuba notes that the key to the film’s poetics lies in contrast:

Tut i postoianno “igraiushchii” kontrast mezhdru mnogoobraznoi liudskoi suetoi i velikolepiem bezmolvnykh peizazhei, izvechnoi dumoi gor; i kontrasty kinoritmov, i kontrasty koloristicheskie, i zvukovye, i, nakonets, slozhnye emotsional’no-smyslovye kontrasty, vznikaiushchie iz nalozheniia dvukh razlichnykh planov kinodeistva.¹⁸

It is this last insight, however, – the identification of two filmic planes – which is particularly instructive and which will come to be a defining feature of the school. This thesis will argue that the two filmic planes in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* are the narrative plane and the plane of the filmmaking process. In the case of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the first plane, in which the narrative takes place, is located in the past, whilst the second plane – that of the filmmaking process – provokes an awareness of the (filmmaking) present. Chapters One to Four will examine the nature of the filmmaking process and how it is manifested in the film. The role of the landscape, the importance of which is noted by Dziuba, is crucial here. Equally vital, however, is the use of local, non-professional actors filmed in their own environment. The layering of these two planes is expressed at times through the co-existence of a lyrical style of filmmaking with documentary-style tropes, a technique which has clear

¹⁷ Ivan Dziuba, ‘Den’ poiska’, *Iskusstvo kino*, 1965.5, 73–82.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

parallels with the films of Italian neorealists, for example Luchino Visconti's *La terra trema* (The Earth Quakes, 1948) and the earlier work of filmmaker Robert Flaherty, for example *Man of Aran* (1934). However, this is distinguished in the Ukrainian school by its usage when dealing with events set in the past, which gives the impression of the re-appropriation and remembrance of a cultural heritage by its inheritors.

The tendency for the films to be set in the past is fundamental to their aesthetic. It is also a feature for which they have consistently been criticized. In an article for *Novyny kinoekrana* in 1968, for example, Mykola Bazhan made the following remark in his discussion of *Kaminnyi khrest*, *Vechir na Ivana Kupala* and Artur Voitets'kyi's *Z nud'hy* (From Boredom, 1968):

Zvychaino, tvorcha smilyvist' osmyslenist' interpretatsii, hlybyna ideinoi pozytsii interpretatora vyavliaiut'sia i v roboti nad materialamy mynuloho, nad tvoramy, shcho staly vzhe tsinnostiamy klasychnymy. Prote osoblyvo vyavliaiet'sia taka smilyvist', hlybyna, pochuttia novators'ke v roboti nad materialom suchasnym, osiaianym prominniam maibutn'oho. Same tut – holovni trasy poshukiv. Tut – novyzna i nepovtornist' tem.¹⁹

This perceived orientation towards the past was subsequently picked up by Bleiman and, according to his argument, is symptomatic of the school's questionable poetics. At the heart of Bleiman's thesis lies what he believes to be a concentration on the visual element within the films. Such attention to detail in the composition of every

¹⁹ 'Of course, creative daring, the thinking-through of the interpretation and the depth of the interpreter's conceptual position can also be revealed when working on materials of the past, on works which have already entered the classical canon. However, such daring, depth and innovative feeling are particularly apparent when working on contemporary material, illuminated by the light rays of the future. It is along these paths that you need to be searching. Here is novelty and thematic originality.' See Mykola Bazhan, 'Try fil'my Dovzhenkivtsiv' [1968], in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 95–102 (p. 102). Bazhan (1904–1983) was a poet and writer, and a contemporary of Dovzhenko, with whom he became acquainted whilst working at VUFKU as the editor of the journal *Kino*.

shot means that, whilst admittedly beautiful to behold, the resulting work has more in common with painting than cinema. Consequently, he maintains, it is impossible for the filmmakers in question to develop the psychological depth of their characters or deal with the complexities of contemporary life. As a result, the filmmakers are forced to restrict their choice of subject matter to the past, for which it is possible to communicate solely by means of symbols and imagery. In his view, this gives rise to a tendency to allegorize and leads Bleiman to the conclusion that the school deals only in parables.

It should be noted that whilst Bleiman uses the word ‘school’ (always in inverted commas), at no time does he give the prefix ‘Ukrainian’; this is undoubtedly because he includes within the scope of his analysis works produced by the Georgian and Armenian studios (Tengiz Abuladze’s *Mol’ba* (The Plea), released in 1968 by Gruziiia-fil’m, and Paradzhanov’s *Sayat Nova*, produced at Virmenfil’m in 1968, but re-edited by Sergei Iutkevich and released under the title of *Tsvet granata* (The Colour of Pomegranates)).²⁰ Certainly, against the background of the emergence of a ‘neo-nationalist’ tendency within the Soviet Union generally during the 1960s, parallels can be drawn with other republican studios. Our definition of the poetic school is restricted to the films produced at the Dovzhenko Studio, however, and Bleiman’s own analysis highlights why this is in fact appropriate. With regard to *Mol’ba*, for example, he notes:

²⁰ The other works which Bleiman discusses (*Tini zabutykh predkiv*, *Vechir na Ivana Kupala*, and *Kaminnyi khrest*) were all produced by the Dovzhenko Studio. In addition, he refers to *Zaivyi khlib* (1967) directed by Viktor Hoviada at the Dovzhenko Studio, and *Arena* (1967), directed by Samson Samsonov at Mosfil’m. However, he finds both these films unsuccessful in their attempts to emulate the style of filmmaking he identifies as characteristic of the other films.

Obstanovka, material'naia sreda, ne v primer fil'mam S. Paradzhanov, L. Osyki, Iu. Il'enko, lishena etnograficheskoi pestroty, ne individualizirovana. V sootvetstvii s zamyslom ona predel'no, ia by skazal, bibleiski surova i prosta. Ona prizvana ne stol'ko okarakterizovat' konkretnost' vremeni, konkretnost' deistviia, skol'ko vechnuiu i abstraktnuiu ikh povtoriaemost'.²¹

With this comment, Bleiman identifies a particular treatment of landscape, evident in the works of Paradzhanov, Osyka and Illienko, but missing in *Mol'ba*, which it will be argued is key to developing a deeper understanding of the poetic school. It is precisely their focus on a specific time and place which distinguishes the films from the Dovzhenko Studio – as Bleiman here acknowledges. A deeper consideration of what Bleiman labels their ‘ethnographic’ traits, and the implications therein of such a term, will generate fresh insights into how these films, far from reverting to ‘archaisms’, can be viewed as offering an innovative response to the issue of cinematic representation, one which draws on experimental filmmaking of the 1920s, yet remains equally engaged with broader trends in European cinema in the 1960s.

Bleiman explains that the painterly technique displayed in the films reaches its peak in *Tsvet granata*.²² Here he has in mind the prevalence of static shots within the film, which creates the impression of a series of frescoes, and is a style which Paradzhanov began to experiment with fully in *Kyivs'ki fresky* (Kyiv Frescoes, 1966). Bleiman notes: ‘To, chto v fil'makh drugikh masterov “shkoly” tol'ko ugadyvaetsia, tol'ko predpolagaetsia, dovedeno zdes' do predela.’²³ He thus positions *Tsvet granata* at the pinnacle of the school’s aesthetic trajectory, which helps explain the deficiencies in his analysis of the three films from the Dovzhenko Studio which fall

²¹ Bleiman, ‘Arkhaisty ili novatory?’, p. 63. The reference to Paradzhanov’s work relates to *Tini zabutykh predkiv*; Bleiman has not yet turned to his consideration of *Tsvet granata*.

²² Ibid., p. 64.

²³ Ibid., pp. 65–66.

under our definition of the school. Whereas there are some clear similarities between *Tsvet granata* and these films – the use of colour and texture, for example, to generate a ‘haptic visuality’, which will be examined in further detail in Chapter Three – by the time Paradzhanov came to make *Tsvet granata* he had moved away from the poetic school and was developing his own, personal style of filmmaking.²⁴ Returning to our conceptualization of the school as a series of concentric circles at the heart of which lies *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, we can see how Paradzhanov has spiralled away from its core, setting up a new centre of gravity around which *Tsvet granata* revolves. In establishing *Tsvet granata* as the goal towards which the school’s aesthetics are directed, Bleiman’s analysis is therefore de-centred, which explains why certain of his conclusions appear misguided. This is particularly evident in his discussion of movement within the films. Having characterized the school as ‘painterly’, for example, Bleiman argues that its proponents,

orientiruias’ na izobrazitel’noe iskusstvo, na spetsificheskie formy ego vyrazitel’nosti, vol’no ili nevol’no sozdaiut vmesto real’nogo dvizheniia freski i pribegaiut k sopostavleniiam otdel’nykh siuzhetnykh situatsii vmesto demonstratsii ikh dvizheniia.²⁵

Whilst it can perhaps be seen how Bleiman reaches this conclusion with regard to *Tsvet granata*, it is hardly an apt description for the dazzling movement found in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, or the less dramatic, but equally fluid, camerawork in *Kaminnyi khrest*.

The crux of Bleiman’s argument lies in his perception of the school as overly focused on the visual at the expense of other cinematic elements. However, it is

²⁴ See Laura U. Marks, *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000).

²⁵ Bleiman, ‘Arkhaisty ili novatory?’, p. 69.

arguably Bleiman who is guilty of overlooking these elements, in particular the use of sound, which receives little attention in his article. Indeed, it is solely the use of dialogue on which Bleiman focuses. He notes with reference to *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, for example, that:

Rech' okazalas' prizvannoi v luchshem sluchae podcherknut' ritmy "nemogo" deistviia, sozdat' ego zvukovuiu sredu. Kharakterno, chto v sootvetstvii s zamyslom rezhissury dialog ne byl pereveden, khotia i izobiloval dialektizmami, neponiatnymi inogda dazhe ukrainskomu zritel'iu. [...S]voeobychnye cherty poetiki etoi kartiny [...] v kontsentratsii osnovnogo vnimaniia na zrelishchnykh komponentakh kinematografa, v prenebrezhenii dialogom i voobshche rechevoi vyrazitel'nost'iu.²⁶

While Bleiman is undoubtedly correct to note that language helps create the aural environment, he does not extend this far enough to encompass the wealth of sounds which feature in the film. The viewer (or, more accurately, to use a term coined by the film sound theorist Michel Chion, the audio-viewer) is invited to experience the aural world of this mountain community and to hear the sounds of an axe, of fire, of water, and of local instruments, such as the *trembita* and the *floiara*, in addition to the linguistic register and tones of the Hutsul dialect.²⁷ In ignoring these sounds, Bleiman misses the fact that, in certain respects, as Chapter Four will demonstrate, the aural seems to dominate the visual. Although sound is therefore important, a restricted use of dialogue is indeed a characteristic of the school. Illienko's *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, for example, runs for some considerable time before the first words are spoken, after which the words which are spoken cannot be said to constitute 'dialogue' as such, since they neither follow from, nor lead to, another character's words in any logical fashion. The lack of dialogue provokes the viewer to seek

²⁶ Ibid., p. 56.

²⁷ Michel Chion, *Film, A Sound Art*, trans. by Claudia Gorbman (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), p. 468.

meaning in other ways, thus awakening the aural, visual, and tactile senses. It is perhaps with this in mind that subsequent analyses of the school, which to a greater and lesser extent take issue with Bleiman's article, have referred to a cinematic 'synthesis' in the films. Sviatoslav Ivanov, head of Derzhkino from 1963 to 1972, has noted the following:

Zorovyi obraz u "Tiniakh" vystupaie v iednosti zi zvukovym. Tochnishe – tse ne iednist' dvokh obraziv – zorovoho i zvukovoho, - a dva komponenty iedynoho syntetychnoho obrazu, zvukova hama u fil'mi, tak samo, iak i kol'orova, maie shchedre emotsiine zabarvlennia.²⁸

Dziuba also notes this synthesis when he characterizes the film as an assertion 'of the construction of a cinematic whole, in which colour, sound, movement, and composition all act on one another to give a meaningful unit of ciné-language' (pobudovy hlyboko vzaiemodiiuchoho kol'oro-zvuko-dynamiko-kompozytsiinoho kadrovoho kompleksu iak znachushchoi odyntsi kinomovy).²⁹ Ivanov helps build on Bleiman's analysis with regard to the scarcity of dialogue in the films. In relation to *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, he notes that:

Liuds'koiu movoiu fil'm ne bahatyi. Chastishe tse pisni, holosinnia, okremi repliky. Bezsumnivnoiu znakhidkoiu stala zakadrova hustul's'ka "hovirka" – svoieridnyi komentar podii, shcho nese v sobi iaskravo emotsiine i natsional'ne zabarvlennia.³⁰

This is paralleled in *Kaminnyi khrest*:

²⁸ 'The visual in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is presented in union with the aural. More precisely, it is not a union of these two – the visual and the aural – but two components of a single, synthetic whole: the aural range of the film, just as its spectrum of colour, has a rich, emotional hue.' Ivanov, 'Ukrains'kyi khudozhnii fil'm 60-kh rokiv', p. 234.

²⁹ Ivan Dziuba, 'Vidkryttia chy zakryttia "shkoly"?' [1989], in *Poetchne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 209–28 (p. 214).

³⁰ 'The film is not rich in human language. More often you find songs, ritual lamentations, isolated snatches of dialogue. An undoubted find was the off-scene Hutsul 'dialect' – a kind of commentary on the action, which carries within it an intensely emotional and national hue.' Ivanov, 'Ukrains'kyi khudozhnii fil'm 60-kh rokiv', p. 234.

Povil'no panoramuie kamera natovpom odnosel'tsiv, shcho zibralsia bilia khaty Didukhiv, vdyvliaiuchys' to v ti, to v inshi oblychchia, my chuiemo uryvky rozmov, komentari do podii, shcho skhyliuvala selo. Tut rozkryvaiut'sia kharaktery liudei, ikh vzaiemyny, v oposeredkovanomu vyhliadi postaie kartyna zhyttia sela.³¹

A kind of internal commentary can therefore be identified here, one conducted on-site by the residents of the location where the filming took place. A pattern begins to emerge in which the relationship between space and sound plays a central role in the films of the poetic school. This will be analysed in greater detail in the following chapters.

The sequence in *Kaminnyi khrest* which Ivanov highlights has also been noted by Dziuba, although not for its sound:

Osyka – maister zahal'noho planu i masovykh stsen: stsena proshchannia bilia khaty Ivana Didukha, iaka zaimaie dobru tretynu fil'mu i trymaie hliadacha v napruzi til'ky za rakhunok “ohliadu” natovpu i pryskiplyvoho vdyvliannia kamery v oblychchia – zrazok rezhysers'koho i operators'koho (V. Kvas) mystetstva.³²

As Dziuba notes, the camera looks into the faces of the filmic subjects, who, in turn, look straight back. The use of the returned gaze is quite common in the films of the poetic school and requires further consideration. It is linked to the documentary-style techniques employed at times within the films, and, of course, the decision to use non-professional actors. In *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, for example, one member of the

³¹ ‘The camera slowly pans the crowd of villagers who have gathered by the Didukh house, scanning first one, then a different group of faces, and we hear snatches of conversations, commentaries on the event which has agitated the village. Here people’s characters are disclosed, as well as their relationships, and through this intermediary a picture of the life of the village is conjured up.’ Ibid., pp. 237–38.

³² ‘Osyka is a master of the panoramic and mass scenes: the farewell scene by Ivan Didukh’s house, which takes up a good third of the film and keeps the viewer on the edge of his/her seat only on account of its “inspection” of the crowd and the camera’s probing gaze of faces, is an example of the art of the director and cameraman (V. Kvas).’ Dziuba, ‘Vidkryttia chy zakryttia “shkoly”?’’, p. 227.

local cast actually winks to the camera as he passes in front of it.³³ This has the effect of foregrounding the interaction between observer and observed, and by extension the filmmaking process. A more recent article by the critic Robert Lakatosh also notes this feature in relation to *Tini zabutykh predkiv*:

Liudy natomist' chasto hraiut' pered kameroiu, napryklad sopilkar, iakyi pochynaie hraty, koly zauvazhuie, shcho kamera nablyzhaiet'sia do n'oho, i perestaie, koly kamera ioho mynaie. Pershe fiksuвання, a tochnishe, pershyi zriz (plan, kontraplan) vyznachaie fabul'nu faktura fil'mu, prote u vypadku fiksuвання smerti Oleksy kamera, iaka na pochatku duzhe kinematografichno padala razom z derevom, pochynaie podovytys' niby dokumental'no, zaiavliaiuchy svoiu okremishnist', ne zihranist' z rukhom aktoriv. [...] Sproby italiis'koho neorealizmu, iaki inodi torkalysia selians'koho zhyttia, maly dokumental'nu osnovu, ale zoseredzhuvalysia na analizi suchasnoho suspil'noho zhyttia, a nove brazil's'ke kino, iake nadykhalosia narodnoiu mifolohiieiu, takozh ne pryinialo estetyky, iaka b vyplyvala z narodnoi tradytsii ta ikonhrafii.³⁴

Lakatosh is concerned with tracing the influence of local art forms, and particularly iconography, in Paradzhanov's filmmaking style. He suggests that the spontaneity of the camera's movement in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, for example, parallels the spontaneity and instinctiveness with which the Hutsuls themselves move.³⁵ This is useful in drawing attention to the ways in which the local area is manifested in the

³³ This occurs during the wedding scene between Ivan and Palahna, as the villagers depart to leave the couple alone.

³⁴ 'But the people often play up to the camera, for example the reed pipe player, who starts to play when he notices that the camera is coming towards him and stops when the camera passes him. The first shot, or more accurately, the first cut (shot, counter-shot) defines the narrative texture of the film. However, in shooting Oleksa's death, the camera, which at the beginning fell very cinematographically together with the tree, begins to behave in an almost documentary fashion, declaring its autonomy, its lack of harmony with the movement of the actors. [...] The experiments of Italian neorealism, which sometimes addressed village life, had a documentary basis, but concentrated on the analysis of contemporary society, while the new Brazilian cinema, which fed on folk mythology, similarly did not accept the type of aesthetic which sprang from folk traditions and iconography.' Robert Lakatosh, 'Tradytsiia i novatorstvo v strukturuvanni zobrazhennia u fil'makh Serhiia Paradzhanova' [1999], in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 33–43 (p. 38).

³⁵ Ibid.. Here Lakatosh refers in particular to the Hutsul style of dancing (see Chapter Two, n. 305).

fabric of the film itself, something which shall be analysed in Chapter Three. There, it will be revealed how *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, like the other films of the school, is saturated with a sense of the particular location in which it is set (in this case Hutsul'shchyna). Other films of the school focus on different, yet similarly regional-specific, areas. *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, for example, concerns Cherkashchyna in central Ukraine; and *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu* is set in Bukovyna, an area in the Carpathians encompassing parts of Chernivets'ka *oblast'* and northern Romania. Critical reception of the films, however, has tended to subsume this focus on the local with considerations of the national. This is particularly evident in the English-language criticism surrounding the school.

Relatively little has been written in English concerning these films, with *Tini zabutykh predkiv* receiving most of the attention, but the majority of this work has focused largely on representations of national identity.³⁶ Indeed, this is typical of the analysis concerning the republican studios as a whole, itself a largely neglected area of research, as Woll has identified.³⁷ In her own analysis of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Woll highlights the attention to detail in the representation of Hutsul culture, one which springs from Paradzhanov's collaboration with the local residents. In her view, this meant that the film:

³⁶ A notable exception to this focus on *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is the recent article by Vitaly Chernetsky on *Kaminnyi khrest*, in which he highlights the use of non-actor, local residents in the making of this adaptation, which was filmed on location in Stefanyk's native village in which the story is set. See Vitaly Chernetsky, 'Visual language and identity performance in Leonid Osyka's *A Stone Cross: The roots and the uprooting*', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 2 (2008), 269–80.

³⁷ Josephine Woll, *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2000), p. xiv.

lacks the ‘masquerade effect’ of a costume drama, picturesque routines played out on sweetly sentimentalized farms. Despite its patently historical setting, it looks and feels timeless.³⁸

Although she points to an interesting feature in the film’s treatment of time, she is unable to expand on this within the context of her broader survey of ‘Thaw’ cinema, and her concluding remarks revert back to the nationality question:

Shadows powerfully influenced film-makers outside Moscow. Its mixture of lyricism, highly individual directorial vision and scrupulous attention to the physical particularity of a milieu and a community became prototypical for ‘national’ cinema, especially Ukrainian cinema, in 1966 and 1967.³⁹

Clearly, the issue of national identity is one with which the republican studios were concerned and, following independence in 1991, the role of cinema in the nation-building project has been hotly debated in Ukraine. According to Nebesio, it was the poetic school of the 1960s which shaped Ukrainian cinema in the first decade of independence. He attributes this to the central role played by key figures from the school in prescribing the cultural model for the new, independent state, and contends that this put Ukrainian cinema in a ‘retrospective mode’ which has hampered its further development.⁴⁰ Although he is alert to the aesthetic achievements of the school, he lays two charges at its door. Firstly, he argues that the films

reinforced official stereotypes about Ukrainians promoted by the Russian Empire and its successor – the Soviet Union. The image of rural, backward, superstitious folks speaking a “useless dialect” has always been juxtaposed with an image of modern, urbanized and successful Russian-speakers.⁴¹

³⁸ Ibid., p. 186.

³⁹ Ibid..

⁴⁰ Nebesio, ‘Questionable Foundations’, p. 35.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 40.

Secondly, he notes that ‘few films dealt with Ukraine’s present and most of them were set in the past’.⁴² Furthermore, in his view both charges – the focus on village life and the historical past – can be seen as ‘a result of the poetic cinema’s reliance on literature as a source of inspiration and as a quick and safe way of getting around censorship’.⁴³ Whilst Nebesio’s analysis moves little beyond the position articulated by Bleiman in the early 1970s, it is interesting to note his observations with regard to the continued association of the poetic school with the politics of nationhood. Although the films have been exploited by those engaged in such debates, however, it does not necessarily follow that their analysis should be restricted to the theme of nation. Indeed, viewing the films as attempts to define what is, or is not, Ukrainian is potentially limiting.

A recent and welcome addition to the English-language material on the school is provided by Joshua First. Although he, too, concentrates on nationality and its visual representation in the films, his work provides a comprehensive account of the system within which the Dovzhenko Studio was operating, and is an invaluable contribution to a deeper understanding of the school. His research has unearthed a great deal of material on the debates surrounding the making of these films and how they related to Soviet nationalities policies, and he identifies two separate modes of representing the nation: the ‘folkloric’ mode of high Stalinism and the ‘ethnographic’ mode of the 1960s. The difference he explains as follows:

Formally, the ethnographic mode brought visual “excess” to the foreground of the narrative space. Whereas the folkloric revealed a familiar knowledge of the ethnic subject, [...] the 1960s ethnographic film relished in [*sic*] the spectacle of ethnic difference. In this shift, the principle [*sic*] variable is in

⁴² Ibid., p. 41.

⁴³ Ibid..

how filmmakers conceptualized space, in terms of the relationship between the national and the natural. [... T]he ethnographic positioning of the spectator in the 1960s is simultaneously other and self.⁴⁴

First is correct to highlight the importance of space in the films of the 1960s. Given that his interest lies in the visual representation of the nation, however, he is not concerned with the other elements of the cinematic and their relationship to space, and suggests an assumption of a particular space as a national space. The films are more specifically concerned with the relationship between landscape and the peoples that inhabit that landscape – their sounds, history, and way of life – above and beyond any notion of nation. In highlighting the fluidity between Self and Other, he broaches issues central to the field of anthropology, with regard to which a more rigorous analysis of the ethnographic terminology he deploys could yield greater insights. First is not alone in using this term to describe the school, however. Dziuba provides a classic example of such usage in the following passage:

*U Tiniakh zabutykh predkiv, iak, mabut', u zhodnomu tvori radians'koi kinematohrafiï dosi, shyroko i shedro vykorystani etnohrafichni, fol'klorni motyvy i material, ale vony tsilkom pidporiadkovani zavdanniu osmyslennia zhyttia narodu i rozkryttia doli heroiv [...] protystoiat' fil'mam ekzotychnym, fil'mam, u iakykh etnohrafichni fol'klorni elementy abo navmysne "vyokremeni" abo prosto vidihraiuť dekoratyvnu i vydovyshchnu rol'.*⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Joshua First, 'Scenes of Belonging: Cinema and the Nationality Question in Soviet Ukraine During the Long 1960s' (doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 2008), <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/61707/1/jfirst_1.pdf> [accessed 25 January 2012], p. 65.

⁴⁵ 'In *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, as, perhaps, in no other work of Soviet cinema to the present day, there is an extensive and rich use of ethnographic and folkloric motifs and material, but these are completely subordinated to the task of understanding the life of the people and showing the fate of the main characters....[and] stand in opposition to exotic films, films in which ethnographic and folkloric elements are either intentionally "highlighted" or are simply there for decoration and spectacle.' Dziuba, 'Vidkryttia chy zakryttia "shkoly"?', p. 213.

Both Dziuba and First use the term ‘ethnographic’ to describe *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and to distinguish it from other Soviet films, yet a full consideration of the implications of this term, of how this difference is achieved and what it means cinematically, is lacking.

Whereas the focus of First’s research is national identity and how this is manifested in the films of the Dovzhenko Studio in the 1960s, this thesis takes the poetic school as its focus and is therefore not limited to concepts of ‘nation’. First’s conclusions suggest that this is an appropriate development in extending our understanding of the school:

[T]he 1960s appear as a period during which cultural producers had less certainty about what it meant to be Ukrainian in the first place. [...] Thus, this generation of Ukrainian filmmakers and writers who worked at the Dovzhenko Studio were more interested in personal expression than national independence for Ukraine, even if their cultural interests brought them into contact with dissident nationalists.⁴⁶

This research therefore aims to fill a number of gaps in the existing body of knowledge surrounding the poetic school. Primary amongst these is a more rigorous understanding of what is meant by the oft-noted ‘ethnographic’ nature of these films, one not necessarily confined to a concept of national identity. Furthermore, whilst some critics have argued that the films are overly concerned with the visual, others have found in them a unique synthesis of cinematic devices; thus a more detailed examination of how these films function cinematically – particularly in their use of sound – is required. With the task thus outlined, the following section will examine the theoretical debates within the field of anthropology on the relationship between

⁴⁶ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, pp. 316–17.

film and ethnography in order to develop the methodological apparatus necessary to conduct the subsequent analysis.

Part Two: Film, Ethnography and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode

Bleiman, Dziuba and First are not alone in employing the word ‘ethnographic’ in discussing *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and/or the poetic school. The application of the term ‘ethnographic’ to Paradzhanov’s film *Tini zabutykh predkiv* can be traced at least as far back as October 1962, when the studio’s artistic council noted in their assessment of the screenplay the ‘director’s love for Hutsul ethnography’ (zakokhanist['] rezhysera v Hutsul's'ku etnohrafiiu).⁴⁷ The term subsequently featured in numerous assessments by the studio’s editorial board of the footage that had been filmed so far.⁴⁸ In such cases, however, adequate consideration is not given to what is meant by the application of this term. The disciplinary home of ethnography is anthropology, yet the word has come to feature in a wide range of discourses. As anthropologist Jay Ruby points out: ‘There is a general tendency to be overly generous in the use of the term *ethnographic* – an error common to anthropologists, film scholars, and indeed, many people in a host of situations.’⁴⁹ With regard to the application of this word to cinema, Ruby continues by explaining that, ‘[i]n keeping with a general tendency to misappropriate, the term *ethnographic* is often used to describe any “serious” film about an exotic Other’.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1581, l. 55.

⁴⁸ See, for example, *ibid.*, ll. 7, 29, 33.

⁴⁹ Jay Ruby, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 27.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*.

Without any qualification to the contrary, it is difficult not to be persuaded that previous uses of the term ‘ethnographic’ in relation to *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and/or the poetic school fall into this category. Indeed, First explains his ‘ethnographic mode’ as a mechanism by means of which ‘principles of national identification were linked to an *exoticized image of essential differences*’ (my emphasis).⁵¹ Historically, as Ruby acknowledges, anthropological ethnographies were concerned with an exotic (that is to say, non-Western) ‘other’, yet it does not follow that this is what defines an ethnography.⁵² To use the term ‘ethnographic’ in this way, then, is limiting; it does not take advantage of other, more sophisticated ways in which this term can offer insights into the films of the poetic school. These are films in which the process of their production – involving an extensive period of time on location and, crucially, collaboration with locals – forms an intrinsic part of the work itself. It is in this respect that the term ‘ethnographic’ sheds light on our analysis.

It is important to outline what is here understood by the term ‘ethnography’. Ethnography describes both a product and a process. As a product, it may take written or recorded or filmic form, and is the result of a particular process – a particular research methodology.⁵³ This methodological approach is fundamental to the production of an ethnography. In this respect, ethnography is perhaps most easily defined in terms of what ethnographers do. Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson, for example, explain that:

⁵¹ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, p. 38.

⁵² Ruby, *Picturing Culture*, p. 27.

⁵³ Anthropologists have also sought to communicate ethnography through other media, such as in the sound ethnographies of Stephen Feld, which will be discussed further in Chapter Four, or through performance ethnography. For more on the latter, see Norman K. Denzin, *Performance Ethnography: Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003).

ethnography usually involves the researcher participating, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal and formal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts – in fact, gathering whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the emerging focus of inquiry.⁵⁴

Karen O'Reilly expands on this definition by explaining that ethnography,

(in its minimal definition) is iterative-inductive research (that evolves in design through the study), drawing on a family of methods, involving direct and sustained contact with human agents, within the context of their daily lives (and cultures), watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions, and producing a richly written account that respects the irreducibility of human experience, that acknowledges the role of theory, as well as the researcher's own role, and that views humans as part object/part subject.⁵⁵

In both these definitions, we can see that the method of participant observation is central to the practice of ethnography. Participant observation, a method which can be traced to the anthropologist Bronisław Malinowski, elucidates one of the historically distinguishing features of ethnography – that it is a research practice in which the researcher is an outsider to the community which he or she investigates.⁵⁶ The idea of taking part whilst simultaneously remaining a detached observer problematizes the relationship between self and other, observer and observed. Malinowski famously proposed that the goal of ethnography is 'to grasp the native's point of view, his

⁵⁴ Martyn Hammersley and Paul Atkinson, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, 3rd edn (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 3.

⁵⁵ Karen O'Reilly, *Ethnographic Methods* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 3.

⁵⁶ Concepts such as autoethnography, for example, seek to broaden the notion of the relationship between the researcher and the group being researched. See Carolyn Ellis and Arthur P. Bochner, 'Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity', in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. by Norman K. Denzin, 2nd edn (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000), pp. 733–68.

relation to life, to realise *his* vision of *his* world' (emphasis in the original).⁵⁷ In this way, the ethnography seeks to represent the native's point of view through the eyes of the anthropologist. As a result, the ethnography presents a kind of layered perspective, which Ruby explains as follows: 'Ethnographies have two plots: there is the story of the ethnographer's experience in the field [...]; and there are the stories of the lives of the people studied'.⁵⁸ This idea of the layering of two plots is particularly instructive for our analysis of the films of the poetic school. Recalling Dziuba's identification of the two filmic planes, which we have elaborated as that of the narrative and that of the filmmaking process, we can see how the term 'ethnography' illuminates the ways in which the filmmakers' experience during the filming process is embedded into the film.

Ruby's concern is to explore the possibilities for communicating ethnography through the medium of cinema.⁵⁹ He is quite explicit about the contexts in which he believes the term 'ethnographic' can be applied to film:

I propose that the term *ethnographic* be confined to those works in which the maker had formal training in ethnography, intended to produce an ethnography, employed ethnographic field practices, and sought validation

⁵⁷ Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1984), p. 25.

⁵⁸ Ruby, *Picturing Culture*, pp. 264–65.

⁵⁹ In addition to investigating the ways in which the cinematic medium can be used to communicate anthropological knowledge, visual anthropologists are concerned with film as a (audio-)visual element of 'culture' to be analysed itself. See *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. by Paul Hockings, 3rd edn (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003). The political and intellectual developments of the 1960s and 1970s led to a heightened awareness of the politics of representation and an increasing interest in so-called 'indigenous media production'. See Faye Ginsburg, 'The Parallax Effect: The Impact of Aboriginal Media on Ethnographic Film', *Visual Anthropology Review*, 11.2 (1995), 64–76. Such considerations gave rise to such research as Sol Worth and John Adair's Navajo Film Project, in which they taught filmmaking to a group of Navajos in Arizona. See Sol Worth and John Adair, *Through Navajo Eyes: An Exploration in Film Communication and Anthropology* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1972).

among those competent to judge the work as an ethnography. I believe that this conception transcends the medium of presentation – that is, it can be applied to both written and pictorial ethnographies. As such, it can serve as the basis for theorizing about what makes a film ethnographic. I also realize that such a conceptualization excludes the majority of films now called ethnographic.⁶⁰

In this last sentence, Ruby highlights the ‘canonical dilemma’ of ethnographic film.⁶¹

The term has entered common parlance, where it is sometimes applied anachronistically and to works in which no trained anthropologist took part. Ruby contrasts his approach with a more inclusive conceptualization of ethnographic film, exemplified in Karl Heider’s suggestion that:

In some sense one could argue that all films are “ethnographic”: they are about people. Even films that show only clouds or lizards have been made by people and therefore say something about the culture of the individuals who made them and who use them.⁶²

In fact, Heider goes on to elucidate sixteen different ‘attributes’, according to which the ‘degree of ethnographicness’ of a particular film can be evaluated.⁶³ Heider’s approach is useful in questioning the extent to which the term ‘ethnographic’ is a bounded category, and in highlighting the potential existence of grey areas. However, his list of attributes – which includes, for example, the extent to which the ethnographer’s presence is acknowledged (‘Reflexivity’), the relationship between sound and image (‘Appropriate Use of Sound’), and the extent to which the filmic subjects are presented as rounded individuals (‘Whole People’) – is at times arbitrary.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 6. Emphasis in the original.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 27.

⁶² Karl Heider, *Ethnographic Film*, rev. edn (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2006), p. 4. For more on the debate about what constitutes an ethnographic film, see, for example Marcus Banks, ‘Which Films are the Ethnographic Films?’, in *Film as Ethnography*, ed. by Peter Ian Crawford and David Turton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 116–30; and David MacDougall, *The Corporeal Image: Film, Ethnography, and the Senses* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

⁶³ Heider, *Ethnographic Film*, pp. 3 & 1–109.

It is not clear, for example, why the use of close-ups is to be avoided, whereas profile shots, say, which similarly result in a 'loss of information' (that is to say, one half of the body is not facing the camera) are not deemed unacceptable.⁶⁴ Indeed, it seems to suggest that, for Heider, film offers the potential for providing an unmediated perspective of the subject, rather than seeing him or her through the anthropologist's eyes. Ruby, on the other hand, does not prescribe how the filmic medium should be used in order to communicate the ethnography. Indeed, he states that all existing conventions of cinema should be deployed, and more invented where necessary.⁶⁵ Ruby is more concerned with how the film is made in terms of the methodological process, and how this is reflected in the film itself. It is difficult not to be persuaded by his approach. Ultimately, there must surely be a theoretical or methodological basis underlying the work, otherwise one is compelled to ask along with Ruby 'where is the ethnography in ethnographic film'?'⁶⁶

The approach outlined by Ruby is here taken as the basis for understanding what constitutes an ethnographic film. On this basis, it is clear that we cannot consider the works of the poetic school as examples of ethnographic film. These films were not made by anthropologists, nor were they intended to contribute to anthropological debate. Furthermore, whilst their content may well be of interest to anthropologists, they were not made with this explicit intention. This fact notwithstanding, however, there are certain aspects in which the approach to filming employed by the filmmakers of the school converged with the methodologies of ethnographers in the field, something which shall be explored in Chapter One. This

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 81.

⁶⁵ Ruby, *Picturing Culture*, p. 266.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 27.

factor needs to be accounted for and it is here that our understanding of ethnography and ethnographic film, outlined above, can inform our analysis of the poetic school. As Ruby has explained, there are two stories in an ethnographic film: that of the filmic subject, and that of the ethnographer's experience during the filmmaking process. The films of the poetic school can similarly be characterized. If we apply the term 'ethnographic' to these films, therefore, we might do so in order to highlight a particular relationship between the filmic product and the filming process, in which a sense of the filmmakers' experience in the field is imparted by means of the film. It is in this sense of the word that the concept of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is proposed. This is defined as a particular treatment of time, space and sound which establishes a relationship between the filmic subjects, the story that is performed, and the place of its performance; asserts the coexistence in time and space of filmmakers and filmic subjects (that is to say, it highlights the filmmaking process and the nature of that process); and seeks to evoke in the viewer the experience of being there herself.

The Experiential Ethnographic Mode is elaborated fully in Chapters Two to Four. It is offered as a defining characteristic of the poetic school but can apply more broadly to other fiction films in which there is a similar approach to filming, one which is foregrounded in the filmic product. The most obvious potential parallel in this respect can be found in Italian neorealism. Emerging as the result of a combination of factors, including the financial constraints imposed by post-war conditions and a deliberate reaction against the big productions of a centralized industry, Italian neorealism took filmmaking onto the streets. Small crews filmed on

location, using natural daylight and local non-actors speaking in their own dialects. Eschewing melodramatic plotlines, the neorealists took a heightened interest in the banal and the everyday, finding their drama in the small events and details which characterize daily life. The films function as social critique, examining the difficulties of modern life, often, although not always, in the urban environment.⁶⁷

There are a number of parallels between neorealism and the poetic school, for example the use of non-professional actors, local dialects and the level of collaboration between filmmaker and filmic subject. As with the Ukrainian school, the neorealist works are concerned with the specificities of the shooting location, to which the narrative is intrinsically linked. For *Roma, città aperta* (Rome, Open City, 1944–46), for example, the work with which Italian neorealism is generally considered to have begun, Roberto Rossellini stated that ‘We shot [the film] in the same settings in which the events we re-created had taken place’.⁶⁸ Although the neorealists’ focus on the urban environment differs from the Ukrainian school’s preference for rural settings, Visconti’s *La terra trema*, which was filmed entirely on location in the Sicilian fishing village of Aci Trezza, proves an instructive and interesting exception, and might be regarded as the closest link between neorealism and the poetic school. Indeed, Visconti’s refusal to dub the vernacular spoken by the

⁶⁷ There are a number of comprehensive accounts of the Italian neorealist movement. See, for example: Peter Bondanella, *Italian Cinema: From Neorealism to the Present*, 3rd edn (New York: Continuum, 2002); Millicent Marcus, *Italian Film in the Light of Neorealism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986); and *Italian Neorealism and Global Cinema*, ed. by Laura E. Ruberto and Kristi M. Wilson (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2007). Of particular interest for this thesis is the work of anthropologist Marc Henri Piault, who has identified Italian neorealism as ‘documentary fiction’, which he suggests has the potential to expand the classical field of anthropology. See Marc Henri Piault, ‘Real with Fiction’, *Visual Anthropology Review*, 23 (2007), 16–25.

⁶⁸ Quoted in Georges Sadoul, *Dictionary of Films*, trans. by Peter Morris (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1972), p. 317.

fishermen, providing subtitles for the mainland Italian audience instead, is strikingly similar to Paradzhanov's stance with regard to the Hutsul dialect in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

In contrast to the poetic school, however, the neorealists did not seek inspiration in literary sources. In their concern for current societal issues, these films do not look to the past. Planning for *Roma, città aperta*, for example, which concerns the Nazi occupation of Rome during the Second World War, had already begun whilst the city was still occupied, and shooting began only two months after its liberation.⁶⁹ The directors of the poetic school, however, are concerned with more distant events, ones which occurred just before their births, or when they were children. Yet, upon closer inspection, this distinction is not so great. The literary sources for the poetic school were themselves inspired by real events.⁷⁰ Moreover, as this thesis will demonstrate, in looking to the past – and in using the Experiential Ethnographic Mode to do so – the films are very much engaged with current concerns, namely the ways in which society remembers and commemorates the past. This was a topical issue for this particular generation of filmmakers, to which their films attest. Here, the concept of postmemory can help illuminate this use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode to deal with the cinematic representation of the past.

⁶⁹ Ibid.. For a detailed account of the film and its making, see: David Forgacs, *Rome Open City (Roma Città Aperta)* (London: BFI, 2000).

⁷⁰ For example, Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi's 'Tini zabutykh predkiv' is inspired by the story of two feuding Hutsul families, about which he was told by Luka Harmatii during one of his trips to the Carpathians. See the recollections of Hanna Harmatii-Tsehel's'ka in *Volodymyr Hnatiuk: Dokumenty i materialy (1871–1989)*, ed. by Iaroslav Dashkevych (Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1998), pp. 404–06 (pp. 405–06). Stefanyk's story 'Kaminnyi khrest' was based upon the emigration of Ivan Akhtemiichuk from his native village of Rusiv. See Larysa Briukhovets'ka, *Leonid Osyka* (Kyiv: Akademiia, 1999), p. 42.

Postmemory and Postmemorial Work

The last two decades have witnessed a surge of interest in an area of research that has come to be called ‘memory studies’, much of which has focused on and been driven by remembrance of the Holocaust. Within this body of work, attention has been brought to the issue of how the children of those directly affected – the second generation – have responded to this trauma.⁷¹ Psychoanalysts had been investigating this issue since the late 1960s, with the founding in 1974 of the Group for the Psychoanalytic Study of the Effects of the Holocaust on the Second Generation.⁷²

Commenting upon the body of work that had emerged, Milton Jucovy noted that:

One dramatic finding involved the tendency shown by children of survivors often to live their lives in a way where the reality of the past seemed to intrude excessively into the reality of the present.⁷³

Jucovy also highlighted the consistency with which problems arose around the communication between generations of the parents’ experience during the Holocaust, with silence in particular being regarded as potentially damaging.⁷⁴ Silence is a theme that recurs in writings by and about the second generation. Nadine Fresco, herself a child of Holocaust survivors, notes that parents who were unwilling or unable to talk ‘transmitted only the wound to their children, to whom the memory had been refused

⁷¹ See, for example, Eva Hoffman, *After Such Knowledge: Memory, History, and the Legacy of the Holocaust* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004); Froma I. Zeitlin, ‘The Vicarious Witness: Belated Memory and Authorial Presence in Recent Holocaust Literature’, *History and Memory*, 10.2 (1998), 5–42; and Aaron Hass, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Second Generation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁷² Milton E. Jucovy, ‘Psychoanalytic Contributions to Holocaust Studies’, *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 73 (1992), 267–82 (pp. 268–69).

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 271.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* Silence was, of course, not the only response. Jucovy notes ‘a tendency towards polarization, from almost complete silence to a rather open sharing with children of the harrowing experiences of parents’. *Ibid.*

and who grew up in the compact void of the unspeakable'.⁷⁵ Void is another word which features persistently in this literature, an example of which can be found in the following comment by Henri Raczymow:

There is a void in our memory formed by a Poland unknown to us and entirely vanished, and a void in our remembrance of the Holocaust through which we did not live.⁷⁶

Scholars have sought ways to account for the experiences of the second generation, who have no direct memory of events, but nonetheless for whom

Far from foreclosing any identification with these events, this very belatedness leads them urgently to seek ways of linking the present to the past. Even more, it seems to engender the desire of representing the past through modes of re-enactment – even reanimation – through which the self, the “ego” of “the one who was not there,” now takes on a leading role as an active presence.⁷⁷

Various terms have been proposed. Froma I. Zeitlin has used the terms ‘vicarious memory’ or ‘vicarious witnessing’; Raczymow has talked of a ‘memory shot through with holes’ (*mémoire trouée*); and Ellen Fine has suggested the phrase ‘absent memory’.⁷⁸ ‘Postmemory’ is the term that Marianne Hirsch adopts, the intention being not to suggest that the second generation experiences ‘*literal* “memories”’ (her emphasis), but rather something that ‘approximates memory in its affective force’.⁷⁹ Here the suffix ‘post’ functions in a similar way to its application in the term

⁷⁵ Nadine Fresco, ‘Remembering the Unknown’, *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 11 (1984), 417–27 (p. 419).

⁷⁶ Henri Raczymow, ‘Memory Shot Through with Holes’, trans. by Alan Astro, *Yale French Studies*, 85 (1994), 98–105 (p. 104).

⁷⁷ Zeitlin, ‘The Vicarious Witness’, p. 6.

⁷⁸ Raczymow ‘Memory Shot Through with Holes’; Zeitlin, ‘The Vicarious Witness’; and Ellen Fine, ‘The Absent Memory: The Act of Writing in Post-Holocaust French Literature’, in *Writing and the Holocaust*, ed. by Berel Lang (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1988), pp. 41–57.

⁷⁹ Hirsch, ‘The Generation of Postmemory’, p. 109.

‘postmodern’, that is to say, in order to express ‘both a critical distance and a profound interrelation’.⁸⁰

In addition to this interest in the second generation, attention has been drawn to the experiences of child survivors, those whom Susan Rubin Suleiman calls the ‘1.5 generation’. Suleiman explores the difficulties in drawing boundaries in this context. Given the distinctions psychoanalysts make between different stages of childhood, she suggests that one option might be to identify three categories:

Children “too young to remember” (infancy to around three years old); children “old enough to remember but too young to understand” (approximately age four to ten); and children “old enough to understand but too young to be responsible” (approximately age eleven to fourteen).⁸¹

However, these categories are complicated by geographical and historical dimensions. As she explains,

Given the length of the war, let alone the twelve years of Nazi rule in Germany, as well as the variations in when exactly (and how) Jews in different countries first experienced the persecution, where is one to “locate” the growing child?⁸²

Suleiman argues convincingly for ‘the acceptance of approximate rather than tidy categories’, an approach which is adopted in this thesis where the term ‘postmemory’ is not intended to exclude those individuals who experienced the event as children.⁸³ Indeed, the films of the poetic school were made by members of both 1.5 and second generations, sometimes working together on a single film. *Bili khmary*, for example, is based on a novella by Oleksandr Syzonenko, who was a young child when the events about which he wrote took place, whereas the director, Serhiienko, was born a

⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 106.

⁸¹ Suleiman, ‘The 1.5 Generation’, p. 283.

⁸² Ibid., p. 284.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 289.

few years after the events had occurred. This inclusive approach to postmemory as potentially encompassing both 1.5 and second generations is implicitly accepted by Hirsch, who examines, within the context of postmemory, works in which the protagonist is a member of the 1.5 generation.⁸⁴

Hirsch is keen to stress that postmemory ‘need not be *strictly* an identity position’ (her emphasis).⁸⁵ She has described postmemory as ‘an intersubjective transgenerational space of remembrance, linked specifically to cultural or collective trauma’, and more recently, as ‘a *structure* of inter- and trans-generational transmission of traumatic knowledge and experience’ (emphasis in the original).⁸⁶ In order to explain the structure of postmemory, Hirsch draws on the work of Jan and Aleida Assmann. Expanding on the influential concept of ‘collective memory’ developed by Maurice Halbwachs, the underlying assumption of the Assmanns’ work is that memory has a social dimension:

Every individual memory constitutes itself in communication with others. These “others”, however, are not just any set of people, rather they are groups who conceive their unity and peculiarity through a common image of their past.⁸⁷

Individuals belong to a variety of groups – familial, religious, national, and so forth – within which memories are shared and conveyed. Jan Assmann identifies this kind of memory as communicative memory: a non-institutionalized memory based on everyday exchanges. Given its non-institutional nature, communicative memory is of

⁸⁴ See her discussion of W. G. Sebald’s *Austerlitz* (Munich: Hanser, 2001) in Marianne Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), pp. 40–48.

⁸⁵ Marianne Hirsch, ‘Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory’, *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, 14 (2001), 5–37 (p. 10).

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, and Hirsch, ‘The Generation of Postmemory’, p. 106.

⁸⁷ Jan Assmann, ‘Collective Memory and Cultural Identity’, *New German Critique*, 65 (1995), 125–33 (p. 127).

limited duration, lasting three generations, or between eighty to one hundred years.⁸⁸ Cultural memory, on the other hand, is based on fateful events of the past and is the ‘*culturally institutionalized heritage of a society*’ (emphasis in the original).⁸⁹ Where communicative memory is a ‘living, embodied memory’, cultural memory is ‘mediated in texts, icons, dances, rituals, and performances of various kinds’.⁹⁰ Over time, individual and communicative memory is transformed into cultural memory.⁹¹ Hirsch argues that the processes identified by the Assmanns are disrupted in the event of collective historical trauma, such as war, Holocaust, exile or refugeehood.⁹² During such events, cultural memory may well become the target for attack through, for example, the destruction of archives and records; traumatic experiences can impair the operation of communicative memory; and the transmission from communicative to cultural memory might be disturbed. In Hirsch’s words:

The structure of postmemory clarifies how the multiple ruptures and radical breaks introduced by trauma and catastrophe inflect intra-, inter- and trans-generational inheritance. It breaks through and complicates the line the Assmanns draw connecting individual to family, to social group, to institutionalized historical archive.⁹³

What Hirsch then goes on to explain is the desire and drive to repair these breaks in the transmission of memory. She terms this ‘postmemorial work’, the striving to reactivate and reembody the more distant structures of cultural memory ‘by reinvesting them with resonant individual and familial forms of mediation and

⁸⁸ Ibid.; Jan Assmann, ‘Communicative and Cultural Memory’, in *Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View*, ed. by Peter Meusburger, Michael Herrernan and Edgar Wunder (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011), pp. 15–27 (p. 19).

⁸⁹ Assmann, ‘Collective Memory and Cultural Identity’, pp. 127 and 130.

⁹⁰ Assmann, ‘Communicative and Cultural Memory’, p. 22.

⁹¹ Ibid..

⁹² Hirsch, ‘The Generation of Postmemory’, p. 111.

⁹³ Ibid..

aesthetic expression'.⁹⁴ Hirsch is interested in the function of photographs in this respect. In particular, she finds that family photographs 'can bridge the gap between viewers who are personally connected to the event and those who are not. They can expand the postmemorial circle.'⁹⁵ She examines the work of such artists as Art Spiegelman, who has used photographs as a medium for postmemorial work. In one of his drawings, for example, Spiegelman imagines his father's experience through reference to a publicly available photograph of prisoners in a camp. 'This "adoption" of public, anonymous images into the family photo album finds its counterpart in the pervasive use of private, familial images and objects in institutions of public display – museums and memorials [...] – which thus construct every visitor as a familial subject.'⁹⁶ Postmemorial work enables less directly affected individuals to become engaged in what Hirsch describes as 'affiliative' postmemory.⁹⁷ Hirsch acknowledges the potential pitfalls of such postmemorial work – over-personalization or the occlusion of context, for example.⁹⁸ At the same time, however, she notes that this kind of postmemorial work is 'a *mostly* helpful vehicle of working through a traumatic past' (her emphasis).⁹⁹

The Holocaust was unique and we should therefore be cautious about transposing to other contexts the terms and concepts that have been devised in order to deal with its specific complexities. Catherine Merridale notes just this in her

⁹⁴ Ibid..

⁹⁵ Marianne Hirsch, *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), p. 251.

⁹⁶ Hirsch, 'The Generation of Postmemory', pp. 112–13.

⁹⁷ 'Affiliative' postmemory is distinguished from the 'familial' postmemory of the literal second generation. Ibid., pp. 114–15.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 115.

⁹⁹ Marianne Hirsch, 'Surviving Images', p. 9.

fascinating study of the impact on Russians of decades of violence, *Night of Stone: Death and Memory in Russia*, in which she states that ‘each country’s story should suggest interpretations of its own’.¹⁰⁰ Drawing on the oral histories of around one hundred and fifty respondents, including those of the children of survivors, along with memoirs and archival sources, Merridale examines how the devastating losses incurred between 1914 and Stalin’s death in 1953 have affected ordinary Russians.¹⁰¹ Over fifty million Soviet lives were lost during this period as a result of the litany of horrors that were endured, which included the First World War; the October Revolution and Civil War; the processes of collectivization and dekulakization, which were launched in the late 1920s and the ensuing famine of 1932 to 1933, known in Ukraine as the Holodomor; state repression and the purges; and the Second World War, by the end of which the Soviet ‘population deficit’ was between forty and fifty million lives.¹⁰² Much of Merridale’s work concerns the effect of these events on those who experienced and survived them. Alert to the body of work surrounding second generation traumatic experience, however, Merridale set out to capture empirical evidence of this phenomenon as part of the broader scope of her enquiry, by gathering together ‘a group of the grown-up children of purge victims and dekulakised peasants’.¹⁰³ Her findings are reported as follows:

They had regarded themselves as children of the repressed, victims, in a way, of the totalitarian system, but always – for the purposes of victimhood – as the bearers of their parents’ standard, not as people with injuries of their own. They were surprised, then, to find they shared some kinds of memory. They

¹⁰⁰ Catherine Merridale, *Night of Stone: Death and Memory in Russia* (London: Granta Books, 2000), p. 20.

¹⁰¹ Merridale includes the testimonies of other nationalities, including Ukrainians, who lived through these events but limits the scope of her inquiry to Russia.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, pp. 274–75.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 420.

enjoyed discovering that they all had a story of concealment. They also shared a corresponding tale of guilt. Beyond that, however, there was very little that they had in common except their life-long hardship.¹⁰⁴

She concludes that:

none of the second-generation survivors whom I met – variously heirs of repression, civil war and famine – reported intrusive nightmares, phobias or nervous illness for themselves. To some extent, of course, this could be the effect of a taboo. [...] But it is also clear that the western illness, post-traumatic stress, is not a problem that is recognised to any significant extent by Russians of the second and later generations.¹⁰⁵

Merridale is not seeking to deny that the second generation have been affected by the experiences of their parents. Her concern, rather, is to question the universality of the concept of post-traumatic stress disorder. (It should be noted that this concept is associated with the first generation rather than the second; Hirsch, for example, specifies that the experience of the second generation ‘is a *consequence* of traumatic recall but (unlike post-traumatic stress disorder) at a generational remove’.¹⁰⁶) Ultimately, Merridale’s story is one of survival and the mechanisms by which people coped: ‘Russians really do seem to have lived with their histories of unspeakable loss by working, singing and waving the red flag.’¹⁰⁷ Merridale is, of course, right to highlight the importance of contextualization and her work is a significant contribution to our understanding of the specificities of the Soviet experience. Yet this does not mean that there is no place for theory. Such work is valuable precisely in order to help shape, develop and test concepts and ideas. By bringing theories into contact with new contexts, we may hope to enhance our understanding of both the specific case in question and the broader theory. Merridale’s research, for example,

¹⁰⁴ Ibid..

¹⁰⁵ Ibid..

¹⁰⁶ Hirsch, ‘The Generation of Postmemory’, p. 106.

¹⁰⁷ Merridale, *Night of Stone*, p. 418.

highlights ways in which the theoretical debates about the nature of trauma can be developed through consideration of processes of accommodation, the way in which people 'rebuilt their lives in the new world, developed ways of coping with a dual reality'.¹⁰⁸

Whilst Merridale does not find any evidence of post-traumatic stress disorder amongst her second generation respondents, she nonetheless points on numerous occasions to the ways in which patterns of remembrance between generations have been disturbed. This is closely linked to the issue of silence:

While some kinds of death – the heroes' deaths – were honoured and commemorated, the collective discussion of many less acceptable forms of loss was muted for most of the twentieth century. The silence was sometimes a source of suffering (some people wanted very much to talk and grieve collectively). It left some murders unavenged.¹⁰⁹

This silencing was another form of loss: 'the loss of the means to share their searing images of the past'.¹¹⁰ In private, people sometimes did talk of their experiences, 'but the things that people talked about in private remained separate: they did not usually translate into a public kind of knowledge'.¹¹¹ Finally, Merridale notes that: 'A fifty-year public silence has left them without the collective framework that is needed to contain debate, without the structures and points of reference that make discussion safe.'¹¹² Merridale's research suggests, therefore, that the process by means of which private memories become absorbed into a more public sphere has been disrupted,

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 148.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 24. Merridale is careful to distinguish this silence from that associated with traumatized individuals, including, one assumes, survivors of the Holocaust: 'their [i.e. the Russian/Soviet survivors'] lifetime's habit of silence could as easily have been attributed to state violence – the threat of arrest or demotion – as it could to psychological damage'. Ibid., p. 22.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 148.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 200.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 240.

resulting in the lack of a collective framework within which to remember the past. Here, the theory of postmemory as elaborated by Hirsch is particularly useful. This is precisely because the term, as Hirsch specifies, describes ‘not an *identity* position but a *generational* structure of transmission’ (her emphasis).¹¹³ Potentially, therefore, the concept of postmemory can be used in the Soviet context to describe the disruption identified by Merridale in the movement between private memories and collective knowledge.

Postmemory, the Poetic School and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode

The concept of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is proposed in this thesis to describe a style of fiction filmmaking which establishes an inter-relationship between the filmic product and the filmmaking process, one based on a particular methodological approach. The films of the poetic school are distinguished by their use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. What is particularly interesting about the films’ use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is its application in order to deal with events that are set in the past. It will be shown how this enables a connection to be forged between the past and the present. The concept of postmemory provides a useful framework for thinking about this particular treatment of the past in the films of the poetic school. These films, which were made (predominantly) in the 1960s, can be connected to the turbulent events of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s. In some cases, the event to which the films are connected is obvious. *Bili khmary*, for example, deals with dekulakization and the collectivization of Ukrainian land in the 1930s, and the tragic consequences of those processes; *Khto povernetsia – doliubyt'* and *Sovist'* are

¹¹³ Hirsch, ‘The Generation of Postmemory’, p. 114.

focused on the experience of the Second World War; *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoii* concerns guerrillas fighting for independence in western Ukraine during and after the war; and *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* deals with the population changes brought about by war and urbanization. Some of these events were more able to be spoken of than others, which perhaps explains the preponderance of films about the war. Indeed, Merridale suggests that ‘the war, arguably, provided a conduit for griefs which had few other outlets’.¹¹⁴ In other films, the connection is transposed to a more distant past: *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and *Kaminnyi khrest* are both set in pre-revolutionary times, around the turn of the last century. Yet both these films, upon closer inspection, relate to processes that had taken place more recently. Paradzhanov’s film, as we shall see, is concerned with the issue of cultural heritage and its preservation – an issue which came to the fore in this area of the Carpathians in the aftermath of the First World War, when the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire gave way to competing territorial claims. Hutsul’shchyna is an area of the Carpathians which today extends into three of Ukraine’s *oblasti*: Ivano-Frankivs’ka, Chernivets’ka, and Zakarpats’ka.¹¹⁵ Following the unsuccessful attempts in 1919 to establish a West Ukrainian People’s Republic (Zakhidno-Ukrains’ka Narodna Respublika (ZUNR)) or an independent Hutsul Republic (Hutsul’s’ka Respublika), Hutsul’shchyna was divided across three separate states: Romania, interwar Poland,

¹¹⁴ Catherine Merridale, ‘Death and Memory in Modern Russia’, *History Workshop Journal*, 42 (1996), 1–18 (p. 13).

¹¹⁵ There are also a few Hutsul villages in the Maramureş district of Romania. Paul R. Magocsi and Ivan Ivanovich Pop, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), p. 206. They note that ‘[t]he Hutsuls have traditionally considered themselves to be different from Rusyns in the rest of Carpathian Rus’. Beginning with the early twentieth century the Hutsuls gradually adopted a Ukrainian national identity.’ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

and the Czechoslovak Republic.¹¹⁶ In the latter case, the position of Ukrainians greatly improved: the Czechoslovak Republic ‘supported education, culture, and the use of the Ukrainian language in local administration’.¹¹⁷ For those living under Polish rule, however, including the inhabitants of today’s Verkhovyns’kyi *raion* where *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was shot and is set, the situation was quite different:

The Polish administration closed down two thirds of the Prosvita Society’s reading rooms and abolished Ukrainian Studies departments at Lviv University. [...] In 1924, the state banned the use of Ukrainian in government agencies and began transforming the old Austrian system of Ukrainian elementary schools into a bilingual one in which Polish was dominant.¹¹⁸

A similar policy of assimilation was pursued by Romania in the interwar period.¹¹⁹ Indeed, Ukrainians living in the Soviet Union during the cultural revolution of the late 1920s and 1930s would be likewise affected. This period of Stalinist social transformation included the suppression of ‘bourgeois’ culture and the purging of the intelligentsia, processes which particularly affected Ukraine.¹²⁰ Paradzhanov’s film can therefore be seen within the context of these aggressive policies directed towards cultural heritage and tradition.¹²¹ Osyka’s film, on the other hand, concerns the first

¹¹⁶ See Magocsi, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*, pp. 237–38; Serhy Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 76–78.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 123. For more on relations between Poles and Ukrainians during this period, see Bohdan Budurowycz, ‘Poland and the Ukrainian Problem, 1921–1939’, *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 25 (1983), 473–500.

¹¹⁹ Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, pp. 128–30.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 112. Yekelchuk writes that ‘in Ukraine, the Cultural Revolution evolved into a crusade against “nationalist deviations”, which lasted throughout most of the 1930s. Owing to the combination of all-Union campaigns with local purges, the republic experienced more waves of mass arrests than Russia.’ *Ibid.* Andrew Wilson notes that ‘[the purges] hit Ukraine particularly hard and were longer and more thorough-going than elsewhere. Up to “80%” of the Ukrainian intelligentsia were killed or disappeared or sent to the camps’. Andrew Wilson, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, 2nd edn (New Haven, CT: Yale Nota Bene, 2002), p. 146.

¹²¹ For information on the repression of Rusyn self-identity during this period, see Magocsi, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture*, p. 116.

wave of emigration to Canada from western Ukrainian lands which took place from 1891 until the outbreak of the First World War. This too, however, had re-emerged as an issue of concern more recently: during the interwar period some 150,000 western Ukrainians emigrated (mostly to Argentina, France and Canada).¹²² Furthermore, a third wave of emigration occurred following the 'reunification' of the region with Soviet Ukraine in 1939 and during the immediate aftermath of the Second World War.¹²³

Following Hirsch's argument, the traumatic events with which the films of the poetic school are concerned would rupture the normal processes of intra-, inter-, and trans-generational remembering, necessitating modes of remembrance which seek to repair this structure. Furthermore, Merridale's work suggests that memorial processes were indeed disrupted by these events. Indeed, displaying an interest in the (grand)parent-child relationship, the films deal with the theme of complications in the flow of memory between generations. In *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, for example, Ivan dies without leaving any heirs; in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, Levko is estranged from his children, who have all left the village in which they grew up; and in *Kaminnyi khrest*, Ivan Didukh attempts to keep the memory of his family alive in the village from which his sons have convinced him to emigrate, by erecting a stone cross. At the same time, however, the films seek to repair the inter-generational memorial

¹²² Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, p. 122.

¹²³ In 1939, as a direct result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, Soviet forces annexed the regions of Galicia and Volhynia from eastern Poland; this was followed by the annexation of northern Bukovyna from Romania in 1940. During the war, western Ukraine was occupied by the Axis powers until the return of the Red Army in 1944. According to Yekelchuk, 'a significant percentage of Ukrainian Ostarbeiter and POWs chose to stay in the West because of memories of poverty at home and because they feared repression on their return to the USSR'. *Ibid.*, p. 147.

structure which has been ruptured, and can thus be seen to engage in postmemorial work. This relates not only to memory of the event itself, but, perhaps above all, to memory of a way of life that had endured for centuries and been disrupted. The various traumas of the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s had a severe impact on the relationship between the individual and the land on which he or she lived. The demographic changes brought about by war, famine, industrialization and so forth transformed the face of Soviet Ukraine: ‘whereas in 1920 only 15 percent of Soviet Ukraine’s population lived in cities, by 1939 the figure had more than doubled, to 36.2 percent’.¹²⁴ Through their use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, the films portray the past as something that is being remembered in the filmmaking present; by encouraging the viewer to participate in this act of remembering, they facilitate the generation of affiliative postmemory and thus function to expand the postmemorial circle. They attempt to show that memory of the past, and of a past way of life, can and does live on.

Whereas Hirsch focuses on the role of photography as a medium for postmemorial work, here we examine the potential of cinema to operate in this capacity. In this particular context, cinema is peculiarly appropriate given that it is, after all, an audio-visual art. Unlike photography, cinema is able to treat silence as a presence rather than simply an absence. As Merridale has noted, in the Soviet context, silence was itself an aspect of the traumatic experience either through lack of official recognition or a space within which to speak openly about the experience. In Chapter Five, it will be seen how the films of the poetic school speak of these events

¹²⁴ Paul Robert Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and its Peoples*, 2nd rev. and expanded edn. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010) p. 576.

and these silences. Whilst the events were not experienced directly, or as adults, by the filmmakers or the *shistdesiatnyky* generation to which, broadly speaking, they belong, their films show how these past events continue to echo in the present. The filmmakers belong to the second (or 1.5) generation; their films suggest a need to ‘remember, to re-build, to re-incarnate, to replace and to repair’.¹²⁵ Although focused on the past, the films can only tell us of the filmmaking present; by their very nature they express the irretrievability of the past. Whilst the past is irretrievable, the films of the poetic school nonetheless attempt to reconnect with it. Yet they cannot authenticate the past that they perform. Instead, the authenticity of which they speak lies in the project itself, in the experience of the second generation. It is the authenticity of the echo.

Structure of the Thesis

This thesis develops the concept of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, which it is argued is a defining characteristic of the films of the poetic school. In order to elaborate what is meant by the term, an in-depth analysis of its use in a single film is conducted. That film is *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the work with which the poetic school began, and which can be considered as emblematic of the movement. Drawing on a combination of close textual analysis of the films, memoirs, archival research and oral interviews, the concept is illustrated and the significance of its use in the films of the poetic school examined. This combined methodological approach enables the views of the non-professional participants to be incorporated alongside those of the filmmakers, to give a more complete account of the filmmaking process than has

¹²⁵ Marianne Hirsch, ‘Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile’, *Poetics Today*, 17 (1996), 659–86 (p. 661).

hitherto been provided. During the summer of 2010, I embarked upon my own journey to the Carpathians in order to find the local residents who took part in the making of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* (some of them were also involved in the films *Oleksa Dovbush* (1959, directed by Viktor Ivanov) and *Annychka* (1968, directed by Borys Ivchenko)). Their recollections form an additional layer through which the films, which are themselves concerned with processes of remembering, are considered and without which it would not be possible to investigate the collaborative nature of the filmmaking process.

Underlying the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is a particular relationship between the filmic product and the filmmaking process. Accordingly, in Chapter One, the history behind the making of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is examined. This chapter sets out the various influences which gave rise to this remarkable film, including the cultural climate at the Dovzhenko Studio at the time, and consideration of the original expedition to the Carpathians conducted by Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, who penned the original novella on which the film is based. In 1963, Paradzhanov and his crew followed in Kotsiubyns'kyi's footsteps, and in many ways the approach to filmmaking which they adopted can be seen to have its traces in the manner with which the writer conducted research for his novella. The experience of the filmmakers on location and their interactions with the local residents is considered against this background. These experiences during the filmmaking process had a significant impact upon the completed film. The Experiential Ethnographic Mode describes this interrelationship between the filmmaking process and the filmic product. In Chapters Two to Four, the various ways in which the filmmaking process

is reflected in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is analysed according to the three components of the mode: its treatment of time, space, and sound.

Chapter Two examines how time is layered in the film. The two filmic planes noted by Dziuba are identified here as the temporality of the narrative and the temporality of the recording. Through the use of shadows, camera movement and the returned gaze, the film asserts the coexistence in time and space of the filmmakers and filmic subjects, this giving rise to an awareness of the temporality of the recording. In the case of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the temporality of the narrative is located in the past. Its layering with the temporality of the recording therefore positions the narrative past as something that is being performed – and thus remembered – in the filmmaking present. Moreover, by provoking an awareness of multiple temporalities, the film arguably evokes in the viewer the sensation of remembering – itself the experiencing of multiple temporalities. In this way, the film can be seen to engage in postmemorial work and to attempt to rebuild the memorial structures that have been disrupted.

Chapter Three investigates the film's treatment of space and how it introduces the viewer to the particular locale in which the narrative is set and in which the filming took place. The ways in which space is inscribed onto the film through, for example, clothing and textures will be examined. A pattern is discerned in which the film moves between near and far, depth and surface, and detail and contextualization. This mimics the experience of the ethnographer in the field and so seeks to encourage in the viewer a similar process of learning and discovery. In this way, the film suggests that knowledge is passed on and traditions kept alive. In Chapter Four, we

move from concentrating on the visual elements of the film to a consideration of its uses of sound. The different aural components of the film are identified and the ways in which they help create a regionally specific acoustic world. Different sounds evoke a sense of the Carpathian landscape not only through their regional specificity (the use of local instruments, for example), but through their layering and reverberations, which suggest a sense of height and depth. Sounds interact with image to create an acoustic way of knowing specific to this world, and one which is imparted to the audio-viewer.

The Experiential Ethnographic Mode is thus identified as a treatment of time, space and sound which establishes a connection between the narrative, the filmic subjects, and the place of filming; asserts the coexistence of the filmmakers with the filmic subjects; and evokes a sense of their experience of being there. Chapter Five then examines how the mode is used in other films of the poetic school. It is argued that, along with *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Illienko's *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* and Osyka's *Kaminnyi khrest* form the inner core of the poetic school. These two films are analysed in detail accordingly. The films of the poetic school are united by their preoccupation with a common theme: the relationship between people and the land, and a traditional way of life that has endured for centuries. Recent traumatic events of the past have affected that relationship and it is seen how the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is used to deal with the postmemory of these events. Of all the films of the poetic school, it is *Bili khmary* which most clearly addresses the relationship between the people and the land, and the chapter concludes with an analysis of this film. In its treatment of silence, *Bili khmary* demonstrates how and

why cinema is particularly suited to deal with the postmemory of these events in the Soviet context. Ultimately, the films give an insight into this generation of filmmakers and, contrary to other interpretations, it is suggested that the films are less concerned with loss than with hope and the possibility and attempt to overcome that loss, to reconnect with the past, and re-establish processes of remembering that have been disrupted. In its conclusion, this thesis turns to one last film of the school, Illienko's *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*. The character of Heorhii is shown to represent not only the white bird of the film's title, but also the filmmakers. Heorhii is a member of the 1.5 generation; he is haunted by the echoes of the past, which he hears in the form of the melodies that his family used to play before the war dramatically restructured their lives. Yet in ending with this music being played by a new group of musicians, the film – like the poetic school of which it is a part – ends with an air of hope and an assertion of continuity.

CHAPTER ONE

Fiction, Film and Ethnography: The Making of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*

Work on the production of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* began at the Dovzhenko Film Studio in Kyiv in 1962. Shooting started in 1963, and by September of the following year the finished film was submitted to the studio for approval. Following a lengthy debate over the production of a Russian version for release onto all Soviet screens, the film (in its original, Ukrainian version) received its official premiere in Kyiv on 4 September 1965. The film was a huge success for the studio, winning a host of awards both at home and abroad. More importantly, it heralded a new wave of filmmaking at the Dovzhenko Studio which has since come to be known as the school of Ukrainian poetic cinema.

This chapter examines the various influences that gave rise to the creation of this exceptional film. Against the wider background of the ‘Thaw’, it considers the cultural changes taking place at that time in the Ukrainian Republic, and at the Dovzhenko Studio in particular. The Soviet practice of dubbing films is outlined, against the background of which the filmmakers’ stance with regard to the soundtrack is subsequently discussed. The chapter also provides a survey of Paradzhanov’s early work and identifies traces of the filmmaking style which the director would later adopt. Ultimately, one of the greatest sources of creative inspiration for the film is found in Mykhailo Kotsiubyns’kyi’s own approach to writing the novella.

In 1963 Paradzhanov and his film crew departed for the Carpathian Mountains and the village in Hutsul’shchyna where Kotsiubyns’kyi’s novella was set.

The collaborative approach to filmmaking upon which they embarked shares some similarities with ethnographic research practices and, in many ways, can be seen to have its roots in the original experience of Kotsiubyns'kyi himself. Some fifty years earlier, the author had made a journey to this area of the Carpathians in order to conduct the research which would form the basis for his novella. In re-tracing Kotsiubyns'kyi's footsteps, the filmmakers experienced Hutsul'shchyna for themselves. It is this experience which gives the film its particular aesthetic quality and which, in turn, it seeks to impart to the viewer. Through a specific treatment of time, space and sound, the film bears witness to the filmmakers' experience, and attempts to invoke in the viewer the sensation of being there herself.

Ukrainian Culture in the 1950s and 1960s and the Dovzhenko Film Studio

Tini zabutykh predkiv was produced during a period of change and rejuvenation at the Dovzhenko Film Studio. Founded in the late 1920s, the Kyiv studio had once been the largest film studio in the Soviet Union and was regarded as a centre for innovative and experimental filmmaking; it is where such filmmakers as Dziga Vertov and Dovzhenko produced some of their finest work.¹²⁶ By the time it was renamed in honour of Dovzhenko in 1957, however, it had lost its former claims to glory and

¹²⁶ The Odesa and Ialta studios, which had hosted film productions since pre-revolutionary times, and two smaller facilities in Kyiv and Kharkiv fell under the auspices of the All-Ukrainian Photo and Film Administration (Vseukrains'ke foto-kinoupravlinnia (VUFKU)) when it was established in 1922. See Vance Kepley Jr, 'Federal Cinema: The Soviet Film Industry, 1924–32', *Film History*, 8 (1996), 344–56; and Bohdan Y. Nebesio, 'Competition from Ukraine: VUFKU and the Soviet Film Industry in the 1920s', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 29.2 (2009), 159–80. In 1926, VUFKU was charged with building a new base in Kyiv from which to develop Ukrainian cinema. Construction began in early 1927; later that year, the first films were being shot at what would come to be known as the Dovzhenko Studio. See M. O. Fil'kevych, *Dovzhenkivtsi: Storinky nashoi istorii*, 2nd edn (Kyiv: PP Kl'ots A. O., 2006), pp. 9–15. Vertov's *Liudyna z kinoaparatom* (Man with a Movie Camera) was produced at the Kyiv studio in 1929, and Dovzhenko's *Zemlia* in 1930.

become synonymous with mediocrity, or worse, an object of ridicule as can be gauged by the following Soviet joke: ‘Fil’m’y ie khorishi, fil’m’y ie pohani, a ie fil’m’y kinostudii Dovzhenka’ (There are good films, there are bad films, and there are films from the Dovzhenko Studio).

In the 1950s, the cultural renaissance that was being witnessed elsewhere in the Soviet Union appeared to bypass the Dovzhenko Studio altogether. This was the time of the ‘Thaw’, a period of cultural liberalization associated with Nikita Khrushchev’s time as leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1953–64).¹²⁷ Yet the ‘Thaw’, as Polly Jones points out, ‘took its cues directly from the agenda of “greater realism” set in the last few years of Stalin’s life’.¹²⁸ Shortly before Stalin’s death in March 1953, Soviet writers and critics had begun to criticize the ‘varnishing of reality’ (*lakirovka deistvitel’nosti*) which was particularly prevalent in post-war literary and artistic works.¹²⁹ Although the crisis in Soviet literature and the arts had been identified before and in the immediate aftermath of Stalin’s death, it was only after Khrushchev’s ‘secret speech’ to the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956 that it could be directly connected to Stalin’s regime.¹³⁰ There followed a series of articles and editorials which disseminated the main points in Khrushchev’s speech, including in the film journal *Iskusstvo kino*.¹³¹

¹²⁷ The ‘Thaw’ takes its name from a novella by Il’ia Erenburg, *Ottepel’* (The Thaw), published in the journal *Znamia* in 1954.

¹²⁸ Polly Jones, “‘A Symptom of the Times’: Assigning Responsibility for the Stalin Cult in the Soviet Literary Community, 1953–64”, *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 42 (2006), 151–67 (p. 152).

¹²⁹ See, for example, ‘Preodolet’ otstavaniya dramaturgii’, *Pravda*, 7 April 1952, pp. 2–3. For more on the literary crisis of the early 1950s, see Maria Zezina, ‘Crisis in the Union of Soviet Writers in the Early 1950s’, *Europe-Asia Studies*, 46 (1994), 649–61.

¹³⁰ Jones, “‘A Symptom of the Times’”, p. 152.

¹³¹ Woll, *Real Images*, p. 9.

Defining the beginning and the end of the ‘Thaw’ is a complicated task. In her study of Soviet cinema of this period, Josephine Woll demarcates the ‘Thaw’ in film as beginning in 1954 and ending in 1967, within which period there were a number of advances and retrenchments. She attributes the slower reaction to the death of Stalin in Soviet cinema, compared to literature, to the length of time between the initial idea for a screenplay and the finished film.¹³² By 1956 and the time of Khrushchev’s speech, however, a new style of Soviet filmmaking was clearly beginning to emerge. Thematically, greater emphasis was placed on the individual over the collective, and the private and lyrical over the epic. Aesthetically, the influence of Italian neorealism could be detected in the favouring of everyday, unglamourized locations and a documentary-style observation of real life, particularly noticeable, for example, in the work of Marlen Khutsiev.¹³³ Khutsiev, who was born in Tbilisi in 1925, had graduated from VGIK in 1952, whereupon he found work at the Odesa Film Studio. It was there in 1956 that he made *Vesna na Zarechnoi ulitse* (Spring on Zarechnaia Street, co-directed with Feliks Mironer), a film which deals with an individual’s inner journey as she adapts to her new life in an industrial town, where she has been assigned a teaching post. Having just arrived in town during a rainstorm, she is driven through the muddy streets as the camera surveys the factories with smoke billowing out of their chimneys. Later, the camera will explore those factories as she ventures inside during the film’s climactic sequence. Khutsiev followed this film with *Dva Fedora* (The Two Fedors) in 1958, after which he left the Odesa Studio for Moscow.

¹³² Ibid, p. 5.

¹³³ Woll notes that ‘Film professionals, film club members and urban residents generally had easy access to Rossellini’s *Rome – Open City*, De Sica’s *Umberto D.* and *Bicycle Thief* [sic], and to all of De Santis’ films’. Ibid., p. 35.

There, at the Gor'kii Film Studio, Khutsiev began work in 1961 on *Zastava Il'icha* (Il'ich's Gate), which was eventually released in 1965 under the name *Mne dvadtsat' let* (I am Twenty). At first glance there are few similarities between this film, which deals with a group of young Muscovites searching for their own meaning in life in the early 1960s, and Sergei Paradzhanov's *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, also released in 1965 but set in the Carpathian Mountains in the nineteenth century. Upon closer inspection, however, the two films share a number of aesthetic concerns, concerns which would come to characterize the films of the Ukrainian poetic school. An interest in the relationship between fiction and non-fiction, for example, can be discerned in Khutsiev's film through the incorporation of documentary footage, such as can be found during the May-Day parade sequence. Furthermore, the poetry reading scene is a quasi-real event: the filmmakers printed invitations to a poetry evening to which a mass of non-professional actors responded. The handheld camerawork provides a subjective point of view, in which the camera participates in the action, for example during the football match in which the camera falls to the ground with the ball. The film also has an experimental soundtrack in which sounds overlap one another and the relationship between sound and image is explored, for example, through the use of internal monologues. As we will see in the following chapters, *Tini zabutykh predkiv* similarly experiments with the boundaries between fiction and non-fiction, an expressive and mobile camera, and the use of sound. Indeed, a number of parallels can be drawn between Khutsiev and Paradzhanov: both were born in Tbilisi, one year apart; both studied at VGIK under Savchenko; and both found work in the Ukrainian Republic following graduation in 1952. However, in the early years of their careers,

when they were working in the Ukrainian studios – Khutsiev in Odesa and Paradzhanov in Kyiv – their paths began to diverge. Whilst Khutsiev soon found work in which he was able to engage in and develop the ‘Thaw’-era thematics and aesthetics of his contemporaries in Moscow, Paradzhanov was to find the atmosphere at the Dovzhenko Studio in the 1950s less than stimulating.

In 1954, Giuseppe De Santis visited the Dovzhenko Studio during a trip to the Soviet Union.¹³⁴ Whilst the Italian neorealist may well have inspired the studio workers whom he met, it is nevertheless difficult to detect this in the vast majority of the studio’s output around this time. In his doctoral thesis, First provides a comprehensive summary of the debate surrounding the stagnancy in Ukrainian cinema in the late 1950s and early 1960s, one which focused on its perceived ‘theatricality’.¹³⁵ Whilst critics such as Andrii Romitsyn and Myron Bilyns’kyi condemned such anti-realism as emblematic of the late-Stalinist period, others such as Ivan Chabanenko took a more positive view, suggesting that theatricality might be considered a specifically Ukrainian style of filmmaking.¹³⁶ Yet one thing is clear: innovation was lacking at the Dovzhenko Studio. The situation had become so serious that, by the time *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was released, distributors had taken to concealing the name ‘Dovzhenko Studio’ on posters advertising the latest releases;

¹³⁴ Fil’kevych, *Dovzhenkivtsi*, p. 124.

¹³⁵ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, pp. 66–71.

¹³⁶ Ibid.. Chabanenko asks: ‘A ne imeiut li elementy teatral’nosti, v khoroshem smysle etogo slova, pravo na sushchestvovanie v ukrainskoi kinematografii kak spetsificheskie cherty national’nogo iskusstva, porozhdennye national’nymi osobennostiami obrazno-emotsional’nogo vospriiatia iavlenii?’. See I. Chabanenko, ‘Puti ukrainskogo kinoiskusstva’, *Iskusstvo kino*, 1958.10, 111–14 (p. 114).

otherwise, it was feared, audiences would not come.¹³⁷ Elsewhere in other spheres of Ukrainian culture, things were not so dire. A new generation of writers was emerging whose works, in addition to engaging with the ‘Thaw’-era concerns of their counterparts elsewhere in the Soviet Union, revitalized the literary use of Ukrainian, promoting it as a medium for artistic expression. Such writers as Lina Kostenko, Mykola Vinhranovs’kyi, Stus and Dziuba began to have their works published in the late 1950s; by the early 1960s, they were joined by Vasyl’ Symonenko, Ivan Drach and others. These writers were members of the *shistdesiatnyky*, who were particularly concerned with issues of Ukrainian identity, and sought to reconnect with similarly minded movements in the 1920s and before, knowledge of which had effectively been erased from the history books during the 1930s and 1940s.¹³⁸

The problem at the Dovzhenko Studio, as First identifies, lay in the management’s failure to embrace the younger generation and cultivate their creative talents.¹³⁹ In 1957, Paradzhanov wrote an open letter to the managing director of the studio, Davyd Kopytsia, which he copied to the Ukrainian and Soviet Ministries of Culture, and the editor of the journal *Sovetskaia kul'tura*, in which he vented his frustration at the studio’s failure to embrace talented young directors and their new ideas.¹⁴⁰ Paradzhanov had first come to the studio as a student to assist on his teacher

¹³⁷ As reported by Kun during a discussion following a screening of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* in December 1964. RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 528, l. 11.

¹³⁸ Yekelchuk provides a thorough account of the changing historical narratives of Ukraine during the Stalinist period. Ukrainian history was not taught as a separate subject in schools, unlike in other republics where the national history was studied separately. Serhii Yekelchuk, *Stalin’s Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003), pp. 60 & 106.

¹³⁹ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, pp. 98–99.

¹⁴⁰ Sergei Paradzhanov, “‘...Chtoby ne molchat’, berus’ za pero”: Vybrannye mesta iz peregovora s nedrugami i druz’iami’, *Iskusstvo kino*, 1990.12, 32–41 (pp. 32–34).

Ihor Savchenko's films *Tretii udar* (The Third Blow, 1948) and *Taras Shevchenko* (1951). Savchenko also brought along his other pupils, Oleksandr Alov and Vladimir Naumov, as well as Khutsiev, to Kyiv to work on this latter film, which they completed, following their teacher's untimely death. After graduation, Khutsiev went to work in Odesa, whilst Alov and Naumov stayed at the studio to make *Tryvozhna molodist'* (Restless Youth, 1954) and *Pavlo Korchahin* (1956). To varying extents, these films display the young directors' burgeoning concern with 'Thaw'-era aesthetics and suggest that it was within the studio's grasp to embrace this duo and the fresh approach which they might bring. However, dissatisfied with the studio's lack of enthusiasm for more experimental filmmaking, Alov and Naumov returned to Moscow shortly after completing *Pavlo Korchahin*.¹⁴¹ Paradzhanov, meanwhile, had made a full-length version of his diploma film, *Andriiesh* (1954), which he co-directed with Iakov Bazelian. Since then, and until the time of his letter, none of his proposals had been approved, most disappointingly his screenplay for an adaptation of Vladimir Vygovskii's *Ogon' iunogo serdtsa* (The Fire of a Young Heart), on which he had worked for some time.¹⁴² Whilst Paradzhanov did not receive a response to his letter, perhaps an answer of sorts came in the form of his next commission: a highly conventional *kolkhoz* romance, *Pershyi khlopets'* (The First Lad, 1958), with a screenplay by Pavlo Lubens'kyi and Viktor Bezorud'ko. In March 1959, at a conference of cinema-goers in Kyiv, the film, along with two other outputs from the

¹⁴¹ See Larysa Briukhovets'ka, "‘Viina kul'tur’ chy zahroza asimiliatsii? Ukrain's'ke poetychne kino iak faktor national'noho samostverzhennia', in *Naukovi zapysky: Tom 75: Teoriia ta istoriia kul'tury*, ed. by V. S. Briukhovets'kyi and others (Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylians'ka Akademiia, 2008), pp. 77–84 (p. 79).

¹⁴² Paradzhanov, "...Chtoby ne molchat", pp. 32–34.

Dovzhenko Studio, was heavily criticized (not without justification) for being unconvincing and lacking truth.¹⁴³

Around this time, preparations were underway for the forthcoming ten-day festival of Ukrainian literature and art (Dekada ukrainskoi literatury i iskusstva) to be held in Moscow in November 1960. The need to improve the reputation of Ukrainian cinema was particularly pressing. At a meeting between the studio, the Ukrainian Minister of Culture (Rostyslav Babiichuk), and the SPKU, there was only one question to discuss: how to raise the quality of Ukrainian films, in particular for the festival?¹⁴⁴ In the end, eight of the ten films chosen for the festival were produced at the Dovzhenko Studio. Several of these films were reasonably successful at the box office: *Roman i Francheska* (Roman and Francesca, 1960, directed by Denysenko), *Oleksa Dovbush* and *Krov' liuds'ka ne vodytsia* (Where Human Blood is not Found, 1960, directed by Mykola Makarenko) each attracted over twenty million viewers following their release onto Soviet screens.¹⁴⁵ Despite their relative success, these films did not serve to restore the studio's reputation as a centre for innovative filmmaking.

The complaints voiced in Paradzhanov's letter of 1957 were still being echoed in January 1962 when a letter from the Dovzhenko Studio Komsomol was published in *Komsomol'skaia pravda*.¹⁴⁶ The letter, which was written in response to an earlier article in the same paper by Nataliia Kolesnikova which criticized the studio for its

¹⁴³ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 92, l. 17.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., l. 37.

¹⁴⁵ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 3, d. 33, l. 17.

¹⁴⁶ V. Repiakh and others, 'Molodye za ekranom: Komsomol'tsy otvechaiut na kritiku gazety. A chto dumaiut rukovoditeli studii imeni Dovzhenko?', *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 31 January 1962, p. 2.

failure to embrace the creative youth, acknowledged this critique, emphasizing the failure of the studio, whose managing director had changed four times in the last eight years, to nurture young people's creative talent.¹⁴⁷ Work was given to the same directors and writers (that is to say, the war generation) whilst the younger generation were overlooked, or else, like Alov and Naumov, forced to find stimulation elsewhere. The *Komsomol'skaia pravda* article was referred to by Ivan Py'rev in his address to the Organizational Committee of the SK at the Fourth Plenum in February 1962.¹⁴⁸ In his speech, Py'rev stressed the importance of making films on a contemporary theme, and for screenplay writers to go out onto location, to the towns, collective farms or construction sites, so that they might see what was going on in their country. He also highlighted the need to improve the native cadres at the republican studios. In particular the Dovzhenko Studio came under repeated attack by Py'rev, who stressed that, for some time now, things at the studio had been far from how its namesake would have liked them to be.¹⁴⁹ Noting the absence of a serious response to the article in *Komsomol'skaia pravda* by members of the SPKU, he continued: 'Malo na ukrainskikh studiakh, v Orgbiuro Soiuzu i v Ministerstve kul'tury Ukrainy podlinnoi zaboty o talantakh, o privilechenii molodykh, odarenykh liudei v kino.'¹⁵⁰ When Vasy'l Vasy'l'ovych Tsvirkunov was appointed to the role of managing director at the Dovzhenko Studio in April 1962, he was thus faced with a considerable challenge.

¹⁴⁷ N. Kolesnikova, 'Po doroge na ekran', *ibid.*, 12 December 1961, p. 4.

¹⁴⁸ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 151, l. 140. Py'rev headed the Organizational Committee of the SK, which was established in 1957.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, l. 62.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, ll. 140–41.

Tsvirkunov, however, turned out to be the right man for the job. Born in 1917 in a village in the Zaporizhian steppe, Tsvirkunov graduated from the Voroshilovhrads'kyi Institute (now Luhans'k) before volunteering to serve at the front during the war, where he suffered near fatal injuries and the loss of a leg.¹⁵¹ After the war, having graduated from the Academy of Social Sciences in Moscow, he worked as a literary editor for a number of Kyiv journals, before his appointment at the Dovzhenko Studio. Belonging to a different generation than the *shistdesiatnyky*, he was nonetheless, as Trymbach states, 'one of them'.¹⁵² This affiliation was cemented by his marriage to Lina Kostenko in the mid-1960s. Tsvirkunov set about changing the atmosphere at the studio so that it would be an attractive place for young graduates to work. He travelled to Moscow in order to persuade the Ukrainians studying there to work in Kyiv after graduating.¹⁵³ In many ways, Tsvirkunov's task was assisted by the fortuitous timing of other personnel changes elsewhere in Ukrainian cultural politics. In 1963, the State Committee for Cinematography (Goskino) was re-established and its Ukrainian counterpart (Derzhkino) placed under the direction of Sviatoslav Ivanov. Later, Kostenko would recall the close relationship between these two prominent figures in Ukrainian cinema of the 1960s:

Vony byly duzhe rizni, ale povazhaly i rozumily odyh odnoho. Vony dobre trymaly oboronu ukrains'koho kino v umovakh totalitarnoho rezhymu i chasto ishly na proryv. [...] Iak posadovi osoby, S. P. Ivanov i V. V. Tsvirkunov ofitsiino perepysuvalys', hovoryly movoiu postanov i rishen'. A iak khoroshi poriadni khloptsi vony prosto chesno pratsiuvaly. Buvalo navit' tak, shcho

¹⁵¹ Lina Kostenko, 'Narodzhenni pid znakom Stril'tsia', *Kino-Teatr*, 2002.2, <<http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/2002/2/index.htm>> [accessed 12 February 2012].

¹⁵² 'Vin nalezhav do inshoho pokolinnia, vlasne bat'kiv, odnache buv svoim' (he belonged to a different generation, to that of their parents, but he was one of them). See Serhii Trymbach, 'Vasyl' Vasyl'ovych', *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, 49 (21 December 2002), <http://dt.ua/CULTURE/vasil_vasilovich-30555.html> [accessed 12 February 2012].

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*. See also Briukhovets'ka, *Ivan Mykolaichuk*, pp. 14–15.

holova Komitetu Derzhkino URSR vyklykav nekerovanoho dyrektora kinostudii, oholoshuvav iomu dohany za nevykonannia abo porushennia iakois' vkazivky TsK, pohrozhuvav sanktsiiamy, a sam smiiavsia ochyma, i v tsilkovytomu vzaiemorozuminni vony rozkhodylysia pratsiuvaty dali.¹⁵⁴

Also in 1963, Petro Shelest became First Secretary of the Communist Party of Ukraine. During his nine years in office, Shelest would earn himself a reputation as a defender of Ukrainian culture, for example by choosing to speak in Ukrainian at public events in contrast to his predecessors and successors.¹⁵⁵ These three figures, Tsvirkunov, Ivanov and Shelest, appointed within a few months of one another, would all play an important part in supporting the new style of filmmaking which emerged at the studio and was heralded by the release of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

Only a few months before Shelest took office, in February 1963, a conference on the Ukrainian language was held in Kyiv by the State University and the Institute for Linguistics. Attracting an audience of over six hundred people, many of whom were not professional linguists, the conference became a focal point for debate about the status of the Ukrainian language.¹⁵⁶ The language situation in Ukraine has its own protracted history which falls outside the scope of this thesis. However, as integral to

¹⁵⁴ 'They were very different but they respected and understood one another. They maintained a good defence of Ukrainian cinema under a totalitarian regime and often had breakthroughs. [...] In their professional capacities, S. P. Ivanov and V. V. Tsvirkunov corresponded officially and spoke the language of decrees and decisions. But as good, decent lads they simply worked honestly. There were even times when the head of the Derzhkino Committee summoned the uncontrollable director of the film studio, reprimanded him for the non-fulfilment or violation of some order of the TsK [Central Committee], threatened sanctions, all the while smiling with his eyes, and in complete mutual understanding they went their separate ways to carry on working.' Kostenko, 'Narozhnyi pid znakom'.

¹⁵⁵ Yekelchik, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, p. 160.

¹⁵⁶ For further information, see Viktor Hrabovs'kyi, 'Nepokora – 1963: Zabuttiu pidliahaie?', *Telekritika*, 15 February 2008, <<http://telekritika.ua/view/2008-02-15/36523>> [accessed 25 January 2012]. The authorities, however, did not respond to the call to designate Ukrainian as a state language. See *Movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini: Mizh konfliktom i konsensusom*, ed. by O. M. Maiboroda and others (Kyiv: Instytut Politychnykh i Etnonatsional'nykh doslidzhen' im. I. F. Kurasa, Natsional'na Akademiia Nauk Ukrainy, 2008), p. 26.

the cultural background of the time, certain developments must be taken into account. As noted above, the *shistdesiatnyky* promoted the beauty of the Ukrainian language as a literary medium. Correspondingly, the publication of material in the Ukrainian language increased during this time. Originally conceived of during the period of ‘Ukrainianization’ in the 1920s, the project to produce a multi-volume dictionary of the Ukrainian language was revived in the late 1950s; and between 1959 and 1965, a Ukrainian encyclopaedia was finally published, followed by a six-volume history of Ukrainian art (1966–70) and an eight-volume history of Ukrainian literature (1967–71).¹⁵⁷ With regard to cinema, the dearth of Ukrainian language publications (in the twenty years following the closure of the Ukrainian film journal *Kino* in 1936 not a single work of film criticism had been printed in Ukrainian) had finally been addressed by 1960 with the establishment of *Novyny kinoekrana*.¹⁵⁸ Of course, the language situation also affected the films themselves. Since the mid-1950s, concerns had been voiced about the lack of Ukrainian-language films being produced at the studio, yet by the early 1960s little progress had been made: in 1962, for example, only one film was shot entirely in Ukrainian.¹⁵⁹ However, the problem was not only related to the language in which the film was shot; it also concerned the language in which the film was distributed.

In general, films tended to be dubbed, not subtitled, in the Soviet Union.¹⁶⁰

The justifications for this were outlined in a resolution prepared by the dubbing

¹⁵⁷ Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, pp. 704–05.

¹⁵⁸ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, p. 76.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

¹⁶⁰ Only in the Baltic Republics was there a preference for subtitled rather than dubbed films. RGALI, f. 2936, op. 4, d. 1287, l. 76. Recent studies suggest that there is little to distinguish dubbing and subtitling in terms of the benefits and drawbacks which each method brings.

commission of the SK, following a meeting in February 1960, and included the following: subtitles ruin the image and are illegible on light backgrounds; a significant portion of viewers are unable to read them due to the speed with which they are presented; and most cinemas and clubs do not have a raised floor, meaning that only the front row are able to see the subtitles.¹⁶¹ (Whilst audience members sitting in the front row generously read aloud the subtitles for those at the back, this did not necessarily solve the problem; as one participant at a plenum devoted to dubbing in 1969 bemoaned, the dialogue was inevitably read with an awful intonation!)¹⁶² Against this background, the 1960 resolution advocated that the Soviet Minister of Culture only authorize subtitling for films of a musical genre (film-operas and musical comedies) or in those instances where the dubbing of the film would be particularly problematic.¹⁶³

Film dubbing was a considerable industry. In 1959, around three hundred films were dubbed in the Soviet Union, generating a revenue of over four billion roubles.¹⁶⁴ By 1969, the number of dubbed films had risen to around six hundred a year.¹⁶⁵ Films that were produced by a republican studio and authorized for release onto all-Soviet screens would need to be dubbed – into Russian, the ‘language of

Preferences tend to be based simply on that to which one is accustomed. See Cees M. Koolstra, Allerd L. Peeters and Herman Spinhof, ‘The Pros and Cons of Dubbing and Subtitling’, *European Journal of Communication*, 17 (2002), 325–54; and Bartholomäus Wissmath, David Weibel and Rudolf Groner, ‘Dubbing or Subtitling? Effects on Spatial Presence, Transportation, Flow, and Enjoyment’, *Journal of Media Psychology*, 21.3 (2009), 114–25.

¹⁶¹ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 452, l. 14.

¹⁶² RGALI, f. 2936, op. 4, d. 1287, l. 51.

¹⁶³ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 452, l. 14.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 11.

¹⁶⁵ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 4, d. 1287, l. 13. These figures presumably take account of individual films being dubbed into several languages, and do not represent the overall number of films being produced that year in the Soviet Union, which was considerably lower.

interethnic communication' (iazuk mezhnatsional'nogo obshcheniia), and possibly into the languages of the other republics. Similarly, Russian-language films might also be dubbed into the republican languages. In the 1950s and 1960s, the extent to which the republican studios were equipped to deal with dubbing varied enormously. A lack of resources meant that republican studios often resorted to *nagovarivanie*, in which the translated dialogue was recorded by a single, monotonous voice.¹⁶⁶ In cinemas of the Georgian Republic, the practice of *zhivoi dubliazh* was not uncommon, whereby a live commentator would translate the dialogue directly from the screen.¹⁶⁷ The Dovzhenko Studio had begun to dub films by the end of the Second World War. In 1945, ten films were dubbed at the studio, seven of which were dubbed into Ukrainian, with other languages including Polish and Moldavian.¹⁶⁸ Films produced by the studio may originally have been recorded in Russian, and then subsequently dubbed into Ukrainian for internal distribution. Alternatively, the film may originally have been recorded in Ukrainian and subsequently dubbed into Russian for release. In practice, it was more likely to be the former.¹⁶⁹ But in any case, the Ukrainian versions of the films were not necessarily widely distributed and tended only to be shown in western Ukraine.¹⁷⁰

As Makarenko explained in an article for *Sovetskaia Ukraina* in 1961, the dubbing policy directly affected the films that were produced. He recalled a

¹⁶⁶ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 452, l. 12.

¹⁶⁷ Interview with Levan Kuparadze, Georgian Film Studios (Tbilisi, 17 November 2011).

¹⁶⁸ Fil'kevych, *Dovzhenkivtsi*, pp. 120–21.

¹⁶⁹ Roman Balaian, personal communication (25 June 2010). It is important to be aware of the existence of other versions of republican films and for researchers to specify whether their analysis is based on the original variant.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*.

conversation with a director at the Dovzhenko Studio, a recent VGIK graduate, who said:

Ved' ia delaiu fil'm ne tol'ko dlia Ukrainy, no, glavnoe, dlia Soiuzu. A poetomu zachem delat' osnovnym variantom – ukrainskii? S tem, chtoby s nego delat' posredstvenniu russkuu kopiu? Luchshe sdelat' naoborot – s osnovnogo russkogo delat' kopiiu ukrainskogo.¹⁷¹

It also led to some rather absurd situations, such as the following incident in which a director was given a screenplay by Vasyl' Zemliak, full of living characters and their wonderful language and *byt*.

- Perevedite na russkii iazyk! – komanduet rezhisser Navrotskii, kotoromu veshch' prigianulas'.
Pereveli.
- Priglasite akterov iz Moskvy, ia ikh znaiu, oni menia ne podvedut, sygraiut!
Sygrali.
- Teper' perevedite na ukrainskii...

Ne budem utochniat' – dlia kogo neobkhodimo delat' perevod s perevoda. Vo vsiakom sluchae, ne dlia tekh, o kom i dlia kogo pisal Zemliak svoiu knigu. Dvoinoi perevod! Iz-za togo, chto rezhisser za piat'nadtsat' let raboty na Ukraine ne priblizilsia i na rasstoianie pushechnogo vystrela k zhizni, kul'ture i iazyku naroda, kul'turu kotorogo on prizvan dvigat' vpered!¹⁷²

It is against this background of cultural change at the Soviet, republican and studio levels that *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was produced. With hindsight, it may well seem that the time was ripe for a 'new wave' at the Dovzhenko Studio. Yet few then would have anticipated that it would be this film that would signal such a movement. Filmmakers at the time were under pressure to produce works on a contemporary theme, yet this was a fairly routine literary adaptation.¹⁷³ The idea to make the film

¹⁷¹ Nikolai Makarenko, 'Gliadia v koren', *Sovetskaia Ukraina*, 1961.1, 109–35 (p. 118).

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 119–20.

¹⁷³ The importance of producing films on a contemporary theme was much discussed at meetings of the Organizational Bureau of the SPKU in the early 1960s. RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 92. The pressure to create works on contemporary Ukrainian life was raised during the

arose in a letter to the Dovzhenko Studio from Kotsiubyns'kyi's daughter, in which she suggested the adaptation of the story in commemoration of the upcoming centenary of her father's birth. The letter fell into the hands of the Dovzhenko Studio editor, Renata Korol', who was working on a screenplay by Ivan Chendei at the time. Korol' suggested to the studio management that Chendei take up the Kotsiubyns'kyi adaptation instead, together with Paradzhanov.¹⁷⁴ It was Korol' who had originally suggested to Paradzhanov that he might work on the screenplay by Vygovskii, about which he had written in his open letter of 1957, and which, as we know, came to nothing.¹⁷⁵ Subsequently, Korol' worked with Paradzhanov on the film *Kvitka na kameni* (The Flower on the Stone), which was released in 1962. Yet the decision to assign the adaptation of a Ukrainian classic to Paradzhanov was not necessarily an obvious one for the studio. Born in Georgia to Armenian parents, Paradzhanov had been working in Kyiv since graduating from VGIK in 1952, where he had studied under Savchenko and, later, Dovzhenko. When the studio's artistic council met to discuss the film following its completion, one participant admitted to having been worried about how Paradzhanov would be able to make this adaptation of a Ukrainian classic, coming as he did 'from other mountains, and other places' (z inshykh hir, z inshykh mists').¹⁷⁶ In any case, Paradzhanov's output thus far had not given any particular reason to suspect that he would provide Ukrainian cinema with the new direction it was seeking. Nonetheless, it is worth considering briefly these earlier

discussion of *Oleksa Dovbush* by the studio's artistic council. TsDAMLMU, f. 655, op. 1, d. 98, l. 19.

¹⁷⁴ Volodymyr Luhovs'kyi, *S. Paradzhanov: Tini zabutykh predkiv rozkadrovyky: Nevidomyi maestro* (Kyiv: Akademiia, 1998), p. 29.

¹⁷⁵ Paradzhanov, "...Chtoby ne molchat", p. 32.

¹⁷⁶ TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1750, l. 104.

works for the hints which they provide, upon closer inspection (and with the benefit of hindsight), of the aesthetic concerns which would come to the fore in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

Shades of *Shadows* in Paradzhanov's Early Work¹⁷⁷

Paradzhanov's first film for the studio, *Andriiesh* (1954), was a full-length version of his graduation piece, *Moldavskaia skazka* (A Moldavian Fairytale), which he had made under Dovzhenko's tutelage, and which had been shot outside the studio using puppet dolls. Paradzhanov would later describe this short-length film as 'the only one of my past works of whose imperfection I am not ashamed'.¹⁷⁸ Following Dovzhenko's advice, Paradzhanov went to Kyiv to make a full-length version with live actors. *Andriiesh* is a fantasy film, made for children, and based on a narrative poem by the Moldavian writer Emilian Bukov. Written in 1946, Bukov's poem is inspired by Moldavian folk tales, and tells of the adventures of a young shepherd, Andriiesh, who dreams of becoming a heroic knight (*bogatyri*). Andriiesh is given a magic flute by the *bogatyri* Voinovan, in which are stored many beautiful songs. This music enrages the evil sorcerer Chernyi Vikhr', who cannot bear to hear such happiness. He wreaks havoc on the community, stealing their sheep, stealing their music, and kidnapping Voinovan's sweetheart, Liana. Andriiesh sets out to recover his

¹⁷⁷ Researching films from the Soviet republics presents its own particular problems with regard to accessing the material. Unless otherwise stated, the analysis provided in this thesis is based on the Ukrainian version of films produced at the Dovzhenko Studio. The following analysis of *Andriiesh*, *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia*, and *Kvitka na kameni* is based on the Russian-language version of the films, and so the dialogue and characters' names are given in Russian. Nonetheless, for consistency, the films are referred to by their Ukrainian titles, as is the case throughout the thesis when referring to work produced at the Dovzhenko Studio.

¹⁷⁸ '[...] edinstvennaia iz moikh proshlykh rabot, nesovershenstva kotoroi ia ne styzhus.'

Sergei Paradzhanov, 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1966.1, 60–66 (p. 60).

flock, meeting a number of unusual characters on the way, who assist him in his quest. Eventually, Andriesh reaches the stone fortress of Chernyi Vikhr' where, with Voinovan's help, good triumphs over evil.

At times, one might be forgiven for failing to note any difference between the actors in *Andriesh* and their puppet predecessors. The overt theatricality of the performances may strike the modern viewer as wooden and unconvincing, in contrast to the vibrancy and authenticity of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Filmed largely in the studio, *Andriesh* fails to convey any real sense of the Moldavian community, whose tales and folklore inspired the original poem. This shortcoming did not go unnoticed by Moldavian viewers: in May 1955 the newspaper *Sovetskaia Moldaviia* printed a number of letters which welcomed this first adaptation of Moldavian literature, but expressed disappointment in its portrayal of the local landscape and way of life.¹⁷⁹ Nevertheless, *Andriesh* remains an important marker in Paradzhanov's oeuvre and reveals several of the interests which would come to prominence in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. In particular, through his choice of actors for *Andriesh*, Paradzhanov evinced some concern with maintaining a link between the story, its place of origin, and the cast. A number of Moldavian theatre actors were cast, including Chiril Știrbu, who plays Pakala, and Eugeniu Ureche, who plays the giant. Following a lengthy search for an actor to play the role of Andriesh, Paradzhanov eventually found Kostia Russu in a Kishinev school. The use of rhymed dialogue (which was pioneered by Savchenko in his 1934 film *Garmon'* (The Accordion)) can thus be seen as an early attempt by Paradzhanov to create a link between filmic adaption and literary source, and the importance of the acoustic world in such a project. The connection between

¹⁷⁹ *Sovetskaia Moldaviia*, 29 May 1955 (page unknown).

local culture and local sound is dealt with thematically in *Andriiesh*: the heart of the community is located in its music. As we shall see in Chapter Four, this connection will be developed cinematically in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Although Bukov was involved in writing the screenplay, it must be noted that the actors are speaking Russian verse, composed by Vadim Korostylev, and the soundtrack is at times overpowered by a conventional film score.¹⁸⁰

Paradzhanov later said that this work ‘[...] iarko vyrazila otsutstvie opyta, masterstva i khoroshego vkusa. I eto bylo, k neschast’iu, tol’ko nachalom.’¹⁸¹ Following *Andriiesh*, Paradzhanov directed the aforementioned *Pershyi khlopets'*, which failed to convince audiences, followed by a number of short documentaries (*Kapela “Dumka”* (The “Dumka” Choir, 1959), *Nataliia Uzhvii* (1960) and *Zoloti ruky* (Golden Hands, 1960, co-directed with two others)). In 1960, his next feature film, *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia* (Ukrainian Rhapsody) was released, attracting an audience of fourteen million viewers.¹⁸² This film tells the story of Oksana, a talented singer who leaves her native village by the Dnipro to study at the conservatoire in Kyiv. When war breaks out she is no longer able to sing and, much to the distress of her teacher (who is played by the celebrated Ukrainian actress Nataliia Uzhvii, about whom Paradzhanov had made his earlier documentary film), she leaves her studies to work as a nurse. Oksana’s childhood sweetheart, Anton, serves at the front during the war and, although they lose touch, they hold onto the belief that one day they will be reunited. Accordingly, shortly after the war, when Oksana is returning from her

¹⁸⁰ It may be the case that the Moldavian Republic screened a dubbed version of the film. Nonetheless, it is clear that by 1964 a different stance towards language is adopted for *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

¹⁸¹ Paradzhanov, ‘Vechnoe dvizhenie’, p. 61.

¹⁸² RGALI, f. 2936, op. 3, d. 33, l. 17.

victory at a singing contest in Western Europe, she meets Anton, who is also making his way home, and they continue their journey together.

Whilst the film breaks little new ground in terms of its portrayal of the Soviet war experience, its fundamental concern is with the power of music to transcend boundaries. Filled with excerpts from the classical repertoire, it importantly places Ukrainian traditional folk song within this canon. Thus we can trace Paradzhanov's interest in folk material, noted already in *Andriiusha*, to *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia* as well. The film opens with Oksana's recollection of having just won an international vocalist competition, at which she performed the aria 'Il dolce suono' (The Sweet Sound) from Donizetti's opera *Lucia di Lammermoor*. Having been awarded the first prize, she asks to perform a song which her father used to sing with her as a child in her native Ukrainian village. This song is 'Zore moia vechirniaia' (My Evening Star), a folk song composed by Hordii Hladkyi to the words of a poem by Taras Shevchenko. Notwithstanding all the wonders of the classical repertoire that are heard in the film, it is this song that lies at the heart of the film and, one assumes, at the heart of Ukraine.¹⁸³ As the song, which is sung in Ukrainian,¹⁸⁴ is heard, the viewer is presented with an image of Oksana as a child handing her elderly, bedridden father a

¹⁸³ In another scene, the singing of the popular folk song 'Rozpriahaite, khloptsi, koni' constitutes a stance of independence as it encourages and assists Soviet (Ukrainian) prisoners of war to escape from their German captor.

¹⁸⁴ When films were dubbed into Russian for all-Union release, songs were generally kept in the original language, possibly for reasons of practicality (so that only the dialogue track required dubbing) but, arguably, also to provide some local flavour. In this sense, music provided one route by means of which the Ukrainian language could be heard in film. This topic requires greater consideration by researchers, as does the issue of republican filmmaking and the role of dubbing more generally.

kobza (or possibly, its modern-day equivalent, a *bandura*).¹⁸⁵ This lyre-like instrument is associated with the traditional Ukrainian wandering minstrel, the *kobzar*, after whom a collection of Shevchenko's poems is famously named. The *kobzari*, and their fellow musicians, the *lirnyky*, were blind musicians who earned their living by singing traditional songs that had been passed down from generation to generation. Paradzhanov's interest in these blind musicians is developed in his later work *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, and will be discussed in Chapter Four. The theme of blindness is, however, also touched upon in *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia*. When Oksana is serving as a nurse during the war, she accompanies a wounded soldier to a ballet performance of *Peer Gynt*. As she is describing the performance to the soldier, who has bandages covering his eyes, he stops her with the words: 'I see!' The power of Grieg's music has enabled him to see with his ears – something which again, as will be examined further in Chapter Four, resonates with Paradzhanov's later work. The importance of the aural sense, over and above the visual, is highlighted in the opening scenes at the competition during which the contestants are instructed to sing from behind a curtain, so that only their voices may be perceived by the audience. Later, as Oksana remembers her blossoming romance with Anton, we see the couple by the Dnipro, whereupon Anton says:

Znaesh', inogda mne kazhetsia, chto u rastenii est' dusha. Oni byvaiut veselye, zadumchivye, dazhe pevuchie. Ty zamechala kogda zreet rozh' i pshenitsa oni poiut kak stogolosnyi khor. A kogda tsvetet grechka, pole zvenit kak orkestr. Vot tak, zakroesh' glaza i slushaesh'.

¹⁸⁵ Natalie Kononenko explains the difference between the *bandura* and its predecessor the *kobza* in terms of shape: the former has a distinctive asymmetrical shape, as opposed to the latter's symmetry. See Natalie Kononenko, *Ukrainian Minstrels: And the Blind Shall Sing* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998), p. 154. The angle in which the instrument is held in *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia* makes it difficult to determine the shape.

This notion of hearing the landscape is one that will be returned to in Chapter Four. Clearly then, as is evident by the title, the film is above all concerned with sound and with music, concerns which Paradzhanov returned to and developed in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Interestingly, the same sound operator – Sofiia Serhienko – worked on both these films with Paradzhanov. There are a number of other features which link these two films, such as the use of local non-professional cast members. In the opening credits of *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia*, we are told that residents of a collective farm in Buchak took part in the film, as did a number of Soviet soldiers. When Paradzhanov came to make *Tini zabutykh predkiv* in 1964, this use of non-professionals formed an integral part of the film. In this later film, Paradzhanov would explore the issue of memory – something which is also evident in *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia*. The opening sequence establishes that the entire film is constructed as a memory, and at times there are even memories within memories. The first words heard in the film, spoken by Oksana, are:

Druz'ia moi, rovesniki moi, ia khochu, chtoby vy uslyshali menia. I to, chto proizoshlo so mnoi, prinadlezhit ne tol'ko mne.

These words raise three points of commonality between this film and *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, all of which will be important aspects of our analysis of the latter work. Firstly, in her request, Oksana highlights for us the importance of listening and of the aural sense, which we have noted above. In addition, she suggests that her story and her memories are to be extended to others; we are invited to claim her story as our own. Finally, the words form part of a voice-over narration which Oksana shares with Anton, which displays an interest in the use of off-screen sound which will be developed in Paradzhanov's later film.

After the moderate success of *Ukrains'ka rapsodiia*, Paradzhanov's next film was *Kvitka na kameni*. This film had a troubled history. Originally entitled *Tak nikhto ne kokhav* (No one has Loved Like This), the film's production began in 1960 under the direction of Ukrainian filmmaker and documentarist Anatolii Slisarenko. During the filming of a fire scene, however, actress Inna Burduchenko, who plays Khristina in the film, was badly burned, and later died in hospital as a result of her injuries. Slisarenko was relieved of his responsibilities, and the film was passed to Paradzhanov for completion. The extent to which *Kvita na kameni* can be credited to Paradzhanov is therefore open to debate. The storyline involving Burduchenko's character is fully elaborated in the film, suggesting that much, if not all, of the material had been shot before Paradzhanov's arrival on set. Perhaps this late involvement in the film contributed to the lack of enthusiasm with which he purportedly approached its production. Whilst on set, Paradzhanov is said to have stated repeatedly that 'this will be the latest bad film from the Kyiv studio'.¹⁸⁶ It seems that the authorities agreed with him: at a meeting of the SPKU in January 1963, the first secretary Timofei Levchuk lambasted the film, criticizing its 'greyness'.¹⁸⁷

At first glance, the film is as conventional as Levchuk indicates. Set in the Donbas area of eastern Ukraine, the story concerns the construction of a small mining town. The arrival of a Pentecostal religious sect threatens to disturb the community which is being established, and two separate plotlines are developed through which this confrontation is played out. Newly arrived in the town, Khristina joins the sect,

¹⁸⁶ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 3, d. 33, l. 48.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, ll. 12–13 & 16.

but eventually breaks free from its grasp, with the help of Arsen, a young man who has fallen in love with her, and Liuda, the leader of the local Komsomol. Liuda's own romance with the brigadier of the mine, Grigorii Griva, forms the basis of the second storyline, in which the film's title is explained. The flower on the stone is a fossil which has been discovered in the Donbas region and is on display in the local museum. During a trip to the museum, the fossil captures the imagination of a young Komsomol member. In the museum we also hear a guide relay the story of how coal was first found in the area by Grigorii Kapustin in 1723. When Griva hears his friends discuss the trip it prompts a reverie in which he presents Peter the Great with a piece of coal which bears the fossilized imprint of a flower.

Whilst the portrayal of the Komsomol as they enthusiastically set about building and working in the mine is exhilarating, it is not new, and there is little to indicate that this is taking place in anything other than an idealized Soviet space. It comes as little surprise to learn that the residents of the Donbas found little with which to identify when they saw the film.¹⁸⁸ Furthermore, the relationship between Liuda and Griva is highly reminiscent of the, by then outdated, *kolkhoz* romance of the Stalinist period. In its thematic concerns and stereotypical characterizations, *Kvitka na kameni* did not provide the Dovzhenko Studio with the new direction it was seeking. Nonetheless, there is a freshness and vitality to the cinematography on occasion, which Levchuk failed to credit. In particular, one might highlight the scene in which Griva walks through the town, before reaching the flat he has been allocated as a reward for his hard work at the mine. As he wanders down the street, the camera's gaze is freed from the narrative to roam over the daily life that is passing by.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., l. 48.

Ordinary men and women, and a group of schoolchildren, are observed going about their normal routine. As the camera drifts over their faces, we see that they occasionally look directly back at us. Perhaps this has something to do with Slisarenko's background in documentary film, but additionally, the influence of Italian neorealism might here be detected.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of pinpointing Paradzhanov's particular input into the film, *Kvitka na kameni* is an interesting example of the director's engagement with the industrial environment of eastern Ukraine. Better known for his subsequent work based on legends, customs and traditions, in this film Paradzhanov shows us a more modern and urban life. The action unfolds against a backdrop of shop windows, telephone boxes, and electricity pylons, and the soundtrack includes popular hits such as 'Mambo Italiano'. At the same time, however, we hear Ukrainian folk songs, and the section involving Griva's fantasy about the flower on the stone might well be traced to Paradzhanov's interest in cultural heritage. Furthermore, the film continues to develop Paradzhanov's concern with memory and might be regarded as a study of the relationship between past and present. Notwithstanding the negative portrayal of the sect, the film highlights the continued existence of the Pentecostals, who had been heavily persecuted during the 1930s. The character of Varchenko, the old man in charge of the mine, is acutely aware of time. At one point, he even asks in jest whether Liuda knows in what year she is living. When he is driving along the road listening to a radio broadcast concerning recent nuclear tests conducted by the United States – a clear indication of the present time – he comes across Arsen and Griva in a brawl and reminds them that he did not lose two sons in the war so that they might

fight amongst themselves. In this way, the film reminds us that our past determines our present, and we must take our knowledge of it into the future – as symbolized by the flower on the stone, a fossil which is, after all, the imprint of the past in the present. In this way, *Kvitka na kameni* touches on the issue of time and memory, which, as we will see in Chapter Two, is investigated in greater complexity in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

Making Shadows

In 1962, the same year that *Kvitka na kameni* was released, Korol' suggested that Paradzhanov might work on the adaptation of Kotsiubyns'kyi's novella, together with Chendei. The resultant film, *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, would elaborate through cinematic means concerns with time and memory, with sound, and with the relationship between people and the space in which they live – concerns which, as we have seen, can be detected to varying degrees in Paradzhanov's earlier works. He would be assisted in this creative task by an extraordinary collective of like-minded and talented artists, whose collaboration resulted in a film which, as Georgii Pobedonostsev remarked, at a meeting to discuss the work in December 1964, is 'made as if in one breath' (sdelanoi na odnom dykhanii).¹⁸⁹

The film follows Kotsiubyns'kyi's text fairly closely. It tells the story of Ivan Paliichuk, a Hutsul shepherd from the Carpathian village of Kryvorivnia. The Hutsuls are a mountain-dwelling community, and their customs and traditions form a backdrop to the storyline. Structured around the cycle of human life, the film follows Ivan from his childhood years to adulthood, showing his work as a shepherd, his

¹⁸⁹ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 528, l. 23.

marriage and, ultimately, his death. In the opening scene, young Ivan witnesses the death of his brother, Oleksa, who has been crushed by a falling tree in the forest. With Oleksa only just buried, Ivan goes to church with his parents, Petro and Anna. Outside the church a number of Hutsuls are gathered at a parish fair, selling their wares and generally making merry. Inside the church, a fight breaks out between Petro and Onufrii, head of the Huteniuk household with whom the Paliichuks have a long-standing family feud. The fight spills outside where Ivan watches as his father is killed by Huteniuk's axe. These two deaths, occurring in such a short space of time, present the viewer with a parallel between the unpredictable nature of the Hutsul community, known for its volatility, and that of the surrounding environment in which they live. It is during the axe fight that Ivan first meets Marichka, the daughter of Onufrii Huteniuk, and so begins the central love story that has led to comparisons with *Romeo and Juliet*.¹⁹⁰ Having played together as children, Ivan and Marichka find their relationship blossoming into romance as young adults. However, Ivan has to leave the village for the summer in order to find work as a shepherd, high up in the mountain pastures. Having parted from Marichka, who, it is implied, is pregnant, Ivan joins a group of shepherds, led by the *vatah* (chief shepherd). We follow the shepherds' daily routine in the pastures, watching them prepare the traditional *brynza* cheese, for example, and listening with Ivan to their tales about the Chornohora mountain range. Late one night, or in the early hours of the morning, as the shepherds are herding their flock down the mountain, Marichka finds a lamb lost in the forest. Having rescued the animal, she loses her footing and slips, falling to her death in the river below. When Ivan learns of Marichka's death, he searches for her body, which

¹⁹⁰ Paradzhanov, for example, makes this comparison in 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', p. 65.

he eventually finds washed up onshore by the river. There follows a series of short black-and-white scenes which depict Ivan over the course of several years, accompanied by off-screen voices that comment upon the action on-screen. Colour is brought back into Ivan's life, and onto our screens, when he meets Palahna, a sensual young woman whom he decides to marry. After the wedding ceremony, we watch Ivan and Palahna go about their daily tasks, reaping grass and making haystacks. Ivan's passion for his wife appears to have subdued somewhat. During the Christmas festivities, Palahna is accosted by the *mol'far* (sorcerer) Iura, although she resists his advances. Ivan witnesses the struggle, but appears unconcerned, and his thoughts turn instead to Marichka. In spring, Palahna steals outside at dawn to perform a fertility ritual naked in the fields. Iura stumbles upon Palahna, whom he again tries, and fails, to seduce. Shortly afterwards, however, Palahna is impressed when Iura attempts to divert a storm with his sorcery and she succumbs to his charms. One evening at the tavern, Ivan is alerted to Palahna's flirting with Iura and a fight breaks out. Ivan is struck by Iura's axe and, wounded, he staggers to the forest where he meets Marichka (or a *niavka* (wood nymph) in Marichka's form) and also meets his death. The final sequence depicts Ivan's wake, during which Palahna performs the *holosinnia* (lamentations) and the youngsters enjoy the various traditional funeral games.

The film launched a number of careers, including those of the cameraman, Iurii Illienko, and the composer, Mykola Skoryk, whose knowledge of the local music enabled him to create a film score which blends organically into the soundtrack. The film also confirmed the star status of its lead actor, Ivan Mykolaichuk, who made his onscreen debut in Denysenko's *Son* (A Dream), filmed

at the same time as *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and released in 1964.¹⁹¹ When, at the age of twenty-two, Mykolaichuk was cast in the role of Ivan in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, he was an unknown actor, yet to graduate from the Karpenko Karyi Institute in Kyiv; following its release, he would go on to become one of the most celebrated Ukrainian actors and filmmakers of his generation. The story of how Mykolaichuk won the role of Ivan has been recounted many times by the various individuals involved.¹⁹² It is a story worth repeating for the insight it provides into the way in which the approach to filmmaking proceeded. Paradzhanov had determined that the Russian actor Genadii Lukhtin would play the role of Ivan. Having enjoyed success with roles in a string of films including *Delo Rumiantseva* (The Rumiantsev Affair, 1955, directed by Iosif Kheifits) and *Vesna na Zarechnoi ulitse*, Lukhtin provided the kind of box-office clout that appealed to the studio. Shortly before the film crew set off on expedition, however, filmmaker Viktor Ivchenko recommended that Paradzhanov audition Mykolaichuk for the role. Ivchenko was teaching at the Karpenko Karyi Institute at the time, where Mykolaichuk was studying, and saw great promise in the young actor, who hailed from Chortoryia, a small village in the Carpathian Mountains, not far from the location in which the story was set. Out of respect for Ivchenko, Paradzhanov agreed to audition Mykolaichuk. However, he did not hold out any great

¹⁹¹ Mykolaichuk's first film role was in Leonid Osyka's short film *Dvoie* (Two, 1964), a piece of coursework for his studies at VGIK.

¹⁹² For Paradzhanov's account, see Briukhovets'ka, *Ivan Mykolaichuk*, pp. 21–22; Serhii Trymbach, *Ivan Mykolaichuk* (Kyiv: KM Akademiia, 2002), p. 45; and Sergei Paradzhanov, 'Nezvazhaiuchy na vidstani', *Literaturna Ukraina*, 34 (20 August 1987), p. 6. Assistant director on the film, Volodymyr Luhovs'kyi, provides his recollection of the event in his *Nevidomyi maestro*, pp. 41–47. For Illienko's version, see Ol'ha Mel'nyk, 'Iurii Illienko: Ia opanuvav Ukrain's'ku metodolohiiu vzhivannia cherez «ne mozhu» i «tak ne buvaie»', *Personal Plus*, 19 (170), 10–16 May 2006, < <http://www.personal-plus.net/170/670.html> > [accessed 16 February 2012].

hope, and even declined to attend the audition. Indeed, Illienko recalls that for the screen test Paradzhanov instructed him to ‘do an American’ (zrobly amerykanku) – that is to say, not use any film reel.¹⁹³ In order to ascertain how the actor should be lit and so forth, Illienko went to look at Mykolaichuk, who was dressed in the Hutsul clothing required for the part. He remembers:

Shcho mene vrazylo? Vin buv, mov vidsutnii, nikoho ne pomichav. Potim ia zrozumiv, shcho tse oznachalo. I v takomu stani Ivan avtomatychno vbyravsia. Ia zhadav, iak tse robyv Iukhtin, khoroshyi pobutovyi aktor: vin rozdyvliavsia hachi (shtany), postoly, vono na n’omu he sydilo, vin ne znay, shcho z tsym robyty.¹⁹⁴

Mykolaichuk’s audition was so impressive that Paradzhanov was summoned to witness the event for himself. As the director recalls:

Vin zacharuvav nas. Iunyi, strashenno skhvyl’ovanyi, vin svityvsia dyvovyzhnym svitlom. Taka chystota, taka prystrastnist’, taka emotsiunist’ vykhliupuvaly z n’oho, shcho my buly pryholomsheni, zabuly pro vse, navit’ pro te, shcho vzhe zatverdzhenyi inshyi aktor. Ia zakrychav: “Evryka! Evryka! Tse henial’no!” Kryk nas chuv uves’ pavil’ion...¹⁹⁵

As these recollections attest, the ease with which Mykolaichuk assumed the role of the Hutsul, the *authenticity* which he brought to the film, hailing from the region himself, was a significant factor in his casting for the role, aside from his undisputed talent as an actor. The decision to appoint Mykolaichuk over Iukhtin therefore marks an important shift towards a preference for what one might term local knowledge.

¹⁹³ Ibid..

¹⁹⁴ ‘What struck me? It was as if he was absent; I didn’t notice anyone. Later I understood what that meant. Ivan [Mykolaichuk] automatically dressed in that way. I remembered how Iukhtin, a good, run-of-the-mill actor, had done this: he had looked at the *hachi* (trousers) and the *postoly* (thick woollen socks); the clothing didn’t sit well on him and he didn’t know what to do with it.’ Cited in *ibid.*

¹⁹⁵ ‘He captivated us. Young and frightfully agitated, he shone with an unusual light. Such purity, such passion and emotion poured out of him that we were stunned and forgot about everything else, even about the fact that another actor had already been confirmed. I cried: “Eureka! Eureka! It’s genius!” The whole studio heard our cry...’ Cited in Trymbach, *Ivan Mykolaichuk*, p. 45.

This was mirrored in the decision not to cast Nataliia Uzhvii, as originally planned, in the role of Baba Khimka, but rather to choose a local woman, Hanna Haradzhuk, instead. According to Volodymyr Luhovs'kyi, the assistant director working on the film, it took considerable effort to convince Paradzhanov – who, we must remember, had worked with Uzhvii on a number of films – to make this change.¹⁹⁶ Yet his concerns were seemingly short-lived. As one local resident recalls, Paradzhanov was heard to quip during filming: ‘who needs Nataliia Uzhvii when they have Hanna Haradzhuk?’¹⁹⁷ Indeed, during the discussion that followed a screening of the completed film in December 1964, Paradzhanov said: ‘This old lady is seventy years old! But I think it is the best role there has been in Ukraine in the last few years.’¹⁹⁸ It seems that others agreed with the director. A few years later, when Borys Ivchenko went to the Carpathians to shoot the film *Annychka*, he chose none other than Haradzhuk for the small, yet central, role of Nanashka. As reported in an article for *Molod' Ukrainy*, Ivchenko offered Haradzhuk the part having been impressed with her performance in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.¹⁹⁹

The casting of Mykolaichuk speaks of a desire to maintain a relationship between the story itself, its place of origin and the people who inhabit that space. As First identifies, promotional material about the film consistently referred to the lead actor’s familiarity with the locale in which the story was set and, additionally,

¹⁹⁶ Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 61.

¹⁹⁷ Interview with Ivan Mykhailovych Zelenchuk (Verkhovyna, 20 August 2010).

¹⁹⁸ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 528, l. 36.

¹⁹⁹ H. Dmytriieva, ‘Sil's'ka kinoaktrysa’, *Molod' Ukrainy*, 28 June 1970. In *Annychka*, Haradzhuk can be heard to refer to the film’s heroine as ‘Marichka’ (rather than ‘Annychka’), attesting to the improvised nature of the scenes in which she performs (according to the *Molod' Ukrainy* article, she categorically refused to learn her lines and, having discussed the role at length with the director, improvised her scenes). *Ibid.*.

stressed the fact that the film crew spent a considerable amount of time in the Carpathians researching and shooting the film.²⁰⁰ Nonetheless, we must not overlook the fact that other actors were less 'native': Tat'iana Bestaeva, who plays Palahna, hailed from Moscow, and Spartak Bagashvili, who plays Iura, was Georgian. Yet at some point whilst the crew were on location it was decided to allocate a significant acting role to a local non-professional. In this respect, the decision to cast Haradzhuk arguably marks an even more important turning point than that with regard to Mykolaichuk. In total, over fifty Hutsuls appeared in the film, a number of whom were given speaking roles.²⁰¹ Local musicians were invited to fill the film's soundtrack. The expedition to the mountains is therefore crucial to the film's aesthetic.

Journey to the Carpathians

It was originally planned that the film crew would spend a total of 129 days in the Carpathians. The expedition would be divided into two trips. Between September and December 1963, they would spend 112 days in Verkhovyna (formerly Zhab'ie), the administrative centre of the Verkhovyns'ki *raion* in the south of the Ivano-Frankivs'ka *oblast'*. Verkhovyna neighbours the village of Kryvorivnia, the place where Kotsiubyns'kyi used to stay when visiting the Carpathians and in which the story is primarily set. The second expedition was planned for January 1964, when the film crew would spend a further seventeen days in Kosiv, the administrative centre of a neighbouring *raion*, famed for its art and crafts. In fact, the crew stayed in Verkhovyna for 146 days from 3 September 1963 to 26 January 1964, followed by

²⁰⁰ First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 161.

²⁰¹ Interview with Halyna Mogan (Verkhovyna, 19 August 2010).

another forty-five days in Verkhovyna between 22 June and 5 August 1964. The total length of time spent on expedition therefore increased by forty-eight per cent according to the plan.²⁰² This increase is attributable to a number of factors, including poor weather conditions, illnesses and Mykolaichuk's absence (he was also filming *Son* during this period). Therefore, the amount of footage shot on location did not significantly alter from that which was planned (it was, in fact, 3.6% less than anticipated); the crew simply stayed longer in the area. This extra time is important as it allowed for a greater immersion in the local culture, of which Paradzhanov in particular took advantage:

Paradzhanov vyvchav Hutsul'shchynu shchodnia, shchohodny i skriz'. Inodi hrupi vypadaly vykhidni, i todi khto vidpochyvav doma, khto ishov u lis po hryby, khto ikhav do Kosova na bazar, til'ky u rezhysera-postanovnyka na tse ne vystachalo chasu. Vin sidav u reisovyi avtobus abo na poputny mashynu i rushav na chiies' vesillia, iakyis' pokhoron, do Kolomyis'koho muzeiu. Tam tsilyi den' blukav po zalakh, prydyvliaiuchys' do istorychnoho Hutsul's'koho kostiuma, do narodnoho promyslu. Vyvchav inter'ier starovynnoi khaty, predmety domashn'oho vzhytku. Vdyvliavsia u kozhnu kakhelynu stolitn'oi davnyny.²⁰³

²⁰² RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 281, l. 39. These are the official dates of the expedition quoted in the production account that was submitted to the Dovzhenko Studio management by the filmmakers. Elsewhere, Paradzhanov has talked about 'a year spent living by the open-air fire, close to the source of inspiration' (rik zhyttia, prozhytyi bilia vohnyshcha, bilia dzherala natkhnennia). See *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, p. 13. In an interview for *Komsomol'skoe znamia*, he refers to having lived for a year and a half in the Carpathian pastures (my poltora goda zhili na prikarpatskikh poloninakh). See L. Voskoboinikova, 'Ozhivaiut davnie teni', *Komsomol'skoe znamia*, 17 September 1964 (page unknown). In Verkhovyna, Paradzhanov is remembered as having stayed for a year and a half. Interview with Halyna Moka (Verkhovyna, 19 August 2010).

²⁰³ 'Paradzhanov studied Hutsul'shchyna every day, every hour and everywhere. Sometimes the group had time off, whereupon someone would relax at home, someone would go to the woods to pick mushrooms, someone would go to the market at Kosiv; only the director did not have time for this. He would sit on a regular bus or in a passing car and set out for someone's wedding, someone's funeral, or to the Kolomyia museum. There he would spend the whole day wandering the halls, inspecting historical Hutsul dress and folk craftwork. He studied the interior of ancient *khaty* and household objects. He looked intently at each tile that was centuries old.' See Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 71.

In fact, the majority of the film crew were similarly engaged in a process of discovery, as Illienko has explained:

Bahato z nas, khto pryikhav u Karpaty, ne znaly ts'oho kraiu. Ale my pryluchaly do ziomok mistsevykh meshkantsiv i pochaly vidchuvaty, iaku vony nesut' v sobi informatsiinu napovnenist'. Tse prykhodylo ne vidrazu, a naroshchuvalos' krok za krokom. I v rezul'tati vyiavylosia, shcho tse buv revoliutsiinyi krok u kino. Bulo okhopeno velykyi areal kul'tury tsiloho narodu. Velyka diaka za tse Heorhiiu Iakutovychu – vin buv velykyi znavets' sered nas.²⁰⁴

Iakutovych had been hired as a production artist (*khudozhnik*) for the film. Born in Kyiv in 1930, he had graduated from the Kyiv Art Institute in 1954 and found employment as a graphic artist and illustrator. Amongst his early works were the illustrations for the 1957 edition of Kotsiubyns'kyi's story *Fata Morgana*. As an artist, Iakutovych was inspired by the Carpathians, which he first visited in 1952. In his childhood, whilst living abroad, he had come across a book with a missing cover, which was written in Ukrainian and from which he began to learn the language. That book was *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, and so began his fascination with the region.²⁰⁵ His son Serhii, also an artist, would later recall how in early 1963 his father became involved in the filming of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*:

Iakos' mii bat'ko zaprosyv svoikh maibutnikh druziv do nashoi domivky. Zhyly my todi z nym udvokh. Po-parubots'ky. Spokiino pohovoryty pro maibutnii fil'm, pokazaty pershi nacherky, eskizy, rozrobky. Rozpovisty pro Karpaty, de do toho ni Paradzhanov, ni Illienko ne byly. Pro ti mistsia, de

²⁰⁴ 'Many of us, who came to the Carpathians, did not know this land. But we involved the local residents in the filming process and we began to feel the wealth of information which they carry within them. This did not happen immediately, but grew incrementally. And, as a result, it turned out to be a revolutionary step in cinema. The immense natural cultural habitat of a whole people was encapsulated. Huge thanks for this go to Heorhii Iakutovych - he was a great connoisseur amongst us.' Cited in Larysa Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit Iurii Illienka* (Kyiv: Zadruha, 2006), p. 35.

²⁰⁵ Oksana Keryk, 'Serhii Iakutovych – syn "Tinei zabutykh predkiv"', *Vyskokyi zamok*, 31 July 2004, <<http://www.wz.lviv.ua/articles/32136>> [accessed 5 April 2012].

bat'ko buvav i iaki dobre znay. Pro hutsuliv, pro svoie bachennia ikhn'oho svitu, ikhn'oi filosofii buttia...²⁰⁶

This trio of artists – Paradzhanov, Illienko and Iakutovych – joined forces to create one of the masterpieces of Ukrainian cinema. They were aided by a host of other creative talents, without whose input the film would not have remained the same: the professional actors, in particular Mykolaichuk and Larysa Kadochnykova (who plays Marichka); the composer Skoryk; the artist Mykhailo Rakovs'kyi; the sound operator (Sofiia) Serhiienko; and, of course, the local residents who took part in the filmmaking process. Dziuba has said about this extraordinary group:

Fil'm sozdavalsia na redkost' interesnym i raznostoronne talantlivym kollektivom vliublennykh v Gutsul'shchinu liudei.²⁰⁷

Yet the collaboration did not always run smoothly. The problem lay in the relationship between director and camera operator, Paradzhanov and Illienko. Early on in the filming period Illienko threatened to leave, taking his then wife, Kadochnykova, with him. In fact, tensions were so fraught that a duel was arranged – and then cancelled due to bad weather! As Illienko has recalled:

A bukval'no cherez nedeliu posle nachala s'emok ia ushel s kartiny. I vyzval Sergeiiia na duel'... Prosto khotel ubit' ego... Za vse. Eto byla ideinaia ssora. Po tvorcheskim motivam. U menia sekundantom byl director studii Tsvirkunov. A u nego – rezhisserskaia gruppa. Shel dozhd'. Cheremysh vzdulsia. Ia shel po vysokomu beregu. On – po protivopolozhnomu, mimo bazara. My dolzhny byli vstretit'sia na mostu i streliaťsia na gutstul'skikh boevykh pistoletakh. Byl budnii den'. Ia vyshel k mostu. No Cheremysh

²⁰⁶ 'One time my father invited his future friends to our home. It was just the two of us living there at the time. Like bachelors. [He invited them] to talk in peace and quiet about the future film, to show them the first sketches, drawings and designs. To tell them about the Carpathians, where neither Paradzhanov nor Illienko had been before. About those places that father had often visited and which he knew well. About the Hutsuls, about his view of their world, their philosophy of existence...' See Serhii Iakutovych, 'Koly zhadiuish Velykoho Maistra', *Kino-Teatr*, 2010.6, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=1087> [accessed 6 April 2012].

²⁰⁷ Dziuba, 'Den' poiska', p. 78.

vzdulsia tak, chto most sneslo, a s tridsati metrov ia nikak ne mog streliat'. [...] A vecherom iz Kieva privezli pervyi proiavlennyi material. My prishli v zal. Seli po raznym uglam. [...] Posmotreli pervuiu partiiu materiala... vyshli... I ia ponial, chto nikuda ne uedu. My obnialis', potselovalis' i... nachali opiat' bit'sia.²⁰⁸

The nature of the artistic differences of opinion can be found in the film, in the tension between movement and stasis, between the dizzying, handheld camerawork of Illienko and the still-life compositions of Paradzhanov, which would come to prominence in his subsequent works. As Briukhovets'ka explains:

Illienko, zhadiuchy tse, poiasniuvav: "Paradzhanov vvazhav, shcho ia ne tak znimaiu, a ia vvazhav, shcho vin u tsii spravi vazhali nichoho ne rozumiie". Buria i natysk operatora peremohly – pobachyvshy vidzniaty material, Paradzhanov zrozumiv, shcho Illienko spravedlyvo vidstoiuvav svoie bachennia.²⁰⁹

Nonetheless, she notes, Illienko decided never to work for a director again but rather to take full artistic control for himself in subsequent movies.²¹⁰

The expedition to the mountains was a period of intense – sometimes tempestuous – creative activity, and is the key to the film's aesthetic. Of course, the decision to shoot on location was not a new one. Filmmakers had been taking the camera outside the walls of the Kyiv studio since its very establishment; Dovzhenko, for example, had filmed *Shchors* (1939) in a number of locations in and around Chernihiv in 1937, having conducted extensive research in the area, including consulting documents held in the regional archives and visiting the local historical

²⁰⁸ Iurii Il'enko, 'Duel' in Sergei Paradzhanov, *Kollazh na fone avtoportreta: Zhizn' – igra* (Nizhnii Novgorod: Dekom, 2005), pp. 130–33 (p. 133).

²⁰⁹ 'Remembering this, Illienko has explained: "Paradzhanov thought that I should not film in such a way, and I thought that he generally did not understand anything about this issue." The storm and stress of the camera operator won out – having seen the footage, Paradzhanov understood that Illienko had rightly defended his vision.' Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 38.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*.

museum.²¹¹ Moreover, filmmakers from the studio had already visited Verkhovyna. As local residents proudly point out, the first filmmaker to visit the area was in fact Dovzhenko himself, when he was looking for a location to shoot a film about Oleksa Dovbush.²¹² Dovzhenko never made that film, but in 1959 Viktor Ivanov followed in his footsteps and shot the film *Oleksa Dovbush* in the area.

Ivanov's film provides an interesting point of comparison for *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.²¹³ Like the latter film, it too is set in the past – in the eighteenth century, when the eponymous hero led his fellow Hutsuls to rise up against the Polish *szlachta* (landowning nobility). As with *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the story of *Oleksa Dovbush* is closely associated with the Carpathian region: Dovbush is a legendary figure in western Ukraine – a kind of Robin Hood of the Carpathians – about whom songs and plays have been written. Based on a screenplay by Liubomyr Dmyterko and Ivanov, the film is inspired by historical events and involved the participation of an academic consultant, Volodymyr Hrabovets'kyi, from the L'viv Institute of Social Sciences. Hrabovets'kyi was completing a doctorate at the time and his research concerned the history of western Ukraine, Dovbush and the *opryshok* movement which he led.²¹⁴ The film shows Dovbush gathering together his band of men to make a stand against the Poles. They succeed in securing the return of the Hutsuls' livestock that had been taken from them by the nobleman Jabłoński. As they are celebrating, Dovbush is

²¹¹ Borys Iur'iev, 'Dovzhenko znimaie "Shchorsa"', *Kino-Teatr*, 2003.1, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=66> [accessed 4 April 2012].

²¹² Interview with Ivan Zelenchuk (Verkhovyna, 20 August 2010). Perhaps the film that Zelenchuk refers to is in fact *Pisnia pro Dovbusha* (A Song About Dovbush), which Ivan Kavaleridze had begun shooting on location in the Carpathians in 1941 but which was halted due to the outbreak of war.

²¹³ The following analysis is based on the Russian-language version of the film.

²¹⁴ TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1052, l. 16.

distraught to discover that his fiancée, Marichka, has been forced to marry another. Further tragedy strikes as Jabłoński goes against his word and authorizes an attack on the Hutsuls, and then himself kills a young boy during a drunken game at a dinner party. To avenge these deaths, Dovbush and his men break into Jabłoński's home and kill him. After several plot twists, in which Marichka is captured and Dovbush narrowly escapes death, the *opryshky* take captive Jabłoński's widow. She manages to escape, however, and is able to warn the Poles that Dovbush intends to go to Marichka that evening. Marichka's husband, Shtefan, is coerced into shooting Dovbush who, mortally wounded, asks his men to take him to the mountains where he disappears with Marichka into the distance.

Ivanov and his crew spent a total of 105 days filming on location in 1959 (thirty-two days in L'viv, thirty-six days in Verkhovyna (then Zhab'ie) and thirty-seven days in Rakhiv).²¹⁵ This is just over half the length of time that Paradzhanov's crew spent filming in the region, although it is still a considerable period. Like *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Ivanov's film also includes regional musical instruments, such as the *trembita*, the *floiara* and the *drymba*; local residents took part in the group scenes (although they are not mentioned in the credits); and the camera operator was none other than Illienko's brother, Vadym. Given these commonalities, therefore, one might expect the two films to share a certain aesthetic. And, at times, there are moments when this might almost be so. Significantly, these moments occur almost without exception during the scenes involving the local, non-professional cast. In these scenes, the camera seems to take on a life of its own and to participate in the action in a way that (Iurii) Illienko would later so skillfully employ. When the cattle

²¹⁵ TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1376, l. 16.

are being taken away from the Hutsul homesteads, for example, the camera is positioned at a low angle in a Dutch tilt. This unusual viewpoint seems to reflect the way in which the Hutsuls are being downtrodden. After the livestock have been returned, the camera moves amongst the celebrating Hutsuls as if it, too, has been liberated from its shackles. At the same time, however, there is an undeniable difference between the two films. Interestingly, we can see how this is manifested through the use of sound. In the aforementioned scene, when the cattle are taken away, an elderly Hutsul woman falls to the ground towards the camera. She speaks – presumably telling us of her woe – and yet she is not heard. We see her lips move but we do not hear her voice. Instead, the scene is played out to the accompaniment of an orchestral score. It is not just the local voices that are muted in *Oleksa Dovbush*, however. During one of the film's climaxes, when Jabłoński goes back on his word, we see a *trembita* player sound out a warning across the mountains. Yet we do not hear his instrument. Again, it is the orchestral score which is used to heighten the dramatic tension. By way of contrast, as we shall see in Chapter Four, one of the distinguishing features of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is the way in which sound is used to give voice to the filmic subjects. Moreover, the film is peppered with the sounds of local instruments which function as part of the narrative itself. The sounds are used to evoke a sense of what it is like to be in this environment, which is an intrinsic element of the film. In this way, we can begin to see what differentiates the two works: Paradzhanov's film is concerned with a journey, or an experience – that of the filmmakers during the filmmaking process which, in turn, the film invites the viewer

to participate in. It highlights the specificity of the Carpathian space which it seeks to introduce to the viewer.

Ivanov's film is not similarly concerned but rather stresses the commonality between this, albeit distinctively Carpathian space and the experience of Ukrainians living elsewhere. When Dovbush selects the men to join his band, he is delighted to find a Zaporizhian Cossack whom he greets thus: 'Iz Ukrainy? Brat, ty.' At the end of the film, the Cossack is sent home to spread word of the Hutsuls' struggle. When the SPKU assessed the screenplay, it was noted that:

Temoiu tvorü ie pokaz narodno-vyzvol'noi borot'by Zakarpats'kykh i Prykarpats'kykh, pol's'kykh i ukrains'kykh selian, iednist' ikh v tsii borot'bi z ukraintsiamy Prydniprians'koi Ukrainy proty shliakhty.²¹⁶

It is perhaps not surprising that Ivanov's film takes up this particular theme given that it was made in 1959, on the twentieth anniversary of the 'reunification' of western regions with the Ukrainian Republic, and thus the Soviet Union. As First identifies, the film 'writes the impetus for "unification" into the 18th century'.²¹⁷ In so doing, it suggests that it was an organic and thus unproblematic process. In practice, however, this was not the case. Initially, as Yekelchuk explains, villagers responded enthusiastically to the appropriation of Polish land, about half of which was distributed amongst the peasants. 'However, the Stalinist regime soon began threatening the traditional structures of western Ukrainian society. The remaining half of the newly seized land was awarded to state-organized state and collective farms,

²¹⁶ 'The theme of the work is the depiction of the folk-liberation struggle of the Transcarpathian, Carpathian, Polish and Ukrainian peasants, and their unity with the Ukrainians of the Dnipro area of Ukraine in this fight against the *szlachta*.' TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1032, l. 13.

²¹⁷ First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 147.

which the peasants were increasingly pressured to join.²¹⁸ The harsh reality of the new situation soon became clear with the beginnings of mass arrests and deportations. It is estimated that during 1939 and 1940, between 1,170,000 and 1,250,000 people were deported from western Ukraine to Siberia, the Arctic Circle, and the Central Asian republics.²¹⁹ The Soviet authorities were concerned with the threat posed by Ukrainian nationalism, particularly in the western regions. Indeed, anti-Soviet partisans in the forests of Volhynia developed into the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Ukrains'ka povstans'ka armiiia (or UPA)) that began fighting for independence during the Second World War.²²⁰ In 1944, after moving to regain control of the area, the Red Army initiated a 'brutal campaign of repression' against UPA, who presented a significant obstacle to the process of Sovietization; as Yekelchuk notes, 'during 1944 and the first six months of 1945, the Soviets reported killing 91,615 nationalist guerrillas and detaining 96,446'.²²¹ Small-scale acts of resistance continued in the region until the early 1950s.²²²

The cinematic representation of this area of the republic was therefore a sensitive topic, particularly in the anniversary year of 1959 when Ivanov was making his film. It is perhaps unsurprising, therefore, that the film stresses commonality over specificity. In so doing, it resonates with other filmic representations of the region, such as Iuliia Solntseva's *Bukovyna, zemlia ukrains'ka* (Bukovyna, Ukrainian Land), a documentary which was made in 1940, immediately after the annexation of northern Bukovyna from Romania. Interestingly, here the voices of the filmic

²¹⁸ Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, p. 133.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 144.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 148.

subjects are also muted, as we have noted in relation to *Oleksa Dovbush*. Solntseva's film opens with a scene portraying a young peasant and his father. We see the man speak and watch his lips move, but we do not hear him. Instead, we hear a voice-over which tells us what the man is saying. This voice-over commentary is present throughout the film. Ironically, in one section it translates for us a sign in a factory that states: 'speak only in Romanian'. This is translated for us three times to emphasize the linguistic repression the region's inhabitants have endured under Romanian rule. Yet the film does little to lift the silencing of their voices. Of course, Solntseva's was a documentary film in which the use of a voice-over commentator was considered the norm. By the 1960s, however, there were calls for this to change. At a meeting to discuss the use of sound in documentaries in 1961, one participant bemoaned the fact that:

govorit chto-to muzhchina, govorit zhenshchina i v to eto vremia [*sic*] i diktor chto-to govorit. Luchshe bylo by esli by sami liudi govorili.²²³

Nonetheless, the prevalence of the voice-over commentator in Soviet documentary film was difficult to change. In 1964, for example, in the documentary film *Tam, gde poet trembita* (Where the Trembita Sings), directed by Boris Golovnia and released by the Mosnauchfil'm studio, the viewer is introduced to the Carpathian people through the intermediary of Leonid Khmara's commentary. That same year, Paradzhanov was making a fiction film in which the voice of these people would be heard. It is important not to underestimate the significance of the fact that in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* the filmic subjects were heard to speak for themselves.

²²³ RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 801, l. 24.

One of the key filming sites for *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was a hamlet (*prysilok*) on the outskirts of Verkhovyna, called Zhab'ievs'kyi Potik. The same spot had in fact been used by Ivanov when shooting *Oleksa Dovbush*. It is also the place where Paradzhanov stayed whilst filming. Originally, Paradzhanov and the rest of the crew were lodged in the hotel in Verkhovyna (at the time there was only one hotel). Whilst one of the windows in his room looked onto the river Cheremosh, the other overlooked a tarmac yard; Paradzhanov was not impressed.²²⁴ Instead, he set about finding somewhere where he could live 'like a Hutsul', and was taken to lodge with Petro and Ievdokiia Soruk.²²⁵ The Soruks lived in a traditional Hutsul *khata* in Zhab'ievs'kyi Potik. Paradzhanov has stated that it was only through living with the Soruks that he truly came to understand the Hutsul way of life.²²⁶ He would go on to explain:

I ot ia zrozumiv, shcho Ievdokiia, ii zvut' Ievdokha [Soruk], vona ie spivavtorom moim, vona zrobyla mene natsionalistom, bo vona vidkryla dlia mene krasu Karpat cherez kuleshu, iaku ia iv, cherez riazhanku (huslianka zvet'sia), ia iv tsiu huslianku i rozumiv, shcho vona nese meni dobro. I hotel', u iakomu ia zhyv, hotel' – to bula b dlia mene smert'. Ia zrobyv by tret'osortnyi fil'm.²²⁷

It was this effort to understand and experience the region that differentiated Paradzhanov's film from the standard fare:

²²⁴ Paradzhanov, 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', p. 63.

²²⁵ Interview with Halyna Moka (Verkhovyna, 19 August 2010).

²²⁶ Paradzhanov, 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', p. 63.

²²⁷ 'And there I understood that Ievdokiia (she is called Ievdokha Soruk), she is my co-author; she made me into a nationalist, because she revealed to me the beauty of the Carpathians – through the *kulesha* which I ate, through the yoghurt (called *huslianka*)... I ate all the *huslianka* and understood that it would do me good. And the hotel in which I had been living – that would have been death for me. I would have made a third-rate film.' Cited in Miroslava Oleksyk-Bleiker, 'Serhii Paradzhanov: "Khai zhyve ukrains'kyi natsionalizm!"', *Kino-Teatr*, 2008.4, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=797> [accessed 21 February 2012].

Skil'ky raziv vony povertalysia nazad i robyly ploskyi i nepotribnyi fil'm, de odiahaly kyptari i tantsiuvaly Hutsul's'ki pliasuny? Ale tse ne stalo tvorom. A prosto fiksatsiieu iakykhos' etnografichnykh momentiv.²²⁸

These words lie at the heart of what makes Paradzhanov's film different, and at the heart of this chapter. Interestingly, Paradzhanov chooses the word 'ethnographic' to describe the kinds of films from which he claims *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is distinct. In using this word, he is referring to the way in which the filmic subjects are represented on film through exterior details, such as costume, props or traditional forms of dance. These elements of course feature in Paradzhanov's work and, indeed, the word 'ethnographic' has often been used to describe *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Again, this tends to revolve around the attention to exterior detail.²²⁹ In distancing his work from the epithet of 'ethnographic', Paradzhanov simply attempts to highlight that the film is not the product of a superficial understanding of a region and its people, one which is limited to external idiosyncrasies. His work is the product of an extensive period of research in the field, by means of which he attempted to understand not only the exterior but also the interior and imaginative worlds of the Hutsuls. Ironically, it is this very approach to the filmmaking process that makes the term 'ethnographic' potentially applicable. After all, as discussed in the introduction to this thesis, behind the word 'ethnographic' is an understanding of a specific methodological approach. Thus this chapter seeks to demonstrate the importance of the filmmaking *process* for the aesthetic look of the film that emerged. Ultimately – as Paradzhanov stresses in the above quotation – the film is a work of art, a fiction film, and it is not the

²²⁸ 'How many times have they gone back and made trite, unnecessary films, where people wear *keptar* jackets and Hutsuls dance? But that doesn't make it art, simply a fixation with some kind of ethnographic moments.' Ibid..

²²⁹ See Introduction, p. 34.

intention of this thesis to argue that it should be included within the scope of 'ethnographic film'. Rather than assigning labels, we might content ourselves with examining how the word 'ethnographic' (in the sense of a methodological approach, as discussed in the Introduction) can shed light on this kind of fiction film in which the relationship between the filmmaking process and the filmic product is foregrounded. It is through underlining the importance of the filmmaking process that the significance of the term 'ethnographic' with regard to this film can be found. In many ways, it is a process that can be traced to Kotsiubyns'kyi's experiences in the Carpathians some fifty years earlier.

Kotsiubyns'kyi in the Mountains

Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi was born in 1864 in Vinnytsia, which was then part of the Russian Empire. Throughout his life, much of his work was published in western Ukraine where, under Austro-Hungarian rule, there were comparatively fewer problems with censorship than in the east.²³⁰ Furthermore, his work, as it developed, was more aligned with that of his contemporaries in western Ukraine.²³¹ *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was written in 1911, towards the end of Kotsiubyns'kyi's life and, to an extent, represents the pinnacle of his achievements as a writer. (Kotsiubyns'kyi himself, known for his harsh self-criticism, was not satisfied with the novella and hoped to improve upon it with a subsequent work drawing on similar material.) Certainly, it brings together several strands of activity and thought with which the

²³⁰ Bohdan Rubchak, 'The Music of Satan and the Bedeviled World: An Essay on Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky', in Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, trans. by Marco Carynnyk (Littleton, CO: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies by Ukrainian Academic Press, 1981), pp. 77–121 (p. 87).

²³¹ *Ibid.*.

writer had been concerned for the majority of his adult life – namely, an interest in folk literature, a fascination with other cultures, and the practice of ethnographic research. In fact, the idea for the novella can be traced to the ethnographer Volodymyr Hnatiuk, with whom Kotsiubyns'kyi enjoyed a long-lasting friendship. In a letter to Kotsiubyns'kyi in 1908, Hnatiuk recommended to his friend:

Ia konechno buv by za tym, shchoby Vy na odne lito prykhaly v nashi hory: iakby Vy zadovol'nialysai prostotoiu, to mohly by Vy ikhaty do Kryvorivni, de ia vyshukav by Vam khatchynu nedaleko vid sebe, de vyhrivalys' by my na sontsi, pryhliadalyisia by Cheremoshevi i hutsulam, chytaly i t.d. Ia dumaiu, shcho tse bulo by dlia Vas iz dvokh bokiv korysne: 1) dlia zdorov'ia bezumovno, 2) dlia Vashoi literaturnoi tvorchosti. U hutsuliv stil'ky poezii, Vy znaishly by v nykh stil'ky novoho dlia sebe, shcho tse, pevno, pryneslo by harni rezul'taty i dlia Vas camykh, i dlia nas, iak dlia naroda.²³²

The Carpathians had long attracted Hnatiuk, and the majority of his research concerns the region. Between 1895 and 1903, he had undertaken six periods of ethnographic fieldwork in the area, collecting data from a range of Ukrainian settlements.²³³ His first work to be published, in 1896, concerned the *lirnyky* musicians. There followed a vast number of publications covering areas such as the Hungarian Rus', Galician-Ruthenian folk legends, *kolomyiky* songs, *koliadky* and *shchedrivky* (carols), Ukrainian demonology and folk tales, and works on dialectics and linguistics.

²³² 'I would, of course, be in favour of you coming to our mountains for one summer: if you are satisfied with a simple way of life, you could come to Kryvorivnia, where I would find for you a little *khata* not far from myself, where we could warm ourselves in the sun, investigate the Cheremosh and the Hutsuls, read etc. I think this would be useful for you from two angles: 1) for your health undoubtedly, 2) for your literary work. The Hutsuls have such poetry, you would find in them so much that would be new to you, that this would surely yield great results both for yourself and us, just as it would for the [Ukrainian] people.' Letter to Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi dated 1 September and 13 October 1908, in *Lysty do Mykhaila Kotsiubyns'koho*, ed. by Volodymyr Maznyi, 4 vols (Kyiv: Ukrains'ki Propilei, 2002), 1 (*Aikhel'berger – Hnatiuk*), 283–85 (p. 285).

²³³ Leonid Rudnytsky, 'A Note on Volodymyr Hnatiuk (1871–1926)', in Volodymyr Hnatiuk, *Vybrani statti pro narodnu tvorchost': Na 100-richchia narodzhennia, 1871–1981* (New York: NTSh, 1981), pp. 25–28 (p. 26).

Hnatiuk therefore knew the area very well and had been going to Kryvorivnia in particular for a number of years. It was on his recommendation that the famous Ukrainian writer Ivan Franko first visited Kryvorivnia in 1901; he became so enamoured with the place that he travelled there almost every summer until 1914. Along with Franko, a host of other Ukrainian writers, including Lesia Ukrainka and Vasyl' Stefanyk, visited this little village in the Carpathians during this period, earning it a reputation for being the 'summertime capital' of Ukrainian culture. Yet it was Kotsiubyns'kyi whom Hnatiuk encouraged to write about the Hutsuls. He repeated his suggestion in 1909 and early 1910 until, finally, Kotsiubyns'kyi made the decision to visit in the summer of that year, telling his friend:

Svoimy slovamy: "Vy musyte shchos' napysaty pro hustuliv" zabyly Vy meni klyn u holovu, vony na daiut' meni spokoju, til'ky shcho ia zrobyt' hoden za 10 dniv?²³⁴

It was not the first time that Hnatiuk had assisted Kotsiubyns'kyi's creative work. Since the two men first began corresponding in 1897, Hnatiuk had frequently sent the author various publications, including his own ethnographic research. In 1902, when Kotsiubyns'kyi was working for the Chernihiv Gubernia Archival Commission, he turned to Hnatiuk for professional advice. The Commission, which had been established in 1896, set itself the task of collecting local stories, folk songs and so forth from the Chernihiv area – a task in the making of which Kotsiubyns'kyi was

²³⁴ 'You have hammered a wedge into my head with your words "You must write something about the Hustuls", and they will not give me any peace; only what can I achieve in ten days?'. Letter to Volodymyr Hnatiuk dated 17 July 1910, in Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v semy tomakh*, ed. by O. Ie. Zasenka and others, 7 vols (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1973–1975), VII (*Lysty (1910–1913)*), ed. by F. P. Pohrebennyk (1975)), pp. 53–54 (p. 54).

instrumental.²³⁵ With the writer's encouragement, the Commission initiated an ethnographic project which would involve the collection of material from all over the Gubernia. Kotsiubyns'kyi was involved in the overall structuring of the project, and was responsible for two large strands of work on folk literature (*narodna slovesnist'*) and the *kobzari* and *lirnyky* musicians.²³⁶ It was with regard to this project that Kotsiubyns'kyi turned to Hnatiuk for advice and material, which was duly sent. In response, Kotsiubyns'kyi thanked his friend for the valuable books which he needed 'for my ethnographic work' (*dlia moikh etnohrafichnykh prats'*).²³⁷

Against this background, we can see that Kotsiubyns'kyi and Hnatiuk had a history of collaborating on ethnographic research in which the writer took an active role. We might therefore assume that it was always understood that, should he heed Hnatiuk's advice and write about the Hutsuls, Kotsiubyns'kyi would not only draw on his friend's ethnographic research but conduct his own data gathering as well. It seems Hnatiuk knew his friend well. Kotsiubyns'kyi's first journey to the Carpathians lasted a mere ten days, but he was enthralled. Upon his return he immediately set about reading the stack of books which Hnatiuk had sent him: the multi-volume work *Hutsul'shchyna* by ethnographer Volodymyr Shukhevych, and a number of works by Osip Iurii Fed'kevych, a writer from Bukovyna in *Hutsul'shchyna*.²³⁸ These works captivated Kotsiubyns'kyi but ultimately left him wanting to experience the region for himself. In January 1911, he told Hnatiuk:

²³⁵ V. F. Tsahaniuk and Iu. P. Humeniuk, *Narodnoznavchi motyvy v tvorchosti M Kotsiubyns'koho* (Vinnytsia: Vinobldrukarnia, 1997), p. 12.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

²³⁷ Letter to Volodymyr Hnatiuk dated 5 June 1902, in Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v semy tomakh, v (Lysty (1886–1904))*, ed. by N. L. Kalenychenko (1974), pp. 266–67 (p. 267).

²³⁸ Letter to Hnatiuk dated 28 September 1910, in *ibid.*, VII, 72–74 (p. 72).

Ia, u svii chas, z holovoju pirnuv u “Hutsul’shchynu”, iaka mene zakhopyla. Iakyi oryhinal’nyi krai, iakyi nezvychainyi, kazkovyi narod. Ale knyzhka knyzhkoiu, treba maty zhyvi vrazhennia, shchob shchos’ zrobyty, - i khochet’sia shvydshe dochekatysia lita.²³⁹

Kotsiubyns’kyi resolved to visit Kryvorivnia again, which he duly did in the summer of 1911. There he spent his time ‘collecting material, experiencing nature, observing, listening, and learning’.²⁴⁰ Notwithstanding the bad weather, Kotsiubyns’kyi managed to make a trip to Holovy, high up in the mountains, where he visited the local teacher Luka Harmatii. Together with Harmatii, he travelled to the Skupova pasture, where they spent the night by the *vatra* (the shepherds’ bonfire which burns all summer on the pasture), ate *banosh* (a Hutsul dish made of cornmeal), and observed life on the pasture. Whilst in Holovy, they also went to a *posidzhennia* (similar to a wake during which special games are played next to the deceased), and observed a funeral and a wedding.²⁴¹ All of these experiences would feed directly into *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Indeed, it was Harmatii who told Kotsiubyns’kyi the true story of the two feuding Hutsul families upon which the novella is based.²⁴² Kotsiubyns’kyi meticulously noted down all his observations upon which he would draw when writing.²⁴³ As Hnatiuk recalls:

²³⁹ ‘A while ago, I completely immersed myself in *Hutsul’shchyna*, which has enchanted me. What an original land, what an extraordinary, fairy-tale people. But a book is a book; you need to have real-life impressions in order to do anything – and I want the summer to arrive more quickly.’ Letter to Hnatiuk dated 12 January 1911, in *ibid.*, pp. 97–98 (p. 97).

²⁴⁰ Letter to Maksim Gor’kii dated 29 June 1911, in *ibid.*, pp. 126–27 (p. 126).

²⁴¹ V. Hnatiuk, ‘Sympatychna Postat’ in *Spohady pro Mykhaila Kotsiubyns’koho*, ed. by Mykhailo Potupeiko, 2nd edn (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989), pp. 175–79 (pp. 178–79).

²⁴² As recalled by Harmatii’s daughter, Hanna Harmatii-Tsheh’s’ka, in a memoir dated 24 February 1970, in *Volodymyr Hnatiuk: Dokumenty i materialy*, ed. by Dashkevych, pp. 404–06 (pp. 405–06).

²⁴³ M. Mochul’s’kyi, ‘Chudovyi khudozhnyk slova’ in *Spohady*, ed. by Potupeiko, pp. 127–29 (p. 128).

Ia mav nahodu prydyvytysia ioho pryhotovanniam do pysannia u Kryvorivni. Napered studiuvav vin mistsevu pryrodu, khodyv po lisi ta po tsarynkakh, vertaiuchy vse z povnym oberemkom riznykh kvitiv, pro iakykh nazvy i pryznachennia vypytyvav opislia selian. Robyv sobi vsiaki zapysky, rozmovliavsia vs'omu pyl'no, ne pomynaiuchy nichoho, navit' naimenshoi dribnytsi. Krim toho, prochytuvav usiaku dostupnu literaturu, artystychny i naukovu.²⁴⁴

Hnatiuk valued and respected Kotsiubyns'kyi's work, noting in particular the author's diligence in areas which others had overlooked:

Velyku vahu pryv'iazuvav vin do narodnoi usnoi literatury i studiuvav ii duzhe pyl'no, prochytuiuchy zbirnyky navit' u takykh dialektakh, shcho inshyi i ne torkav by ikh.²⁴⁵

This attention to language is reflected in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, which incorporates the Hutsul dialect within the text – and, crucially, as part of the narrative voice – and which includes a glossary of terms at the end. Kotsiubyns'kyi began writing the novella in earnest upon his return from the mountains and finished the work in November 1911, remarking:

Ne znaiu, chy vono vdalosia meni, ale koly b ia khoch trokhy perenis na papir koloryt Hutsul'shchyny i zapakh Karpat, to i z toho buv by zadovolenyi.²⁴⁶

In this desire to evoke a multi-sensorial impression of Hutsul'shchyna, as in many other ways, parallels can be drawn between Kotsiubyns'kyi's work and Paradzhanov's adaptation. Ultimately, Kotsiubyns'kyi was not satisfied and,

²⁴⁴ 'I had the opportunity to observe his preparations for writing in Kryvorivnia. He studied the local nature in advance, walked round the woods and village outskirts, returning with an armful of different flowers, the names and meanings of which he later asked the villagers. He made all kinds of notes for himself, talking attentively to all, not changing anything, not even the slightest detail. Aside from this, he read every available piece of literature, artistic and scientific.' Hnatiuk, 'Sympatychna Postat', p. 177.

²⁴⁵ 'He attached great weight to folk oral literature and studied it very carefully, reading collections in the kinds of dialects that others would not have touched.' Ibid., p. 179.

²⁴⁶ 'I don't know if I have succeeded, but if I have been able to transfer onto paper even just a little of the local colour of Hutsul'shchyna and the smell of the Carpathians, then I would be satisfied even with that.' Letter to Mykhailo Mohylians'kyi dated 17 November 1911, in Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v semy tomakh*, VII, 147–48 (p. 147).

following the publication of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, he embarked upon another research trip to Kryvorivnia in 1912, where he gathered even more material which he intended to use as the basis for a further work. Sadly, however, Kotsiubyns'kyi was unable to withstand the ill-health with which he had long been plagued, and he died shortly after this third trip, in 1913.

In the Shadows of *Shadows*

The extent to which Paradzhanov was familiar with the history behind the writing of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is unclear. However, his description of his impressions of Hutsul'shchyna bears a striking resemblance to that of Kotsiubyns'kyi: 'Tse nesvychainyi krai, iakyyi treba piznavaty i vyvchaty u vsii ioho charivnosti' (It is an extraordinary land, which you have to keep on discovering and learning about in all its charm).²⁴⁷ As Kotsiubyns'kyi had done before him, Paradzhanov observed traditional ceremonies – a wedding and a funeral – and ventured high up into the Chornohora mountain range. He wanted to see the surrounding area from the highest vantage point possible before selecting the locations in which he would film.²⁴⁸ Amongst those eventually selected was the village of Kryvorivnia. There, the meeting of past and present found a living link in the form of Paraska Kharuk, the one-hundred-year-old owner of the *khata-grazhda* (a traditional Hutsul farmhouse with a roofed fence and internal yard and porch) which was chosen as the setting for the Paliichuks' home in the film. In her youth, Paraska had been friends with Ivan Franko, who had stayed in a small house opposite her own, across the river

²⁴⁷ Cited in Larysa Briukhovets'ka, 'Litopys podii', in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 13–15 (p. 13).

²⁴⁸ Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 41.

Cheremosh. According to her great-great-grandson, Paraska most probably also knew Kotsiubyns'kyi, who lived in Mykhailo Moiseichuk's *khata* when he visited Kryvorivnia, roughly four hundred metres away from her home. By the time Paradzhanov and his crew arrived, Paraska was well into her old-age, but her son Ivan was well acquainted with the director.²⁴⁹

As Kotsiubyns'kyi had done some fifty years before, the filmmakers also consulted locals in order to better understand the region. It was customary for Soviet filmmakers to engage the services of a consultant, who could provide expert knowledge of the particular topic with which the film was concerned. In Paradzhanov's film this role was fulfilled by Fedir Manailo, an artist from the Carpathian region whom Dziuba described as 'an unrivalled expert and "magician" of folk life and art' (nesravnennyi znatok i "charodei" narodnogo byta i iskusstva).²⁵⁰ However, Paradzhanov did not only rely on his consultant for advice. Indeed, as Luhovs'kyi recalls, the screenplay was constantly changing to incorporate the advice given by the local Hutsuls who were taking part in the film.²⁵¹ The use of non-professional actors was not new in Soviet fiction film. In the 1920s, for example, Eizenshtein, Pudovkin and Dovzhenko had developed the concept of *typage*, whereby individuals were cast according to their physical attributes rather than necessarily for their acting ability. As a result, non-professionals who looked the part could find themselves in a film. The function of the non-professionals lay in their physicality – they represented a particular type, a social class, and were recognized as such by the audience. The decision to use non-professional actors in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is

²⁴⁹ Interview with Vasyl' Kharuk (Kryvorivnia, 23 August 2010).

²⁵⁰ Dziuba, 'Den' poiska', p. 79.

²⁵¹ Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 41.

therefore not without precedent. What was striking in the case of Paradzhanov's film, however, was the extent to which the non-professionals collaborated with the filmmakers. In an interview for the newspaper *Komsomol'skoe znamia* in September 1964, Paradzhanov was reported as saying:

To, chto my poltora goda zhili na prikarpatskikh poloninakh, ochen' mnogo dalo vsemu tvorcheskomu kollektivu. Liudi, s kotorymi my vstrechalis', obogashchali nashi pervonachal'nye plany. I ne budet preuvelicheniem skazat', chto narod poluchilsia glavnym deistvuiushchim litsom kinopovesti. Chtoby ni predstavlialos' na ekrane, ni odna veshch' zdes' ne lozhno-narodnaia. V massovykh stsenakh snimalis' kolkhozniki, kotorye, kstati skazat', vse znaiut "Teni zabytykh predkov" i ochen' revnostno, kak k chemu-to svoemu, rodnomu, otneslis' k postanovke fil'ma. Oni prinosili nam starinnye ikony i tserkovnuiu posudu, namista i kresanki... Esli artistka nadevala kosynku i delala eto ne po-gutsul'ski, to kto-to iz mestnykh zritelei podkhodil k nei i sam popravliial kosynku.²⁵²

This accords well with how the filmmaking process is recalled by the local residents who took part. Hanna Chabaniuk played the role of the young Hutsul bride, who is seen through the foliage during the wedding procession which marks the return to colour from the black-and-white scenes of the film. According to Chabaniuk, the filmed footage was screened throughout the filmmaking process, and if anyone was unhappy with a particular aspect they could say so, and Paradzhanov would listen and try to ascertain what that individual would prefer.²⁵³ This collaborative process bears a striking resemblance to Robert Flaherty's approach to filming *Nanook of the North* (1922), during which he is believed to have shown his footage to Allakariallak, who plays Nanook, for comment.²⁵⁴ Jean Rouch considered this approach by Flaherty as the invention of the principle of 'feedback', a technique he would employ to great

²⁵² Cited in Voskoboinikova, 'Ozhivaiut davnie teni'.

²⁵³ Interview with Hanna Chabaniuk (Verkhovyna, 21 August 2010).

²⁵⁴ Jean Rouch, *Ciné-ethnography*, ed. and trans. by Stephen Feld (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), p. 32.

effect in his own films, most famously *Chronique d'un été* (Chronicle of a Summer, 1960), in which the viewer watches Rouch show and discuss with his respondents footage which has featured earlier in the film.²⁵⁵ Whilst Rouch's film undoubtedly displays a greater level of reflexivity, there is nonetheless a point of commonality with *Tini zabutykh predkiv* in terms of collaboration and feedback.

Vasyl' Khimchak, who took part in the film and was the grandson of Ievdokiia and Petro Soruk, with whom Paradzhanov stayed during filming, recalls the lively discussions of the footage at his grandparents' *khata*. On Saturdays, the cast and crew (Illienko, Kadochnykova, Mykolaichuk and Iakutovych) would convene at the Soruks' home to watch and discuss what they had filmed so far. Petro and Ievdokiia would be consulted on all manner of things and would comment on the film's accuracy. The manner in which Palahna eats her food (with one hand held underneath her spoon), for example, was inspired by Ievdokiia.²⁵⁶ On another occasion, Paradzhanov was trying to stage the scene in which Palahna first meets Ivan, whereupon Ievdokiia ran into her *khata* and retrieved a red parasol she owned from before 1917, when the region was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and laughingly declared: "Let the Muscovite hold the Austrian parasol!" (she was referring to the Russian provenance of actress Tat'iana Bestaeva).²⁵⁷ Paradzhanov seized upon this idea with enthusiasm and Ievdokiia's parasol was used in the scene. The local residents did not always see eye to eye with the director, however. When Paradzhanov decided to incorporate the wearing of a yoke into the ceremonial rituals depicted during Ivan's wedding to Palahna, there was considerable uproar. The

²⁵⁵ See Stephen Feld, 'Editor's Introduction', in *ibid.*, pp.1–25 (pp. 12–13).

²⁵⁶ Interview with Vasyl' Khimchak (Verkhovyna, 23 August 2010).

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*.

Hutsuls were offended: “We are not animals!”, they cried. Paradzhanov explained that this was not meant as an insult but merely to symbolize a lack of freedom.²⁵⁸ Subsequently, he has explained that the inspiration for the yoke came from a *kolomyika* song which he had heard.²⁵⁹ Despite the concerns of the locals, the yoke was incorporated in the scene. In his memoirs, the assistant director Luhovs'kyi has suggested that the yoke has since been embraced by the Hutsul community:

Vidtodu na vsikh Hutsul's'kykh vesilliakh pradavnii ritual popovnyvsia shche odnym obov'iazkovym aksesuarom – iarmom! Khocha i ne vsi teper znaiut', svidky vono vzialosia i shcho tse oznachaie.²⁶⁰

However, none of the individuals whom I met in Hutsul'shchyna confirmed that this was the case. The episode with the yoke is useful in highlighting the dialogue that took place between the filmmakers and local residents. Nevertheless, it also sounds a faint, yet important, note of caution in our consideration of the collaborative nature of the filmmaking process. This is equally true of the filming of Ivan's wake (*posidzhennia*), which provoked much concern with regard to the inclusion of funeral games (which are also described in Kotsiubyns'kyi's text). According to the local residents, such games were played when an old person died and the death formed part of the natural cycle of life. However, in the case of Ivan, who died tragically young, these games would not have been played.²⁶¹ The funeral games were nonetheless included in the film and, as both these episodes demonstrate, ultimately, artistic control lay with the director.

²⁵⁸ Interview with Halyna Moka (Verkhovyna, 19 August 2010).

²⁵⁹ Paradzhanov, 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', p. 63.

²⁶⁰ 'Since then, at every Hutsul wedding the ancient ritual has been augmented with yet another compulsory prop – a yoke! Even though these days not everyone knows where it originated from, or its significance.' Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, pp. 93–95.

²⁶¹ Interview with Halyna Moka (Verkhovyna, 19 August 2010).

In other respects, however, the non-professional participants were given free rein to express their creativity. Most, if not all, of their contributions were improvised. As one participant explained, there was no need for scripts as they all knew, from life's experiences, what to say.²⁶² Occasionally there were difficulties with this method, as evinced in Paradzhanov's recollection of filming the women's lamentations (presumably referring to the funeral of Petro Paliichuk):

Polozhili na stol grob, posadili mestnykh babushek-plakal'shchits. Nachali! Babushki ne plachut. V chem delo? "Grob pustoi." Ia govoriu assistentu: "Lozhis' v grob". Assistent lozhitsia. Motor! Nachali! Babushki molchat. V chem delo? "On molodoi". Nashli deda, poloshili v grob, babusi [*sic*] ne plachut: "On chuzhoi." Privezli deda iz ikh derevni, svoego, liubimogo. Polozhili v grob. Tut takoi plach podnialsia, posle s'emki ostanovit' ne mogli.²⁶³

The use of improvisation again brings to mind the work of Rouch, in particular his 1958 film *Moi, un Noir* (Me, a Black Man), in which he asked the filmic subjects to improvise the dialogue whilst watching footage of their performances being screened. This resonates with the black-and-white section of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, in which a number of non-professional participants provide a commentary to the action on screen. These commentaries do not appear in the original screenplays, and it must be assumed that, as with so many other things, the idea for them arose on location.²⁶⁴ Whilst the fluid approach to filming proved difficult for the assistant director, who never knew what the next day would bring, it is testament to the extent to which the

²⁶² Interview with Katerina Demydiuk (Krasnoillia, 22 August 2010). She immediately proved her point by breaking out into *holosinnia* (lamentations) similar to that which is heard in the film.

²⁶³ Vasilii Katanian, *Paradzhanov: Tsena vechnogo prazdnika* (Moscow: Chetyre iskusstva, 1994), p. 11.

²⁶⁴ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 6, d. 577 and 578.

experience of being on location influenced the director.²⁶⁵ Indeed, there was much to learn – a fact which the local participants impressed upon Paradzhanov, as he recalls:

Nashel ia dedusiu, chtoby sygral narodnuiu melodiiu dlia odnogo epizoda.
On prines instrument – doshchechka i struna.

- Chto igrat', veseloe ili grustnoe?

- Igrai veseloe.

Ded propilikal: tin'-tin'-tin'.

- A teper' grustnoe.

Ded opiat': tin'-tin'-tin'.

- Kakaia zhe raznitsa?

- Ne ponial? Togda vot chto. Ia snachala budu igrat' veseloe, potom kivnu i sygraiu grustnoe.

Opiat': tin'-tin'-tin'. On kivaet. I snova: tin'-tin'-tin'.

- Ponial?

- Net.

- Togda ne snimai kino pro Gutsul'shchinu.²⁶⁶

From this description, it is tempting to conclude that Paradzhanov is referring to the *lirnyk*, whose music can be heard at various intervals throughout the film, and which is discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four. However, we should note that elsewhere the director has recalled a similar story with regard to the *drymba*-playing shepherds.²⁶⁷ Regardless of the identity of the musician, the anecdote – and its telling – suggests that Paradzhanov placed great value on the knowledge of the local participants, who were the real experts in the filmmaking process. He did not go to

²⁶⁵ Frustrated with the divergences from the screenplay, Luhovs'kyi insisted that each evening Paradzhanov agree the plan for the following morning's shoot, which he duly did in the form of little sketches (*rozkadrovky*), which are printed in Luhovs'kyi's book. Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 18.

²⁶⁶ Cited in Katanian, *Tsena vechnogo prazdnika*, p. 11.

²⁶⁷ Paradzhanov, 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', p. 63.

Hutsul'shchyna in order to make a film *about* the Hutsuls so much as to make a film *with* them.

Back to the studio

The collaboration between the filmmakers and the Hutsuls did not end in the Carpathians. On two separate occasions, a number of the participants travelled to Kyiv for recording at the Dovzhenko Studio.²⁶⁸ In particular, this was required for the post-synchronous sound recording (*ozvuchennia*) of certain scenes.²⁶⁹ It is significant that the non-professional participants were invited to Kyiv for this task, as this need not necessarily have been the case. In *Lisova pisnia* (Song of the Forest, 1961, directed by Viktor Ivchenko), for example, Raisa Prokopenko (then Doroshenko) was chosen to play the role of the mermaid but the voice of her character was recorded by a professional actress.²⁷⁰ Indeed, in a studio where films were routinely dubbed into at least one other language, this decision is testament to a desire to maintain a connection between the space in which the film is set and the sounds that are heard

²⁶⁸ Interview with Katerina Demydiuk (Krasnoillia, 22 August 2010).

²⁶⁹ The sound operator Serhiienko did record sound on location. (Interview with Hanna Chabaniuk (Verkhovyna, 21 August 2010).) However, in general the studio was poorly equipped for the synchronous recording of sound. Makarenko bemoaned this lack of equipment in his 1961 article: 'V podavliaiushchem bol'shinstve sluchaev rezhisser na nature lishen vozmozhnosti zapisat' na plenku izumitel'nye bogatstva zvukovoi sredy, s kotoroi slilsia by nerazdel'no obraz geroia. Dlia etogo nuzhno ochen' nemnogoe: proiavlenie tvorcheskogo otnosheniia k delu so storony zvukovogo tsekha – nuzhno ubrat' shumy tekhniki. Prakticheski eta problema na drugikh studiiakh davno reshena. No... Sostoianie tekhniki i osnashchennost' eiu studii imeni Dovzhenko ne pozvoliaet eto osushchestvit'. Poetomu rabota do sikh por idet dedovskim sposobom: zapisyvaiut nacherno na nature, a potom ozvuchivaiut v tonatel'e.' Makarenko, 'Gliadia v koren', p. 130. The situation had not been resolved by the time of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. At a conference in 1966, senior engineer and sound operator at the studio, Anatolii Chernoochenko, reported that on his recent expedition to film *Dni l'otni* (Flight Days, 1965, directed by Mykola Litus and Leonid Rizin), despite all the equipment at their disposal, there was nothing with which they could synchronously record sound. TsDAMLMU, f. 655, op. 1, d. 356, l. 183.

²⁷⁰ Interview with Raisa Prokopenko (Kyiv, 12 July 2010).

within that space. Having made such a decision, it is therefore entirely logical that Paradzhanov would resist attempts to produce a Russian version of the film following its completion in September 1964.

When the studio's artistic council met on 4 September 1964 to discuss the finished film, it was Oleksandr Il'chenko, a writer and author of the screenplay for *Roman i Francheska*, who voiced the following request: 'ne dublirovat' etot fil'm, a dat' subtitry. V etom podlinnost' i pravda.'²⁷¹ In December that same year, Paradzhanov sought the advice of his colleagues at a screening of the film in Moscow on how to resist pressure to dub the film:

My stoim pered bol'shoi problemoi: kak delat' russkii variant. Ia kategoricheski protiv dublirovaniia prichitanii, placha. Ia proshu mne mne [sic] pomoch' i posovetovat'.²⁷²

That winter, the Ukrainian and Soviet authorities had begun to argue over the Russian version of the film. By the end of 1964, it had been agreed that additional intertitles would be used to provide extra information in Russian.²⁷³ By February 1965, however, concerns over this approach were being raised in Moscow: the Deputy Chair of Goskino, Vladimir Baskakov, told Ivanov that, given the difficulty in understanding the Ukrainian language for the mass viewer, certain sections of the film should be accompanied by a voice-over (diktorskii tekst).²⁷⁴ Nevertheless, the studio succeeded in preserving the original soundtrack in its entirety. According to the director Roman Balaian, it was the only film to have been screened in its original

²⁷¹ TsDAMLUMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1750, l. 121.

²⁷² RGALI, f. 2936, op. 1, d. 528, l. 10.

²⁷³ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 280, l. 28.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 31.

language across the entire Soviet Union.²⁷⁵ The delay in reaching this decision resulted in the year-long gap between the film's completion and its official premiere in Kyiv on 4 September 1965.²⁷⁶ As we have noted in the Introduction, the film's screening that evening coincided with another dramatic performance, initiated by Dziuba and Stus in protest against a series of recent arrests. The actual premiere of the film was much less eventful and took place in Ivano-Frankivs'k, followed by a screening in Verkhovyna.²⁷⁷ One can imagine the excitement that must have been felt when the local participants first viewed the film. It was particularly important that in the film their voices were heard – it literally gave them voice. 'We have our own language and the film shows that', I was told.²⁷⁸ As another respondent explained, it had been a great shock for them when *Oleksa Dovbush* was screened and everyone was speaking in Russian!²⁷⁹ The importance of the fact that in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* their own voices are heard, speaking in their own dialect (*po-hutsul's'ky*), should not be underestimated. This particular respondent had taken part in the filming of *Annychka* and recalled having taught the Kyiv visitors how to sing 'po-hutsul's'ky'. Nonetheless, she specified that the memorable performance of the song 'Hei Ivane' in *Annychka* was *po-ukrains'ky* (in Ukrainian) and not *po-hutsul's'ky*. Yet despite the authenticity of the soundtrack in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* this respondent ultimately felt that the best representation of the Hutsuls was to be found in Ivanov's *Oleksa Dovbush*.²⁸⁰ As Ivan Zelenchuk has explained to me, this is by no means an outlying

²⁷⁵ Cited in Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 17.

²⁷⁶ TsDAMLUMU, f. 655, op. 1, d. 309, l. 244.

²⁷⁷ Bohdan Kufryk, 'Iuvilei henial'noho fil'mu', *Ekspres*, 28–29 September 2004, p. 19.

²⁷⁸ Interview with Hanna Chabaniuk (Verkhovyna, 21 August 2010).

²⁷⁹ Interview with Mariia Konishchuk (Verkhovyna, 19 August 2010).

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*.

preference amongst the Hutsul community. Zelenchuk, who is a member of the Hutsul community in Verkhovyna, has conducted his own research into the relationship between his hometown and the Dovzhenko Studio, collecting the memoirs of a number of the ‘amateur-actors’ of Hutsul’shchyna. He suggested that, whilst the Hutsul community recognizes the importance of Paradzhanov’s film, it is a ‘difficult’ film and less accessible than *Annychka* or *Oleksa Dovbush*, with which they are more familiar.²⁸¹ Nonetheless, a number of the participants with whom I spoke articulated highly sophisticated analyses of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, which certainly aided my own appreciation of the film. The reception of the film is potentially quite varied, yet one thing is clear: residents of Verkhovyna appreciate the film’s significance for the region, a factor which can only enhance the respect and esteem in which it is held. The memory of this period in Ukrainian cinema – when Zhab’ievs’kyi Potik came to be known as ‘Hutsul’s’kyi Holivud’ (Hutsul Hollywood) – is being kept alive. In 2001, a museum dedicated to Paradzhanov’s film, and the Hutsuls who took part in it, was established at the *khata* of Petro and Ievdokiia Soruk (now belonging to their grandson Vasyl’ Khimchak); an excursion called ‘Slidamy *Tinei zabutykh predkiv*’ (In the Footsteps of *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*) has been devised so that tourists can visit the various sites where the filming took place;²⁸² and, at the time of my visit, the local museum in Verkhovyna had put on a special display concerning the filming of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* to commemorate the recent death of Illienko.

²⁸¹ Interview with Ivan Zelenchuk (Verkhovyna, 20 August 2010).

²⁸² The name of this excursion is derived from a television documentary about the filming of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, produced in 2000 by the Ukrainian channel “1+1”.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the various influences that gave rise to the production of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* at the Dovzhenko Studio in the early 1960s, influences which shaped the approach to filmmaking that subsequently emerged on location in the Carpathians. As the following chapters will demonstrate, the crew's experience filming in the mountains is crucial to understanding the film itself. The account of the filmmaking process that has been provided in this chapter is supported by the recollections of the non-professional participants, who can be seen as co-creators of the film. Interestingly, a renewed sense of ownership over the film can be detected in recent times amongst the Hutsul community, who are embracing it as part of their local history.

The filmmaking process was unusual for a fiction film and displayed some commonalities with ethnographic filmmaking practices. The collaborative nature of the filmmaking process, in which the visitors from the Dovzhenko Studio drew upon local knowledge and expertise in order to make a film *with* and not *about* the Hutsul community, bears some resemblance to, for example, the contemporaneous work of Rouch, although, as we have noted, when opinions diverged, ultimate control resided with the director and his artistic vision. The desire to experience Hutsul'shchyna and immerse oneself in the local way of life, displayed in particular by Paradzhanov, is strongly resonant of the method of participant observation, which is practised by ethnographers in the field. In some ways, this can be linked to the striving for greater authenticity which characterizes the 'Thaw' era. More particularly, however, it can be traced to the original expedition to the region conducted by Kotsiubyns'kyi.

Notwithstanding these areas of commonality, this thesis does not seek to locate Paradzhanov's work within the body of 'ethnographic film'. As discussed in the Introduction, we must be cautious in our appropriation of the term 'ethnographic' if it is to continue to carry significance. *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was not made by an ethnographer, nor were the aims of the filmmakers directed towards contributing to anthropological knowledge. Their aim was artistic, and Ukrainian cinema is all the richer for it. Instead of labelling the film 'ethnographic', this thesis seeks to explore how this particular term might enhance our understanding of fiction film. Above all, it is argued, this can be found in the foregrounding of the interrelationship between filmmaking process and filmic product. Ethnography is both a research approach – a methodology – and the product of that approach; the one informs the other. Similarly, therefore, we can examine the film *Tini zabutykh predkiv* from an understanding of the filmmaking approach through which it was created. This chapter aimed to provide just such an understanding. In the following three chapters we will examine how the filmmaking process is reflected in the film itself. A specific treatment of time, space and sound will be identified, by means of which a sense of the filmmaking process – a sense of the experience of 'being there' – is imparted onto the film. Termed the 'Experiential Ethnographic Mode', its effect is threefold: it establishes a relationship between the filmic subjects, the story that is performed and the place of its performance; it asserts the coexistence in time and space of filmmakers and filmic subjects; and finally, it seeks to evoke in the viewer the experience of 'being there' herself.

CHAPTER TWO

Time and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode

The Experiential Ethnographic Mode is offered as a defining characteristic of the films of the Ukrainian poetic school. Its identification, as this thesis contends, enables a new interpretation of the films by highlighting how they engage in postmemorial work. The following three chapters will examine in turn the three components of the mode – time, space, and sound – through the analysis of a single film, *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Although each of these components is of equal importance, the temporal dimension perhaps carries a particular significance. After all, it is the relationship between past and present that lies central to the postmemorial work of the film. The nature of this relationship is manifested in the film's very title. *Tini zabutykh predkiv* suggests something that is both present and yet absent. A shadow is the reverse projection of something else, to which it is intrinsically linked and yet materially different. By its very presence, a shadow cannot imply absence, but speaks rather of co-existence. The relationship between the shadow and its originating object is strikingly similar to the relationship between present and past that is described by the term postmemory. A better analogy, perhaps, can be found in the aural equivalent of the shadow. With postmemory, the object of study is the echo of the event, the continued resonance of an originating sound, from which it is distinct yet to which it is intrinsically bound. Given the importance of sound within the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, it is fitting that the aural should offer the most useful analogy. Indeed, Kotsiubyns'kyi considered the word 'echo' as an alternative to 'shadows'

when he compiled a list of possible titles for the story.²⁸³ Although ultimately he chose to place the emphasis on the visual rather than the aural, the title would eventually itself become an echo through its continued resonance in a different medium.

The echo of the title in its filmic form undermines the verb ‘to forget’, to which it refers, and invokes instead the verb ‘to remember’; it is, in effect, a memory of its originating source. Moreover, the film was commissioned to commemorate the centenary of Kotsiubyns'kyi's birth. Having arisen out of an act of memory, the film itself presents the process of remembering: the past is shown in the film to be something that is being performed in the present. This is achieved through the Experiential Ethnographic Mode which, as this chapter will demonstrate, evokes a number of temporalities and can be characterized by their layering. To a certain extent, it could be argued that this is simply the effective use of the cinematic medium, which inherently possesses the capability to engage multiple temporalities: the temporality of the narrative can be distinguished from the temporality of the filmic product (i.e. its manipulation of ‘real’ time through, for example, editing cuts), and the temporality of its reception.²⁸⁴ However, fundamental to the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is the evocation of the temporality of the recording (of both visual and aural material), which conventional fiction film seeks to suppress. This characteristic of the mode is crucial to its function as a mechanism for postmemorial work in the films of the poetic school. The temporality of the recording evokes an

²⁸³ Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v semy tomakh*, III (*Opovidannia, Povisti (1908–1913)*), ed. by P. I. Kolesnyk (1974), p. 355.

²⁸⁴ On the development of a specifically cinematic temporality (here referred to as the temporality of the filmic product), see Mary Ann Doane, *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

awareness of the filmmaking present, which co-exists with the past of the narrative temporality. In this way, the film evokes the sensation of remembering, which is similarly an experience of multiple temporalities, in which both past and present are perceived to coexist. By encouraging the viewer to participate in this act of remembering, the film engages in postmemorial work and attempts to widen the postmemorial circle.

Whilst the previous chapter investigated the nature of the filmmaking process, the following three chapters relate solely to the filmic product. Their focus is purely on the means by which the film, through its usage of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, evokes within the viewer a sense of the filmmaking process, and of the filmmakers' experience of *being there* on location. This chapter examines specifically how the treatment of time functions in this respect. It investigates how the film expresses the temporality of the recording, and what this implies about the nature of the relationship between filmmaker and filmic subject. Furthermore, it considers how the film encourages the viewer to believe in the relationship of the filmic subjects to the past that they perform, that it is 'their' past that is being remembered. This relates to the film's status as a postmemorial work, as an attempt, as noted earlier, 'to remember, to re-build, to re-incarnate, to replace and to repair'.²⁸⁵ Finally, the chapter addresses the ways in which the film encourages the viewer to participate in this remembering and thus expand the postmemorial circle.

²⁸⁵ Hirsch, 'Past Lives', p. 661.

Temporal Multiplicity

Tini zabutykh predkiv is, above all, a film about time. This is made clear through the film's structure, particularly through its use of intertitles. In total, there are twenty-four intertitles in the film, corresponding to the twenty-four hours in a day.²⁸⁶ Grouped into clusters of between one and four, the intertitles appear in the film on thirteen occasions. Continuing with the temporal theme, this divides the film into twelve chapters, representing the twelve months of a year, with either a prologue or an epilogue. The final intertitle ('Pieta'), which marks the thirteenth section, is written in a different script (Latin not Cyrillic) and font, and this is the only section in which Ivan does not feature as a living being. These differences set the final section apart and suggest that the film is most appropriately conceived of as twelve chapters with an epilogue. Given that the twelve chapters correspond to the life cycle of Ivan, the epilogue therefore suggests the continuation of life beyond death. This is enhanced by the final image of the film, in which the camera rests on the faces of eight children, whose lives lie in the future. This shot, in which Paradzhanov's son Suren features, was purportedly the director's favourite from the whole film.²⁸⁷ In his storyboard for the scene, Paradzhanov labelled the children as '8 Ivanchykiv' (eight little Ivans).²⁸⁸ As this final image shows, and through its structural arrangement as a whole, the film is therefore concerned with continuity. This might be imagined as the

²⁸⁶ The following analysis does not include the end credits. In examining the film for this thesis, a shot-by-shot analysis has been conducted which has been combined with information contained in the *montazhnye listy* held at Gosfil'mofond.

²⁸⁷ Larisa Kadochnikova, *Belaia ptitsa: Polety naiavu i vo sne* (Vinnytsia: Globus-Press, 2008), p. 147.

²⁸⁸ Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 147.

continuity from the past to the present and beyond, or as the continuity of the past within the present – a kind of temporal multiplicity.

The use of intertitles was considered by the cameraman, Illienko, to be the key to the film's integrity or wholeness (tsilisnist').²⁸⁹ However, in his 1970 critique of the poetic school, Bleiman pointed to their usage as evidence of archaicism, reverting back to cinema of the early twentieth century in which the 'shot-intertitle' formula was employed.²⁹⁰ Certainly, the use of intertitles resonates with silent-era cinema, and thus can be seen as an evocation of the past. Indeed, it is the evocation of a particular past – the period in which the original novella was written. However, the usage of intertitles is not simply the repetition of an old technique, as Bleiman would have us believe, but its adaptation to suit the capabilities of modern cinema. Making use of both colour and sound, the intertitles do not signify archaicism so much as the interaction between the past and the present. Nineteen of the intertitles are accompanied by sound; the five intertitles that appear in silence all relate to Ivan's relationship with Palahna, as if the loss of aural stimulation mirrors the absence in Ivan's life following Marichka's death.²⁹¹ Seventeen intertitles make use of colour schemes, with the remaining seven employing black and white, which is of course heavily resonant of the silent era (indeed, three of the intertitles without sound are also in black and white, as if to underscore their silence). Fifteen intertitles use red

²⁸⁹ Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 36.

²⁹⁰ Bleiman, 'Arkhaisty ili novatory?', p. 71.

²⁹¹ The silent intertitles are: '...Ivan zhenyt'sia...Treba zh bulo hazduvaty...' (Ivan gets married...he had to build his own home...); 'Ivan tai Palahna' (Ivan and Palahna); '...Tak ishlo zhyttia... Dlia pratsi – budni, dlia vorozhinnia – sviato...' (So their life went on... Workdays – for work, holidays – for sorcery...); 'Zavtra vesna' (Tomorrow is spring); '...Sviatyi Iura poshle ii ditei – i Palahna vorozhyla...' (St Iura hadn't given them children, so Palahna practised sorcery...).

lettering on a black background; the intertitle introducing the twelfth chapter ('Smert' Ivana' (Ivan's death)) reverses this colour code, so that black letters appear on a red background. Obviously, this use of the colour red symbolizes death, and is used consistently throughout the film (the image of the leaping red horses, which signals Ivan's father's death, is a notable example). In addition, the eighth intertitle, which marks the transition to the third chapter, uses a different colour code. Here, the text, which is accompanied by the sound of cicadas, is written in an orangey-yellow colour, signalling springtime and youth. Furthermore, the words themselves provide another means of interaction:

...Ale v Ivanovii pam'iaty smert' bat'ka zhyla ne tak dovho, iak zustrich z divchynkoiu...²⁹²

This draws on the original novella in which Kotsiubyns'kyi writes:

Ale v Ivanovii pam'iaty tatova smert' ne tak dovho zhyla, iak znaimist' z divcham [...]²⁹³

Six other intertitles draw directly on text from the novella. In addition to the cinematic past, therefore, the intertitles interact with the past of Kotsiubyns'kyi's text. Interestingly, as in the above example, these quotations make extensive use of ellipsis. However, this is not to signify missing text, but rather to suggest continuity, as if to show that the words have come from the past, continue to resonate in the present and, presumably, will carry on into the future. It is not just in these seven intertitles that Kotsiubyns'kyi's presence is felt; the writer is referred to directly in

²⁹² '...But in Ivan's memory, the death of his father did not live as long as the meeting with the girl...'

²⁹³ 'But in Ivan's memory, his father's death did not live as long as the meeting with the girl.' See 'Tini zabutykh predkiv', in Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v chotyrokh tomakh*, ed. by M. S. Hrytsiuta (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1985), III (*Povisti ta opovidannia 1910–1912*), 154–211 (p. 161).

three others. The third intertitle states that the film is dedicated to the one hundredth anniversary of Kotsiubyns'kyi's birth; the fifth intertitle presents the author's name; and the sixth intertitle illustrates the centenary between 1864 and 1964. This illustration is particularly significant, as it presents the final two numbers ('64') as shared between the '18' and the '19'. In this way, the past and the present co-exist – within the same intertitle – and are intrinsically bound together. This notion of temporal co-existence or continuity is linked with sound: the line dividing the '18' from the '19' is shaped like a *trembita*, as if to suggest that the sound of this instrument (which accompanies the intertitle in the soundtrack) resonates across the ages. The use of intertitles therefore provides a temporal structure to the film, and one which is layered. An overarching sense of calendrical time (and by extrapolation, the life cycle of an individual) is achieved through the film's division into twelve chapters, with the epilogue representing its continuation. Underlying this is an awareness of the specific time of the film's making (1964) along with that of Kotsiubyns'kyi's birth (1864). Furthermore, the intertitles trace the development of narrative fiction, from the pre-cinematic days of the written word, through the silent era of early cinema with its 'shot-intertitle-shot' formula, and on to modern cinema with its capability for colour and aural symbolism.

The intertitles point to another way in which the film is structured temporally. The eighth and ninth chapters are introduced respectively with the intertitles 'Rizdvo' (Christmas) and 'Zavtra vesna' (Tomorrow is spring), highlighting how the film is also divided according to the four seasons of the year and the calendar events with which it is punctuated. These then correspond to the life experiences with which the

narrative is concerned. Two deaths and a funeral are presented in the first two chapters, which take place during winter. The childhood friendship between Ivan and Marichka develops in spring, which is thus associated with youth. The narrative then jumps forward in time to an Easter church service in which the adult Ivan and Marichka are introduced to the viewer. Their relationship blossoms in the transition between spring and summer, just before Ivan leaves for the pasture. He spends the summer there, dreaming about Marichka, signifying that this season is associated with romantic love. When Ivan returns from the pasture in autumn, Marichka has already died. In just the space of Ivan and Marichka's relationship, from first meeting to separation by death, the film has covered the four seasons. There follows the fifth chapter, which is entitled "Samotnist" (Loneliness) and filmed almost entirely in black-and-white. This chapter presents each of the seasons within itself, attesting to the years of solitude experienced by Ivan following Marichka's death. The narrative then picks back up again in autumn, which is now associated with settling down: two weddings are shown in this season, including that of Ivan and Palahna. When Ivan reaches Palahna's home for the wedding ceremony, the inner yard is covered with fallen leaves. Three chapters later, the yard is filled with snow as the couple attempt to celebrate Christmas together; the chill outside reflects the state of their relationship. Ironically, the couple's lack of progeny is dealt with in spring, the season of re-birth. Palahna then begins a new relationship with Iura, and Ivan meets his death in the mountains.

The four seasons are thus mapped onto the narrative; this is enhanced through the inclusion of calendar events within the narrative itself, which function as seasonal

markers. In this way, the seasons present a means of elaborating the experience of time within the narrative (hereafter referred to as the ‘narrative temporality’). Interestingly, however, there is no clear indication of exactly when the narrative takes place. The novella was written in 1911, and it can be assumed that, in view of Kotsiubyns’kyi’s stated desire to convey the Hutsul’shchyna as he then experienced it, the narrative is also set around this time.²⁹⁴ The film, however, refers only to the year of Kotsiubyns’kyi’s birth (1864), which thus provides a vaguer indication of the time period in question. One other temporal signifier is given in the eleventh chapter (‘Korchma’ (Tavern)), which begins with two static shots of a portrait of Emperor Franz Josef I (1830-1916), under whose rule the region fell as part of the Austrian, and then Austro-Hungarian, Empire.²⁹⁵ Neither of these indications, however, gives a concrete sense of *when* the narrative takes place. However, it is perhaps because of this lack of specificity that the film achieves its temporal multiplicity. Similar to the use of intertitles, which provide a multi-layered temporal structure, the seasons also express more than just the narrative temporality. The changes that occur in the natural landscape throughout the film testify to the experience of time during the filmmaking process. This will be referred to as the ‘temporality of the recording’, a term which is understood to encompass the recording of both visual and aural material, although the former is of greater concern in this particular case. The temporality of the recording

²⁹⁴ In the preceding chapter we noted Kotsiubyns’kyi’s desire to transfer to his novella the smell and colour of the Carpathians (presumably as he experienced them at the time). See Chapter One, p. 112. Nonetheless, it is interesting that in the title Kotsiubyns’kyi selected for his novella he introduced a degree of temporal multiplicity through the use of the word ‘*predkiv*’.

²⁹⁵ These two static shots of the portrait – a close-up followed by a medium close shot – are echoed in the final two shots of the film, in which the children’s faces are framed by the window and form a living portrait. The repetition perhaps asserts that the land now belongs to them.

manifests itself physically in these seasonal changes in the landscapes. These changes can be reflected through the same image, shown in different states. For example, when Ivan erects a cross at Marichka's grave, it is autumn and there are leaves on the ground. The wood from which the cross is made directs the viewer's gaze to the surrounding trees, on which there are still some remaining leaves. The grave is shown again in the eighth chapter ('Rizdvo'). Here, there are no leaves on the trees, and there is snow on the ground. Alternatively, landscape changes are revealed through the use of different images showing seasonal variations. These include: the snow drifts, into which Ivan falls when running through the forest in the opening sequence; the field of flowers, in which Ivan and Marichka rollick in the third chapter; the sunshine in which the women, who are washing their sheets in the river, are bathed when Ivan and Marichka pass over the bridge before saying goodbye to one another; the thick fog, through which the shepherds drive the sheep down the mountain side, just before Marichka's death; and the autumnal colours of the foliage through which the wedding procession is viewed, just before Ivan first meets Palahna. In all of these examples – and there are more – the landscape is shown in a particular seasonal state and, moreover, the filmic subjects are somehow immersed within it. Both these strategies – showing the same image in different seasonal states, and the filmic subjects' immersion within the landscape – are used to great effect when filming the river. In the second chapter, when Ivan first speaks to Marichka after his father's death, he throws her ribbons into the river, on which is floating a great sheet of ice; in the next chapter, the children have become friends, by which time the river in which they are shown splashing about has thawed completely. It is in these gushing waters

that Marichka drowns in the fourth chapter. If the landscape signifies the temporality of the recording, Marichka is literally immersed in it. In this way, the filmic subject is placed within the temporality of the recording, which is of course that of the filmmaker, thus attesting to their coexistence in time. Indeed, when Ivan finds Marichka's body, the camera follows him through the water, thus suggesting the filmmaker's parallel immersion within the landscape too.²⁹⁶ It is perhaps unsurprising that the river should function in such a significant way, given the extent to which water imagery is employed in Kotsiubyns'kyi's text. Indeed, one might posit that the river functions in this way to reveal a further temporality: that of the original novella.

The natural landscape – or more precisely, its seasonal changes – acts as a site on which multiple temporalities co-exist. By mapping their experiences onto these seasonal landscapes, and at times by their literal immersion within them, the filmic subjects are presented as simultaneously occupying more than one temporality.²⁹⁷ This experience of multiple temporalities is akin to that of remembering, an experience in which the past and the present are felt to co-exist. Contrary to its title, it is with remembering and not forgetting that the film is actually concerned. After all, it is precisely Ivan's inability to forget Marichka that drives the narrative forward. Marichka is explicitly associated with Ivan's memory in the eighth intertitle, referred to above, and, as it states, she continues *to live* in his memory (my emphasis) even after her death. Thematically, the film's concern with time and continuity is expressed through the notion of life after death. Marichka's posthumous appearance

²⁹⁶ It is, of course, the camera operator who wades through the water. The operator is here understood to represent the notion of 'the filmmaker'.

²⁹⁷ The relationship between the filmic subjects and the space around them, and in particular the ways in which they are immersed within the landscape, will be examined in Chapter Three.

might reflect how she lives on in Ivan's memory, but it also refers to Hutsul beliefs in the return of the soul in non-human form (when Ivan sees Marichka after she has died in the novella, he identifies her as a wood nymph (niavka)).²⁹⁸ The notion of life after death is not only conveyed through reference to spiritual beliefs, however, but also through the more earthly idea of living on in one's descendants. Ivan bemoans his lack of children, and Palahna turns to sorcery in an attempt to conceive a child. Yet, despite Ivan's lack of an heir, the film ends on the faces of eight children, suggesting that life continues. Crucially, therefore, the film broadens its definition of descendants to one which is not limited to a strictly genetic lineage. The ancestors of whom the film speaks are thus potentially opened up for the viewer to claim as her own.

Temporal multiplicity is fundamental to the treatment of time in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, and represents a key characteristic of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. This is achieved through the layering of different temporalities that are expressed in the film, three of which have thus far been identified (the temporalities of the narrative, of Kotsiubyns'kyi's text, and of the recording). The concept of layering is actually highlighted visually in the film through the use of superimpositions. The visual layering of images in the superimpositions is complemented in the soundtrack by the *volynka* (a bagpipe-like instrument), whose multiple sound provides a kind of aural layering. In examining the superimpositions in more depth, a fourth temporality is revealed. Occurring during the fifth chapter ('Samotnist'), the superimpositions provide a momentary glimpse of colour in the otherwise black-and-white section, and signify Ivan's transition back to society following the years of solitude spent

²⁹⁸ Kotsiubyns'kyi, 'Tini zabutykh predkiv', p. 203.

mourning Marichka's death. Following this, Ivan meets Palahna and the second half of his life begins. In this way, the narrative is divided into two – Ivan's life before and after his marriage to Palahna – with the superimpositions marking the moment of transition. Correspondingly, the midway point of the film, which is ninety-one minutes and forty-one seconds long, is located during this very sequence.²⁹⁹ In this way, the superimpositions, which are themselves the layering of visual images, mark another site of layering; the midway point in the film marks the transition in Ivan's life from Marichka to Palahna, thus layering the temporality of the filmic product with that of the narrative.

The temporality of the filmic product refers to the experience of time within the fabric of the film itself, an obvious demonstration of which occurs during the eleventh chapter ('Korchma'). After Ivan is struck with an axe by Iura, the camera performs a 360 degree panorama in slow-motion, following Ivan around the room. This manipulation of filmic time expresses Ivan's sense of disorientation in his concussed state, and thus provides another example in which the temporality of the filmic product is layered with that of the narrative.³⁰⁰ Aside from the use of slow-motion (or the reverse effect of fast-motion), the temporality of the filmic product is perhaps most commonly expressed through the use of editing cuts. The duration of each shot within a film provides filmmakers with the means of creating rhythm and pace. In *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the average shot length is just under seventeen

²⁹⁹ The analysis provided here is based on the DVD released by Artificial Eye in 2010 (ART 496 DVD).

³⁰⁰ Nebesio has noted the use of slow-motion in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* to convey the subconscious world of the protagonist. See Bohdan Y. Nebesio, 'Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors: Storytelling in the Novel and the Film', *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 22 (1994), 42–49 (p. 45).

seconds.³⁰¹ The superimpositions (identified as one shot (*kadr*) in the *montazhnye listy*) are one of twenty shots in the film which last longer than sixty seconds and can be classified as ‘long takes’. Indeed, the superimpositions are the eleventh of these twenty, lengthy takes, which again positions them at the site of transition between two halves. The use of long takes is a device often employed in documentary and ethnographic filmmaking when wishing to convey the sense of life as it happens, unmediated by the filmmaker. Of course, the notion that unedited footage is less manipulated by the filmmaker has long been discredited. Nonetheless, the long takes in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* do provide a key to understanding how the Experiential Ethnographic Mode imparts a sense of the filmmaking process. Eighteen of the twenty long takes make use of a mobile camera.³⁰² By way of contrast, of the twenty-four shots in the film which last under two seconds, twenty-three are filmed with a

³⁰¹ This is based on the 328 shots identified in the *montazhnye listy* with which the film is composed (330 including end credits). The technique of analysing films according to average shot length (ASL) was one of a number of techniques promoted in a 1975 article by Barry Salt (‘Statistical Style Analysis of Motion Pictures’, *Film Quarterly* 28.1 (1974), 13–22). More recently, the film historian Iuri Tsiv’ian has created an online database for statistical data relating to films <<http://www.cinematics.lv/index.php>>. In a search conducted on 12 May 2011, out of 444 individual films stored within this database that were produced in the 1960s, only 60 were recorded as having an equal or greater ASL as *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Within this data are thirteen films produced in the Soviet Union, only three of which have been recorded as having a greater ASL than Paradzhanov’s film (these are: *Ivanovo detstvo* (Ivan’s Childhood, 1962, directed by Andrei Tarkovskii); *V gorode S* (In the Town of S., 1966, directed by Iosif Kheifits); and *Andrei Rublev* (1966, directed by Tarkovskii). According to Tsiv’ian’s own input to this database, Paradzhanov’s filmmaking corresponds fairly closely with that of Michelangelo Antonioni, for whom Tsiv’ian has recorded the following ASLs: *L’Avventura* (The Adventure, 1960) – 18s; *La Notte* (The Night, 1961) – 15.8s; *L’Eclisse* (Eclipse, 1962) – 11.9s; *Il Deserto Rosso* (Red Desert, 1964) – 10.1s; *Blow-up* (1966) – 11s.

³⁰² The two exceptions are: the superimpositions in which movement is manifested through the changing images themselves; and the scene during which the *vatah* narrates the legend of Vysokyi Beskyd, in which Myko’s bodily performance supplies the movement (this sequence is analysed in further detail below). The Dovzhenko Studio was proud of its capabilities for shooting with a mobile camera, as noted in a speech by camera operator Suren Shakhbazian at a meeting of the science and technology section in January 1964. TsDAMLMU, f. 655, op. 1, d. 294, l. 1.

static camera.³⁰³ Whilst long takes are juxtaposed with short takes, the key to this juxtaposition is movement. The movement of the camera in the long take functions to draw attention to the operator (and by extension the (notionally singular) filmmaker), and thus to the temporality of the recording. The temporality of the recording is of particular importance to ethnographic filmmakers wishing to express the encounter between the subject and anthropologist and the nature of their interaction. This is clearly illustrated in the films of Rouch, in which he draws attention to the filmmaker's presence, even appearing in front of the camera himself. By highlighting the temporality of the recording in this way, Rouch presents his films as an interaction between filmmaker and filmic subject. Whilst the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is characterized by its temporal layering, it is the temporality of the recording which plays a particularly significant role in evoking a sense of the filmmaking process. The following section will therefore examine how this temporality is evoked in the film in order to highlight the interaction between the filmmaker and filmic subject, and moreover, what this suggests about the nature of that interaction.

Temporality of the Recording

Although in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* the filmmaker does not literally appear in front of the camera, as in the films of Rouch, his presence is marked in a number of other ways. When Marichka wanders through the foggy forest, just before falling to her death, the camera pulls back through the trees, causing the branches to spring back in response to their contact with the apparatus. The camera's literal impact on its

³⁰³ The exception occurs during the storm sequence, in which the camera's movement obviously heightens the sense of chaos.

surrounding environment accords with Rouch's insistence that the presence of the camera inevitably impacts on events.³⁰⁴ More significantly, the filmmaker appears by proxy through the shadow of the camera operator, which is clearly visible on a number of occasions and breaks radically with cinematic convention. Given the title of the film, this is perhaps not accidental. A particularly clear example is provided during the third chapter ('Ivan tai Marichka' (Ivan and Marichka)) when the children run through the forest towards the river. Here, the shadow of the operator, and the crane on which he is sitting, is clearly projected onto the ground as the camera follows the children down the hillside. Later in this chapter, as Ivan says goodbye to Marichka before his departure to the pasture, the camera operator again features within the frame by virtue of his shadow. This time, however, the shadow is projected onto the characters themselves. As the camera circles the embracing couple, the operator's shadow correspondingly moves over their backs. In this way, the filmmaker and filmic subject are so closely aligned they effectively touch. The circling of the camera echoes the circle of the embrace, again suggesting a union between filmmaker and filmic subject, and one characterized by touch. Indeed, Ivan and Marichka begin to turn around in a circle themselves, so that the filmmaker and filmic subjects mirror one another's movements.³⁰⁵ Yet, at the same time, they are

³⁰⁴ The aim for Rouch is: 'Not to film life as it is, but life as it is provoked.' Cited in Mick Eaton, *Anthropology, Reality, Cinema: The Films of Jean Rouch* (London: BFI, 1979), p. 51. Eaton explains that in Rouch's films 'the camera, fused with the presence of its operator, is a catalyst, an accelerator, conceived of as an absolutely necessary presence, not to be hidden or minimised, but foregrounded, inscribed into the film text'. Ibid..

³⁰⁵ This circling movement of the camera is used elsewhere in the film, for example, in the scene when Ivan and Marichka embrace after leaving the Easter church service. Lakatos has likened the camera's circling to the Hutsul style of dancing, noting that in certain regions where the male occupied a more dominant position in society, the man would form the axis around which his female partner would turn, whereas in more equal societies, the couple

materially different – one is made of flesh, the other a mere shadow. Significantly, it is the filmmaker that is the latter, thus subverting the film's title.³⁰⁶ In another example, the camera operator's shadow is projected onto Ivan's back as he stumbles down the mountain in search of Marichka. Again, the shadow highlights the filmmaker's presence and the temporality of recording. In addition, whilst the shadow's positioning on Ivan's back is suggestive of a unity between filmmaker and filmic subject, it also reflects the way in which the camera literally tracks its subject. This notion of tracking is particularly evident in the tendency to film the characters through various natural barriers, such as tree foliage, flowers or grass. This will be examined in greater detail in the following chapter, but is simply noted here as one of the fundamental ways in which an observational style of shooting is revealed, and one which draws attention to the agency of the camera itself. This particular shot is the first in a sequence of three which constitute the scene of Ivan's search for, and discovery of, Marichka's body. The sequence provides a particularly striking example of the way in which the temporality of the recording is highlighted through the various movements of the camera. It is composed of two long takes (lasting sixty-two seconds and ninety-four seconds respectively) between which is intercut a shorter, forty-five second shot. Each of the three shots uses a mobile camera, although in different ways and for varying effects. The long takes both employ a hand-held camera, at times approaching Ivan for a close-up shot of his face. These techniques locate the camera in the middle of the action. Inserted between them is (what starts

would spin around a joint axis. Lakatosh, 'Tradytisia i novatorstvo', p. 39. Interestingly, then, the camera spins around the couple, suggesting a deferment to the authority of the filmic subject.

³⁰⁶ The shadows of the filmic characters are also highlighted throughout the film (particularly in the '*Korchma*' scene), and merit further investigation.

as) a high-angle long shot of the river. Here, the camera is given a privileged viewpoint, observing the action from above. Yet it is neither one position nor the other which creates an awareness of the camera's presence; it is their combination (a kind of layering in itself). Indeed, one might say that the camera is omnipresent: it is everywhere at once, both on the ground and looking down from above.

The first shot follows Ivan as he stumbles down the hillside. It moves from a high-angle shot of Ivan from behind (whereupon the operator's shadow is visible) to a low-angle shot looking up at his face as he nears the camera. The change in camera angle obviously creates an awareness of the physical landscape, mirroring the slope of the hill, and is a technique that is used consistently throughout the film.³⁰⁷ However, camera angles can also be used to denote authority: a high angle creates the sensation of looking down onto the filmic subject, thus giving authority to the filmmaker; a low angle reverses this dynamic by making the filmic subject loom over the camera. In this way, the changing angles reflect an interaction between filmmaker and filmic subject, the nature of which is fluid and in which neither party has greater authority over the other. Keeping close to Ivan in these first twenty seconds of the shot, the hand-held camera is very unsteady. This instability reflects both the rough terrain and the camera operator's movements across it, thus provoking in the viewer an awareness of the filmmaker's presence. Moreover, the image shown is that of Ivan stumbling over the terrain; Ivan's movements thus mirror those of the camera, uniting both filmmaker and filmic subject through their similar physical responses to the uneven ground. Ivan then moves towards the right of the screen and walks off frame.

³⁰⁷ The use of camera angles to reflect the physical space will be dealt with in greater detail in Chapter Three.

However, rather than cutting to a new shot of the central character, whom it has thus far been tracking, the camera gradually pans round to the left, before relocating Ivan. In fact, it is some twenty-five seconds until Ivan's reappearance in the frame. The movement of the camera thus provides a means for temporal layering: it enables the extended shot duration – a building block of the temporality of the filmic product – and, at the same time, it highlights the operator's presence and thus the temporality of the recording. Furthermore, it creates a heightened perception of the narrative temporality, for it is the tension of this moment in the story, in which every second counts, that the use of the long take is an attempt to convey. The pan is interesting, however, for another reason. When Ivan walks out of the frame, the camera, which has thus far been following him closely, detaches itself from the main character to record instead what is taking place behind him: Marichka's mother is imploring her husband to find her daughter. The camera then begins its slow pan, taking first in its view Marichka's father as he responds to his wife, and then continuing around to encompass the other groups of people who are also present (shepherds and local women). Just as their images fill the screen, the sound of their voices fills the soundtrack. This is now an inquisitive camera and, importantly, one for whom the background cast are of equal interest. In this slow pan, the camera's movement enables it to change from a subjective point of view (in which it is closely aligned to Ivan) to that of an independent actor within the scene, responding to the surrounding environment.

In the second shot of this sequence, the camera follows a raft on which Ivan is travelling down the river. The camera tracks the movement of the raft at first and then

appears to crane over the river itself.³⁰⁸ The high angle and movement of the camera create the impression that it is flying. If, in the preceding shot, the camera's movement had alerted the viewer to the uneven ground beneath the operator's feet, this shot creates the sensation of the carpet being swept from under them. This spectacular effect stuns the viewer into an awareness of the camera and its capabilities. At the same time it suggests the filmmaker's authority over the events that are unfolding below. The camera then turns as the raft passes beneath, at which point Ivan falls into a prostrate pose, further heightening the authority of the filmmaker over the filmic subject. Indeed, as Ivan passes directly beneath the camera, he is lying down with arms extended in the shape of a cross, perhaps suggesting a God-like role for the camera with Ivan occupying that of Christ – a further twist to the familial theme. The third shot opens with the camera now positioned on the raft with Ivan. However, it initially focuses on an unidentified Hutsul, also on the raft, playing a *floiara* (wooden pipe), which again gives equal weight to the background cast. The camera then pans to the left to locate Ivan within the frame. However, it does so in a sweeping arc that rises up to the sky before descending back to the other side of the raft, where Ivan is sitting. The camera rests for a moment on Ivan, where the use of a Dutch tilt expresses his emotional state, before repeating this arching pan back the other way. The camera focuses on the river bank, where Marichka's dead body is lying, and then repeats its arc back to Ivan. In its fourth and final arc back to the shore, the camera pauses slightly longer at the top, focusing on the clouds. These sweeping pans are a reminder of the high position that the camera occupied in the

³⁰⁸ In recalling the filming of this shot, Illienko explains that he slid down a sloping cable in a cradle, with the camera in his hands. See Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 47.

previous shot – as if looking back to its old viewpoint, perhaps even revelling in its mobility – whilst also reflecting Ivan’s inner turmoil, as his whole world turns upside-down. At the end of the fourth arc, the camera tilts downwards to look at the river. Ivan enters the frame from the right hand side, wading through the water. Clearly, the camera does not represent the point of view of Ivan – who is already in the water and slightly to one side – and so this downward gaze suggests that the camera operator is about to jump in too. The camera now follows Ivan through the water, at a slightly higher angle (perhaps the operator is not really in the water after all). When Ivan reaches the shore, his hand stretches out to touch a large rock. The camera then tilts upwards so that Marichka’s body further down the shore comes into the frame. Ivan moves forward, closer to Marichka, and pauses at another rock, along which he again stretches out his hand. The repetition of this move draws attention to the camera’s position on the first rock which Ivan had touched. The camera thus appears to be mirroring Ivan. In this way, the rock acts as a site of commonality between the filmmaker and filmic subject; Ivan had touched this rock and now the camera is doing so. Suddenly, the camera rushes forwards, right up to Ivan’s face, and the shakiness highlights that it is hand-held, drawing attention to the presence of the operator. Slowly, Ivan raises his hand to his mouth, a gesture which somehow creates the impression that the camera is touching him, through the connections that have been established between his hand, the rock and the camera. Finally, the camera pans to the left to encompass Marichka’s bare feet in the frame. The sensation of touch which has been evoked during the shot thus culminates in this image of Marichka’s feet, as if we can feel the chill of her dead flesh.

The analysis of this sequence demonstrates how the camera's movement provokes an awareness of the filmmaker, thereby highlighting the temporality of the recording in which both filmic subject and filmmaker are present and interact. It also shows how the different ways in which the camera moves can suggest the nature of that interaction. The diversity of the cinematography in this short section is reflective of the film as a whole, in which a wide range of techniques are used. The Dutch tilts, superimpositions and arced pans referred to above are joined by other devices, such as whip pans, which blur the image to the point of obscurity. This can be seen in the scene outside the church in the second chapter, when the camera moves around the different groups assembled outside the church. The whip pans are suggestive of the movement of a head turning in response to noise elsewhere. Indeed, sound comes before image, which heightens this sense of the camera's responsiveness. The sound of a pipe, for example, is introduced into the soundtrack and then the camera quickly pans to focus on the pipe seller. In this way, the camera is an independent actor within the scene, responding to what is going on around it. Furthermore, the filmmaker is established as an outsider, absorbing and absorbed by the colours and sounds of the surrounding environment, the blurriness of which suggests their unfamiliarity or incomprehensibility. Other devices deployed elsewhere include the change of focus within a shot, which is particularly noticeable in the scene when Ivan and Marichka are dancing in the middle of a long line of Hutsuls directly facing the camera. Starting with a long shot, the camera tracks along the line of dancers, from right to left. The camera's movement reflects the sideways pattern of the dance, so that the camera itself might be seen to be participating. No particular attention is

given to Ivan and Marichka, embedded within the other dancers, in the centre of the line. Indeed, the non-protagonists appear to be of greater interest to the camera, as it re-focuses to a closer, medium long shot at the end of the line. The camera then repeats its track back along the line, from left to right. Again, at the end of the line, the camera re-focuses to a medium close-up, and tracks back from right to left. It is only at this point that the camera pauses at the centre of the line, where Ivan and Marichka are dancing. Following their brief conversation, the camera reverses its re-focusing, moving through a medium long shot back to a long shot. These overt changes in focus draw attention to the apparatus, the operator who performs them, and the camera's role as observer. Moreover, the use of the returned gaze by the Hutsul dancers, which is particularly evident after the second re-focus, highlights this observational role. Traditionally, fiction film avoids this kind of direct look to the camera, a look which acknowledges its presence. However, in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the returned gaze is employed on a number of occasions, some seemingly less planned than others. Its use here is similar to that in the sequence outside the church, referred to above, during which the camera passes a number of Hutsuls engaged in different tasks (such as playing the *drymba* (mouth harp) or selling traditional cheese-sculptures), who acknowledge the camera and seemingly perform to it. Just after this sequence, a more spontaneous use of the returned gaze can be found when the young Marichka stumbles in the snow, as she and Ivan are hiding in the bracken during the funeral procession. Her look is almost beseeching, as if checking to see whether the camera has noticed her little accident. At the other end of the spectrum, the series of static shots of unidentified Hutsuls preparing for the funeral (for example the man

holding a wooden cross on his back) also makes use of the returned gaze. Here, its use is more scripted and suggestive of portraiture. In all cases, however, the returned gaze disrupts the notion of the camera as an unobserved witness to events, or a window through which the viewer can watch unnoticed. Instead, the camera is a participant in events, one who is acknowledged and responded to. In this way, the temporality of the recording is asserted, along with the interaction between the filmmaker and filmic subjects. The camera's responsiveness to its surroundings is thus mirrored by the filmic subjects, who also are seen to respond to the camera.³⁰⁹

The re-focusing of the camera within a single shot is also evident in the scene immediately following the superimpositions. Ivan wakes up in a small chapel on the hillside, covered in snow. He picks up a lamb, walks outside, and the camera, which has been following Ivan's movements, zooms in for a close-up of his face. Unexpectedly, the camera then re-focuses to an extreme long-shot of a boy and girl in the distance, stumbling through the snow by a tree.³¹⁰ The boy is holding a Christmas star, connecting the image with the soundtrack in which a child is singing a Christmas carol, urging people to prepare the festivities ('lay the tables and put out the *kolach* (Christmas bread)'). A conversation between two women is introduced into the soundtrack, layered on top of the carol, and the camera then re-focuses on Ivan and the scene surrounding him. The carol fades out, and the deep focus of the shot enables the scene to unfold in the foreground with the children still visible in the distant

³⁰⁹ The theme of mirroring is dealt with cinematographically through the positioning of the camera behind water. Twice, Ivan is filmed with the camera looking up at him through water, as he takes a drink or washes his face. Mirrors, like shadows, suggest that the filmmaker is the same and yet different to the filmic subject.

³¹⁰ This kind of re-focusing, in which the camera changes its focus from foreground to background (or vice versa), is known as a 'racking focus'.

background. This interaction of foreground and background, and the depth of field in the shot, brings to mind Gilles Deleuze's analysis of Orson Welles' filmmaking: 'Welles invents a depth of field, in a very different way, along a diagonal or gap, crossing all planes, making elements from each interact, and in particular having the background in direct contact with the foreground'.³¹¹ The importance of this new depth of field is 'to reverse time's subordination to movement and show time for itself'.³¹² Significantly, Deleuze finds that 'most of the occasions where depth of field appears wholly necessary are in connection with memory'.³¹³ Deleuze's comments shed light on how this shot in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is a site of temporal layering. Just as the camera re-focuses back on the foreground, the soundtrack focuses on the women's conversation and it becomes apparent that the scene we are watching is that about which they are talking. They discuss having seen Ivan during the Christmas Eve celebrations and given him some *horilka* (vodka), a bite of an apple and a candle. The conversation is therefore presented as one in which the filmic subjects are remembering the scene which is unfolding before the viewer's eyes. In this temporal mis-match between visual and aural tracks, the women's conversation functions as a kind of internal commentary on events; the narrative (diegesis) itself is presented as the memory of the filmic subjects, one which the viewer is witnessing in the process of its making (or, more accurately, its performance). Whilst the overt cinematography highlights the temporality of the recording, it is also a mechanism by which the past and the present are layered within the narrative. Through this conjunction the viewer

³¹¹ Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time Image*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (London: Continuum, 2005), p. 104.

³¹² *Ibid.*, p. 105.

³¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 105–06.

is encouraged to perceive the narrative as a memory which is being performed in the filmmaking present.

This scene will subsequently become a memory for the viewer herself, one which is triggered in the eighth chapter ('Rizdvo') through the repetition of visual and aural motifs. The image of Ivan holding a young animal with the accompanying sound of a Christmas carol is repeated in this later chapter: Ivan is shown holding a young goat in his arms and standing in the midst of four children, who are dressed as Christmas angels and singing a carol about the birth of Jesus. In this way, the viewer is called upon to perform her own act of remembering. Indeed, it is a double act of remembering, as the carol prompts Ivan to ask Palahna 'de moia dytyna?' (where is my child?), before starting to sing 'de moi kozy?' (where are my goats?). This provokes a second memory in the viewer of the third chapter ('Ivan tai Marichka'), in which Ivan had first sung these words to Marichka. The connections between the two Christmas carol scenes draw attention to the relationship between foreground and background, which was highlighted through the use of re-focusing in the first such scene. In both scenes Ivan is depicted against a background of young children, suggesting that these are, in fact, the heirs he is looking for. In this way, the Christmas carol scenes demonstrate how the narrative is presented as a performance of memory by the filmic subjects and, crucially, one in which the viewer is invited to participate. The following section will examine further the relationship between the filmic subjects and the past that is being performed, in order to establish how the film convinces the viewer of the 'authenticity' of the past that is being remembered, that it is 'their' past that they are performing. It will then consider how the viewer is

encouraged to participate in this process of remembrance and thus how the film functions as an attempt to widen the postmemorial circle.

Performing One's Past

The filmic subjects fall into two categories: professional actors and local residents. These two categories are distinguished in the film by means of the credits, which provide the names of the actors playing the following roles: Ivan, Marichka, Palahna, Iura, the *vatah*, Myko, the Paliichuks, the Huteniuks, and Ivan and Marichka as children. The remaining filmic subjects are identified as follows: 'in the folk scenes (v narodnykh tsenakh) – the Hutsuls of Verkhovyna'. This distinction is not based on whether or not a character is identified by name in the film, or on the importance of the role. As noted in Chapter One, the character of Baba Khimka is played by Hanna Haradzhuk, whom Paradzhanov considered to be highly talented. Haradzhuk would go on to have a similar speaking role in the film *Annychka*, in which she was credited.³¹⁴ In *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Haradzhuk is not identified separately in the credits because the criterion against which the filmic subjects are distinguished is their relationship to the place of filming. Whilst a number of the local non-professional actors address one another by first name in the film, this distinction creates the impression that these are actually their own names. Indeed, during the black-and-white section of the film, when Ivan is shown leaving his *khata-grazhda*, a conversation between two women is heard in the soundtrack (the women are only seen towards the end of the shot), in which they address one another as 'Ievdoshka'

³¹⁴ In *Annychka*, the credits similarly inform the viewer that 'residents of the town Verkhovyna took part in the film'. However, Haradzhuk is listed in a separate category ('v epizodakh'), along with four other actors.

and 'Marichka'. It is tempting to conclude that these two women are Ievdokiia Soruk (in whose home Paradzhanov stayed during his time in Verkhovyna) and Mariia Iliichuk, both of whom took part in the film. This scene is one of several in which the local residents provide commentaries to the narrative, all of them constituting some form of remembering. In this particular case, the women remember the misfortunes that have befallen Ivan's family, how he has changed, and how a rich man came from Bukovyna to buy his sheep. There follows another scene in which Ivan is shown digging a grave to the accompanying sound of a conversation between two unseen men. The men talk about their lives, which seem to exist externally to the narrative, and their conversation can be regarded as a performance of memory. For example, one man says:

Idu z Kutiv. Ia khodiv do ts'oho virmena-kuptsia, podav iomu vydru tai kunytsiu, kupyv sobi pertsiu, tai ishov uzhe zvidty dodomu. I vy znaiete, otut na zhydivs'komu kladovyshchi ia bachyv Ivana Paliichuka. Znaiete?³¹⁵

Three other scenes follow in which local non-professional actors similarly provide commentaries to the action, culminating in the scene outside the little chapel referred to above. In addition to these, at the end of the film, during Ivan's wake, the voice of an unseen man recalls a conversation with Ivan in which the latter requested that he be buried in the white clothes he wore as a bridegroom. These are, in fact, the last words of the film, and it is significant that they are words of remembrance uttered by a local Hutsul.³¹⁶ Whilst these scenes will be analysed in detail in Chapter Four, it should here be noted that they constitute an important mechanism by means of which

³¹⁵ 'I'm coming back from Kutu. I went to that Armenian tradesman and sold him an otter and a marten, and bought some pepper for myself. And I'm on my way home. And do you know, here in the Jewish cemetery, I saw Ivan Paliichuk. Do you know him?'

³¹⁶ We do not know who speaks these words, but they are not attributed to a named character in the *montazhnye listy*.

the filmic subjects are accorded agency, so that the narrative becomes their own. This section will examine how else the local non-professional actors are distinguished from their professional counterparts, and – more significantly – how they are associated with the story that is performed.³¹⁷

It is not only through the credits that the local non-professional actors are distinguished. The application of make-up is also a clear indicator of the category to which a filmic subject belongs. The professional actors all wear heavy make-up: Marichka's eyes are lined with dark kohl, typical of the era in which the film was made (though not, of course, in keeping with the era in which the narrative is purportedly set); Palahna also has eye-liner and wears a bright coral lipstick; the strong features of Iura's face are emphasized through make-up; and close-ups of Ivan frequently reveal a heavy layer of cosmetics on his face. By way of contrast, the make-up on the local non-professional actors is much less noticeable, if any is worn at all. This is particularly evident during the funeral scene of Ivan's father, in which there is a series of five static close-up shots of unidentified Hutsuls, including a young woman holding a bowl of eggs with down-turned eyes, on which there is no trace of liner. Clearly, this distinction functions to suggest that the local actors have less need to don a costume in order to assume the characters they are portraying. Indeed, their very skin and bodies act as testament to the fact that they belong in this environment. The worn hands which hold the Bible in the final chapter, during Ivan's wake, attest to years of hard, physical work. The close-up shot is held for some time, and then repeated shortly afterwards for good measure, highlighting the significance

³¹⁷ Chapter Three will examine the relationship that is asserted between the filmic subjects and the space in which the story is performed.

of these hands, with one partly-missing thumb. The body of knowledge about the Hutsul world that has been accrued over the course of the film provokes the viewer into imagining some accident involving an axe which resulted in this particular injury.

Hands and feet feature quite prominently in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and are, of course, the things through which we feel the world around us. The movement of Ivan's hands over the rocks when he discovers Marichka's body has already been discussed, as has the image of Marichka's dead feet. Prior to this, however, it was through a close-up of her feet on the rocks that Marichka's fatal fall was illustrated. Palahna's feet are also the subject of a close-up, following her marriage to Ivan. Marichka's hands appear on the window, in ghostly form, following her death, and it is of course on account of the touch of these hands – shown in close-up – that Ivan ultimately dies. This focus on hands and feet creates an impression of the filmic subjects rooted within their surrounding environment, whilst also stimulating within the viewer an awareness of touch. Furthermore, it reveals an interesting interplay that might be termed professional actor versus professional Hutsul. When Ivan first meets Palahna, he is shown shoeing her horse. A close-up shot of hands hammering the shoe into the horse's hoof is followed by a close-up of Ivan taking a nail out of his mouth. The two sets of hands, so clearly juxtaposed in the two shots, do not match up. The thick, short fingers adroitly performing the blacksmith's task do not belong to Ivan Mykolaichuk's smooth, long-fingered hand, nor could they. This is a specialist task, performed by a specialist. In another example, during the opening sequence of the seventh chapter ('Budni' (Work days)), a close-up shot of two hands sharpening a

scythe, lasting some fourteen seconds, is followed by a close-up, low-angle shot of the scythe cutting the flower-strewn grass, with the occasional glimpse of a foot. The camera follows the smooth, rhythmic movement of the scythe – two manual tasks performed by skilled professionals. The hands which sharpen the scythe are visibly not the hands of Mykolaichuk, a fact which was corroborated by Vasyl' Khimchak, who remembered the filming of this scene.³¹⁸ Khimchak himself was a body-double for young Ivan in the scene when the children roll through the grass in the second chapter (the similarly flower-strewn grass in this scene – which was filmed outside Khimchak's grandparents' home, where Paradzhanov was living – suggests that the scythe scene was also filmed at the same time in this location). Yet these two cases of body doubling are quite different: to all intents and purposes the viewer perceives Khimchak as Ivan Dziura, the actor who plays the young Ivan. However, this is not the case in the scythe scene, where the viewer is almost called upon to acknowledge that this task is being performed by a specialist.

Another demonstration of specialist knowledge is found in a six-shot sequence during which Ivan's life as a shepherd is shown. This sequence culminates in the story of Vysokyi Beskyd, narrated by the *vatah*, which provides a clue to understanding this concentration on hands performing specialist tasks in the film. Whilst the images of hands evoke within the viewer an awareness of touch, they also draw attention to skills that are traditional to this region and that, crucially, have been maintained. The sequence is composed of three close-up shots of hands preparing Hutsul dishes traditionally prepared by shepherds, which are intercut with three long shots of the shepherds in the wooden *staia* (shepherds' hut) where they are lodging.

³¹⁸ Interview with Vasyl' Khimchak (Verkhovyna, 23 August 2010).

At first glance, this alternation might suggest that the close-ups are simply cutaways which focus on the action taking place during the long shot. However, this is undermined through the use of lighting and the soundtrack, which differentiate the two types of shot. The sequence begins with a ten-second close-up of two hands tearing corn from a cob. In addition to the rasping noise of the corn, a storm can be heard on the soundtrack. The grinding action of the hands and the rasping noises create an awareness of what it might be like to feel these dry pieces of corn. The transition is then made to a long shot of the shepherds sitting around a fire, one of whom seems to be tearing corn. This activity corresponds to the preceding shot, as does the soundtrack in which the storm, which is visible outside, is heard more clearly. However, these similarities are undermined by the stark contrast in lighting between the two shots: the close-up is brightly lit, whereas the scene inside the *staita* is very dark and shadowy, to reflect the thunderstorm. It is thus uncertain to whom the hands in the close-up belong, and the shot almost appears to be inserted footage from a factual documentary. The next two shots build on this dynamic between close-up and long shot. Firstly, a hand removes an upturned bowl under which is revealed a *kulesha* (a polenta-like dish made from corn). As the bowl is lifted, the *kulesha* wobbles, highlighting the softness of this dish, which contrasts with the earlier hardness of the corn. The contrasting textures combine to heighten the viewer's perception of touch. The storm can still be heard in the soundtrack and forms a point of connection with the next long shot, in which the shepherds are shown drying their clothes by the fire, with the storm still raging outside. Whilst there is still an aural connection between the two shots, the visual link has now been lost. The final close-

up in this sequence shows two hands in a large wooden bowl of milk, making *brynza* (a sheep's milk cheese, traditionally made by Hutsul shepherds). As the hands pour the milk over the cheese, the viewer is made aware of the wet texture of this cheese, accentuated by the sound of liquid pouring. This is, in fact, the only accompanying sound in the shot. The howling of the wind and rain, which has been present in all the shots thus far in the sequence, has suddenly gone, and the gentle lapping of the milk stands out all the more for this. Yet in the final shot of the sequence, in which the *vatah* tells his story, the storm re-enters the soundtrack. The *vatah* has his hands in a similar wooden bowl as he is talking to Ivan, and is clearly supposed to be performing the task that has just been shown in the preceding close-up. However, the aural discord between the two shots ensures that a distinction is made between them (in addition, the *vatah*'s rings do not correspond with those seen in the close-up). This distinction draws attention to the fact that the *vatah* is an actor pretending to perform this task, a fact which is highlighted through his simultaneous narration of the story of Vysokyi Beskyd, which is enacted bodily by the mute Myko. The *vatah* tells a story that is performed through someone else's body, just as the task he is illustrating has been performed by someone else's expert hands. Incidentally, it is also worth observing that these sequences bring to mind early ethnographic filmmaking, in which the camera was used to record individual activities, such as Félix-Louis Regnault's 1895 film of a Wolof woman making pots, which is regarded by some as the earliest example of ethnographic film.³¹⁹ This early style of ethnographic

³¹⁹ See, for example, Emilie de Brigard, 'The History of Ethnographic Film', in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. by Paul Hockings, pp. 13–43 (p. 15)). This use of the camera became intimately linked with the project of 'salvage ethnography'. Concerns over the impact of modernization on (non-Westernized) 'primitive' cultures had given rise to a desire

filmmaking corresponds to the period in which Kotsiubyns'kyi wrote the original novella, and its echo in these sequences of the film thus creates another temporal layer.

By concealing the identity of the individual whose hands perform these specialist tasks, the close-ups are able to be slotted into the narrative, as if they are performed by the professional actors. At the same time, however, by their very nature the close-ups draw attention to the skill and dexterity required to perform these tasks, thereby undermining the notion that the hands belong to professional actors. These tasks can only be performed by hands that do such things in real life. A distinction is therefore drawn and maintained between the filmic subjects who are professional actors, and those who are professional Hutsuls. Central to this is a focus on the body – particularly hands and feet – which functions to unite the local residents with both their surrounding environment and the past that is being performed. Through the demonstration of specialist tasks, the continuation of the past within the present is affirmed. A particularly corporeal type of remembering is displayed, which resonates with Paul Connerton's study of how social memory is constituted through bodily (or incorporated) practices.³²⁰ Concerned to draw attention to non-textual (non-inscribed) practices, Connerton identifies two broad mechanisms by which embodied memory is transmitted: commemorative ceremonies and bodily practices. The focus on the body in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* can thus be seen as an attempt to convey an embodied

to capture those cultures for posterity. As recorder of fact, the camera offered the potential to freeze time, creating a museum of human societies. Indeed, Regnault appears to have had this in mind with his idea of an ethnographic film museum. See MacDougall, *The Corporeal Image*, p. 216.

³²⁰ Paul Connerton, *Bodily Practices. How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

memory, both through bodily practices (such as sharpening the scythe, cutting the grass, or tearing the corn) and through more formal ceremonies (such as the weddings and funerals). Indeed, the ceremonies themselves draw attention to the body, as Ivan is first washed by the local women in preparation for his marriage, and then displayed as a corpse during his wake. Furthermore, the concentration on bodily movement might be seen as an attempt to encourage the viewer to participate in this memorial transmission through ‘kinaesthetic empathy’.³²¹ This term describes the way in which, through watching movement, the spectator vicariously experiences movement herself. In this way, the bodily practices which are shown in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* not only potentially reveal the transmission of embodied memory across the ages, but also encourage the viewer to participate in this process herself.

Conclusion

This chapter set out to examine the treatment of time in the Experiential Ethnographic Mode through the analysis of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Thematically and structurally, the film is seen to display a complex layering of time. The past continues to exist in the present, in slightly different form. Thematically, for example, Marichka continues to live in Ivan’s memory after her death; and structurally, the intertitles provide an echo of Kotsiubyns’kyi’s text (and an earlier era of filmmaking) in a modern cinematic form. Cinematically, time is layered through the evocation of multiple

³²¹ For more on research into kinaesthetic empathy, see John Martin, *America Dancing: The Background and Personalities of the Modern Dance* (New York: Dance Horizons, 1968); Susan Foster, ‘Dancing with the “Mind’s Muscles”: A Brief History of Kinesthesia and Empathy’, keynote address, presented at the conference *Kinesthetic Empathy: Concepts and Contexts*, University of Manchester, April 2010, <<http://www.watchingdance.ning.com>> [accessed 14 May 2011]; and B. Calvo-Merino, D. Glaser, J. Grèzes, R. Passingham, and P. Haggard, ‘Action Observation and Acquired Motor Skills: An fMRI Study with Expert Dancers’, *Cerebral Cortex*, 15.8 (2005), 1243–49.

temporalities. In total, four temporalities have been identified in the film (narrative, filmic product, original text, and recording), and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode can be characterized by their layering. The temporality of the recording was found to have a particularly important function, both in terms of asserting the coexistence in time and space of the filmmaker and filmic subject, and in relation to the film's status as an example of postmemorial work.

Above all, the film is about remembrance and not, as the title might imply, about forgetting. In particular, the film is concerned with remembering between generations – as evinced through its central theme of descendants. Ivan suffers a personal trauma – the loss of Marichka – and he is haunted by her memory. As a consequence of this trauma, the intergenerational relationship is disturbed: Marichka, it is implied, is pregnant when she dies; and Ivan's inability to forget her contributes to his lack of desire for Palahna.³²² Thematically, then, the film raises issues that are central to the concept of postmemory. Moreover, it seeks to repair those disturbances to the transmission of memory between generations and, as such, is an example of postmemorial work. Within the narrative, the young children who surround Ivan, and the image of whom ends the film, suggest a potential line of descent from Ivan to the future. This is accentuated by the film's cyclical structure, which asserts continuity beyond death. But it is through the evocation of the temporality of the recording,

³²² Rory Finnin has commented upon the intimation of Marichka's pregnancy: 'The doomed pregnancy, I would argue, is part of a concerted effort on the part of Paradzhanov to craft a critical modification of Kotsiubyns'kyi's legend. Especially toward the end of the film, Ivan is plagued by a fear that his line will [die] out with him, a fear markedly absent in the novella.' Rory Finnin, 'Silence and Extinction in *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*: Paradzhanov at BAM, November 2007', *Slavic and East European Performance*, 28.1 (2008). In his article, Finnin also notes the importance of sound and silence in the film, and the role of Myko in this respect. Ultimately, however, he concludes that the film points to the extinction not only of Ivan but of his people as well, whereas this thesis demonstrates how the film attempts to suggest continuity and remembrance. *Ibid.*.

when filming the local residents in particular, that the film most clearly engages in postmemorial work.

The temporality of the recording is evoked in the film through the use of shadows, the movement of the camera, its obtrusiveness and independence, and the use of the returned gaze. These devices position the filmmaker within the same environment as the filmic subjects; moreover, as the analysis has demonstrated, it is through the use of these devices that the nature of the relationship between filmmaker and filmic subjects can be expressed. Through the evocation of the temporality of the recording, the past is seen to be something that is being performed in the filmmaking present. The customs and traditions that are performed in the film are thus seen as evidence of the successful continuance of cultural heritage. As discussed in the introduction, this region of the Carpathians had recently experienced a series of competing territorial claims in the aftermath of the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and until ‘reunification’ with Soviet Ukraine. To differing degrees, the cultural policies that accompanied these various campaigns for sovereignty posed a threat to the local way of life. Yet *Tini zabutykh predkiv* works to assert the preservation of their cultural heritage by the inhabitants of this region.

The filmic subjects in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* are divided into two categories: local residents and professional actors. Whilst previous analyses of the film have drawn attention to Mykolaichuk’s knowledge of Hustul’shchyna, this thesis turns the spotlight from the individual towards the chorus.³²³ The local non-professional cast are distinguished from their professional counterparts, and it is *their* relationship to

³²³ First examines the discourse of authenticity surrounding the film, drawing particular attention to Mykolaichuk’s relationship to the region. First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, pp. 161–64.

the land and to the story that the film asserts. At times, through the disjunction between sound and image, the local residents provide an internal commentary on the narrative. In this way, they are presented as remembering the story that is being performed. Moreover, the focus on bodies – in particular hands and feet – suggests an embodied memory that has been passed down through the generations. By watching these bodily movements, it has been suggested that the viewer is invited to participate in this process of remembering. In this way, the film functions as an attempt to expand the postmemorial circle. Above all, however, this is achieved through the temporal multiplicity itself. By continually alerting the viewer to the co-existence of multiple temporalities, the film, through its very watching, stimulates a sensation akin to that of remembering.

CHAPTER THREE

Space and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode

‘Fil’m vvodyt’ nas u svit narodnykh perekazkiv, zvychaiv i pobutu starykh Karpat.’³²⁴

‘[Kartinu] nado smotret’ v kontakte s ekranom.’³²⁵

With the opening shot of the film, the Carpathian region in which the narrative takes place is clearly established. Yet this is no iconic image of the mountains. Instead, the viewer is introduced to the narrative locale through the intertitle cited in the first epigraph above. She is invited into this locale by the filmmaker, whom she is positioned alongside with the word ‘nas’ (us). The motion implied by the verb ‘vvodyty’ (which means both ‘to introduce’ and ‘to lead/bring in’) is suggestive of an ethnographic journey, in which the film will act as our guide. The locale is identified as a world in itself (svit) and given a geographical marker – the old Carpathians. The ambivalence of the word ‘old’ – which might describe either the age of the mountains as they stand now, or refer back to the Carpathians as they once were – accords with the film’s temporal multiplicity identified in the previous chapter. The focus of this chapter, however, lies in the spatial dimension of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. It will examine how the goal set out in this first intertitle is achieved, and how a sense of this Carpathian ‘world’ is evoked. Specifically, it will investigate how the film establishes the geographical locale in which the narrative takes place, and how

³²⁴ ‘The film introduces us to the world of folk tales, customs and everyday life of the old Carpathians.’ *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, first intertitle.

³²⁵ [Genrikh?] Gabai, speaking at the discussion of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* on 23 December 1964. RGALI f. 2936, op. 1, d. 528, l. 8.

the topography of this locale is expressed in the construction of filmic space. The use of camerawork and mise-en-scène will be examined in order to ascertain how and when a sense of depth is created in a two-dimensional medium; moreover, the kinds of spaces that the film creates will be examined to establish the nature of the world that is portrayed. It will be seen that spaces are filled – with objects and with colour – and spaces are associated with the filmic subjects through compositional arrangement and through clothing.

In examining all these elements, it becomes apparent that the journey which the film invites the viewer to embark upon is characterized by a movement between near and far, surface and depth, detail and contextualization. In this respect, the treatment of space within the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is associated with the concept of ‘haptic cinema’. Stemming from the Greek word *haptain* (to fasten), the term ‘haptic’ is fundamentally associated with the sense of touch and encompasses tactile, kinaesthetic and proprioceptive ways of touching.³²⁶ The term has variously been applied to cinema, but it is Laura U. Marks’s conception of a ‘haptic visuality’ – a way of seeing that ‘spreads out over the surface of the image instead of penetrating into depth’ – that is of particular relevance here.³²⁷ One of the most important aspects of Marks’s work is to highlight the reciprocity between the viewer and the viewed; as she writes, ‘it is not proper to speak of the *object* of a haptic look so much as to speak of a dynamic subjectivity between looker and image’.³²⁸ Accordingly, this chapter seeks to understand the relationship between the viewer and the screen, and how the

³²⁶ Jennifer M. Barker, *The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009), p. 37.

³²⁷ Laura U. Marks, ‘Video and Haptic Erotics’, *Screen*, 39 (1998), 331–48 (p. 333).

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

viewer experiences – and is implicated in the construction of – the filmic space. By bringing the concept of haptic cinema into contact with Hirsch's notion of postmemory, it will be suggested that this oscillation between proximity and distance, which characterizes the treatment of space within the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, is used not only to evoke the nature of an ethnographic encounter and convey to the viewer a sense of the filmmakers' experience, but also as an attempt to develop in the viewer a haptic way of seeing, through which to stimulate her memory of the senses – a means by which knowledge that cannot otherwise be expressed may be conveyed. It is this latter project which constitutes an important part of the film's postmemorial work.

Mapping Space: Establishing a Geographical Locale

Although the first intertitle establishes a general narrative locale, this is still quite broadly defined: the Carpathians are the second-longest mountain range in Europe. Like many mountain ranges, they are a site of borders, extending today across seven countries (Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine). The Ukrainian language of the intertitle might suggest a particular geographical focus and, accordingly, shortly afterwards in the seventh intertitle our gaze is narrowed: 'Karpaty – zabuta bohom i liud'my zemlia hutsul's'ka' (The Carpathians – a Hutsul land forgotten by God and by people). With this intertitle it becomes clear that the film is concerned with the Hutsul-inhabited region of the Carpathians, known as Hutsul'shchyna. This region lies in the south-eastern part of the Carpathians, and today Hutsuls live in three Ukrainian *oblasti* (Ivano-Frankivs'ka, Chernivets'ka and Zakarpats'ka), with some settlements in Romania. As we have

already observed, this region of the Carpathians experienced a number of border changes during the last century, particularly in the intervening years between the writing and the filming of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. The narrative locale is therefore a site of contested borders. However, the use of the construction ‘*zemlia hutsul’s’ka*’ circumvents any reference to national borders and focuses instead on the connection between the land and the Hutsul people who live there, suggesting an almost primordial relationship between the two. This emphasis on the relationship between the land and its inhabitants is further enhanced in the next direct reference to location in the film, when the young Ivan and Marichka are singing in the forest:

(Ivan): Stii! Zvidki lia ty?

(Marichka): Z Iavorova!

(Ivan): A chyia ty?

(Marichka): Huteniukova!

(Ivan): Bud’ zdorova, Huteniukova!³²⁹

Whilst the village Iavoriv might simply have been chosen for its rhyming potential (Iavorova/Huteniukova/Bud’ zdorova), it is situated in the Kosivs’kyi raion of Ivano-Frankivs’ka oblast’, less than twenty kilometres from Verkhovyna, the village where much of the shooting took place and whose residents are credited as having taken part in the film. The children’s song therefore maps the narrative location onto the filming location. Furthermore, family name is mapped onto family home, so that an individual’s identity cannot be apprehended in isolation from where she is from. This is echoed when Ivan first meets the *vatah*, who asks him ‘A chyi budesh, lehiniu?’ (Whose son are you, young lad?), to which Ivan replies: ‘Petra Paliichuka, z Kryvorivni’ (Petro Paliichuk’s, from Kryvorivnia). At this point, the exact location of

³²⁹ ‘Stop! Where are you from? | From Iavoriv! | And whose [daughter] are you? | Huteniuk’s! | Keep well, Huteniuk’s daughter!’

the narrative is identified by Ivan and associated with his (fore)father(s). Kryvorivnia is the neighbouring village to Verkhovyna, and the place where Kotsiubyns'kyi would stay when visiting the region. Not far from Kotsiubyns'kyi's residence in Kryvorivnia is the *khata-grazhda* of Paraska Kharuk, which was filmed as the Paliichuk's home in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Again, the narrative location is mapped onto that of the filming and, additionally, that of the original novella's writing. In this way, the temporal multiplicity, characteristic of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode's treatment of time (see Chapter Two), finds its counterpart in the treatment of space through a kind of spatial layering.

The notion of layered spaces resonates with the region's history of contested borders, in which groups living contiguously with one another have laid competing claims to the same space. This is referenced in the black-and-white section of the film in which a conversation between two unseen women is heard:

- (1): E-e, ty de bula?
(2): Oi, nabuvalas' iz khloptsiamy.
(1): Z nashymy chy z Mad'iaramy?³³⁰

The filmic subjects are here identified by distinction: they may occupy the same space, but they are not Magyars. The co-existence in space of 'Self' and 'Other' is here presented as commonplace to the region, and is of course akin to the experience of the ethnographic encounter. Indeed, the region has been the site of research for many ethnographers, including, as indicated earlier, Volodymyr Hnatiuk, in addition to Volodymyr Shukhevych, Ferdynand Ossendowski and Raimund Kaindl. Just as the filmic subjects are identified by distinction from an 'other', the narrative locale is

³³⁰ 'Hey, where have you been? | Oh, I've been hanging out with the boys. | With ours or with the Magyars?'

constructed through reference to ‘other’ places. This can also be found in the black-and-white section, during which a number of different place names are given. In the first sequence, as the shepherds are leaving the pasture, one of them calls out to Ivan: ‘Prykhody do mene na Kryve Pole, ia odruzhuvatys’ budu.’³³¹ When Ivan is then shown in his *khata-grazhda*, selling his sheep, one of the women standing nearby says: ‘Tak, tak... ta i to pryikhav iakyis’ bahach iz Bukovyny ta i tu ovechku... prodaie i tu ovechku.’³³² In the next sequence, a man’s voice is heard to say, in response to his friend’s question as to where he has been: ‘Idu z Kutiv’ (I’m coming back from Kuty). Finally, when Ivan is seen mending a church roof, the following conversation between two women is heard:

(1): Ty kudy khodyla, Marichko?

(2): V Krasnoillia do popa. [...]

(1): I tut taka bula studin’. I v Zhab’iemu i v Kryvorivni. Ta i ts’oho roku ucheni hovoriat’, shcho taka bude studin’, shcho vs’o pomerzne.³³³

In this relatively short section, four place names are given as ‘other’, identifying locations from which people have come or towards which they are going: Kryve Pole (re-named Kryvopillia in 1958) is a village in the Verkhovyns’kyi *raion* of Ivano-Frankivs’ka *oblast’*, some six kilometres from Verkhovyna; Bukovyna is a region in the Carpathians, which is split between the Chernivets’ka *oblast’* of Ukraine, which neighbours that of Ivano-Frankivs’ka, and northern Romania; Kuty is a village in the Kosivs’kyi *raion* of Ivano-Frankivs’ka *oblast’*, roughly twenty kilometres from Verkhovyna; and Krasnoillia lies approximately five kilometres from Verkhovyna. In

³³¹ ‘Come to mine at Kryve Pole – I am getting married.’

³³² ‘Yes, yes and some rich man came from Bukovyna, and even that sheep – he sells it.’

³³³ ‘Where did you go to Marichka? | To Krasnoillia, to the priest’s. [...] | And what a frost there was here – in Zhab’ie and Kryvorivnia. And this year learned people are saying that there will be such a frost that everything will freeze.’

this way, the viewer is able to construct a mental map in which the narrative locale is positioned in relation to these other place names. Irrespective of whether the viewer recognizes these place names or knows the distances between them, the fact of their naming establishes a narrative locale to which they are 'other', and which is finally specified by one of the women as 'here' and then named as Zhab'ie (re-named Verkhovyna in 1962) and Kryvorivnia. In fact, it seems that the significance of these place names does not lie in the viewer's familiarity with them, but in their utterance by locals for whom they carry meaning. After all, it is the locals who pronounce these place names in their own regional dialect, and in this way a connection between the land and its inhabitants is asserted. Moreover, in two cases (Kryve Pole and Zhab'ie), they choose to pronounce an old place name in preference to its recently adopted new name. One might argue that this is simply an attempt to locate the narrative in the past, before these name changes occurred. However, the spontaneity of the dialogue in these sections, which sound like semi-improvisations, highlights the temporality of the recording and thus suggests that the naming of these places reflects the continued use of old names by locals, irrespective of changes at the political level. Again, this underlines the strength of the connection between the land and the people who live there. It also indicates a tension between the written and spoken word, or perhaps between the visual and aural senses: in the film credits, it is written that the non-professional actors are residents of Verkhovyna; in the film's soundtrack, they identify themselves as located in Zhab'ie.³³⁴ In this way, the importance of sound in

³³⁴ It is, of course, significant that the filmic subjects' self-identification differs from that imposed on them by the filmmakers. One might be tempted to suggest that the pronunciation of Zhab'ie is a statement of autonomy. The importance of dialect and its role in giving voice to the filmic subjects will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four.

the film is highlighted, a factor which will be examined in greater detail in the following chapter. Here, we may simply note that place names are accorded to spaces by the people who inhabit them.

Against this background, it can be shown that the film establishes within the narrative a geographical locale of Kryvorivnia and Zhab'ie/Verkhovyna in the Hutsul-inhabited area of the Carpathians. This locale is further defined by reference to other places to which it is connected yet distinct (Iavoriv, Kryve Pole, Kutu, Krasnoillia and Bukovyna). In a process of layering space, the narrative locale maps onto that in which the story was written and filmed, and in which the non-professional actors reside. The notion of spatial layering provides a useful framework as we move to consider the various ways in which the geographical locale is conveyed in the construction of filmic space. Layering is the coexistence of multiple planes or surfaces at different depths. Correspondingly, the placement of objects within the *mise-en-scène* will be examined in order to ascertain how a sense of three-dimensional space is created from the two-dimensional medium of film. The different types of spaces that the film creates will be identified, and the ways in which the filmic subjects inhabit them. Finally, the use of clothing, which draws attention to the sense of touch through a focus on textiles and texture, will be considered as a means of defining space.

Constructing Space: Inside, Outside and In-between Spaces

According to the production notes submitted to the Dovzhenko Studio upon completion of the film, sixty-eight per cent of the total length of the film (*metrazh*)

consisted of footage filmed outside (na nature).³³⁵ Similarly, in sixty-eight per cent of the shots which make up the film the camera can be identified as positioned outside (where this is possible to gauge).³³⁶ Whilst these figures need not necessarily coincide, they both highlight a favouring of outside spaces. The filmic world that is constructed is predominantly an exterior one. In total, only five internal spaces are portrayed: the Paliichuks' and Palahna's homes, the church, the *staia* and the tavern. Furthermore, the inside spaces tend to be filmed in such a way as to reveal the doors or windows within them that lead to outside space. This suggests to the viewer the existence of spaces beyond the limits of the frame, and so potentially encourages her to engage imaginatively in the construction of filmic space. It is through a doorway, for example, that we are introduced to the film's first interior. During the market scene Ivan's mother, standing at the threshold of the church, ushers her son inside and away from the crowd. The darkness of this inner sanctum stands in sharp contrast to the brightness of the preceding shot. The two points of light within this space draw attention to its dimensions: the candles glowing in the foreground, and the dimly-lit gallery in the background, on which a row of people is positioned at a different height and depth to Ivan. The church is filled with people and – like all the film's interior spaces – it is also filled with objects that are particular to the region. With curiosity Ivan handles some of these objects – a wooden cross and a Bible – drawing the viewer's attention to them and, through his touch, to their textures. Ivan moves further into the church, weaving between of the people and objects that are gathered

³³⁵ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 281, l.23.

³³⁶ In 303 of the 328 shots which make up the film the camera position (inside or outside) can be identified. This excludes the twenty-four intertitles, the end credits, the shot of the leaping red horses, and the superimpositions. In 205 of these 303 shots, the camera is located outside.

there. His movement through this space creates a sense of depth as he walks away from the camera. It also draws the viewer's eye to the objects that he passes: icons, *rushnyky* (embroidered towels), candelabra, *khорuhvy* (flags decorated with local crests), crosses and so on. These objects will become familiar to the viewer throughout the course of the film, reappearing in close-ups during the funeral procession, for example. At this early stage, however, the multitude of unfamiliar objects is overwhelming. This is accentuated by the variety of textures which they also display: metal, fabric, wax and wood. There is an abundance of detail upon which to feast one's eyes.

Whilst the tendency to fill interior spaces with regionally-specific objects presents an opportunity to locate them geographically, it also provides a means of constructing the dimensions of that space. This is particularly noticeable with regard to Palahna's *khata-grazhda*, one of the central locations in the film. The viewer is first taken into Palahna's home when Ivan arrives for the wedding ceremony. Again, a doorway forms the focus of our gaze as the camera, positioned in the centre of the room, watches Ivan enter. Leading inwards from the doorway is a *kylym* (carpet), the horizontal stripes of which act like a ladder along which our eye is pulled into the illusion of a three-dimensional space. This pattern is repeated on the *rushnyky* which hang around the door. In fact, the room is composed of multiple stripes, with the wooden planks which make up the floor, walls and doorframe creating horizontal and vertical lines. These lines suggest a concern with planes and depths, a concern which is accentuated by the positioning of a *skrynia* (wooden trunk) in the foreground of the shot, the open lid of which blocks the left-hand side of the frame. The resultant effect

is that half the screen appears to be flat whilst the other half seems deep. This interplay between depth and surface is accentuated by the pulling down of the *skrynia* lid to reveal the rest of the room, the depth of which had been hidden by its temporary screen. As we are drawn into the illusory three-dimensional space that has been revealed, the light catches the carved wooden lid, drawing attention to its surface. We are momentarily caught between looking *at* and looking beyond it. Adjusting to the new perspective, our eyes take in the additional details: the women sitting along the walls; more stripy *rushnyky* hanging down; and the ceramics displayed on the *mysnyka* (a shelving unit built around the door). In the foreground, a woman pulls out a metal necklace from the *skrynia*, demonstrating the importance of this piece of furniture in which the most treasured items are kept in Hutsul homes. Ivan is then blindfolded by one of the women (a covering of the eyes which suggests the need to engage our other senses in this environment) and led to sit down on the *skrynia*. In the next shot, the camera has changed position to provide an alternative view of the room. With Ivan and Palahna seated on the *skrynia* in the foreground, the rest of the room behind them is revealed. The wide-angle lens of the camera exaggerates the dimensions of the room, extending its depth. Palahna is now wearing the necklace, demonstrating its ceremonial purpose. Along the back walls, a row of decorations can be detected: dried corn cobs, painted eggs (*pysanky*), and cheese figurines. These objects are all typical of the region and, moreover, had been shown to the viewer during the market scene outside the church at the beginning of the film. Now, placed in context, these objects can be understood. The inside spaces thus provide a stage upon which regionally specific objects can be displayed. Although many of these

objects might be unfamiliar to the viewer, they are understood through repetition and contextualization. This is similar to the experience of an ethnographer in the field, who learns through a process of assimilation.

The filling of interior space with local produce takes a slightly different turn with regard to the *staia*, the building in which Ivan spends the summer on the pasture. Here, the space is filled with wood – which is to say, literally filled with the local environment. In the first shot of the *staia*, the camera is positioned inside the building, at a low level, close to the wood chippings which are lying on the floor. The composition of this shot is similar to that noted above with regard to Palahna's *khata*. The wooden beams of the *staia* form a similar pattern of horizontal and vertical lines. The *skrynia* lid divided Palahna's room vertically into two halves; here, the wood chippings divide the *staia* horizontally, entirely filling the lower portion of the frame. Just as our eye was drawn to the wooden surface of the *skrynia*, our eye is drawn to the wood chippings in the foreground of the *staia*. At the same time, however, the deep focus of the shot encourages our eye to run over their splintery surface towards the open door in the centre of the frame. Through this door we can see the sky outside, a tree, and a horse. In fact, this door features in every shot of the *staia*, providing glimpses of an outside space beyond the interior one. When the shepherds prepare to leave the pasture, we see them through this doorway. The two points of light in this very dark frame pull our eyes in different directions: the fire burns brightly in the foreground; the mountains in the sunlight outside draw our gaze into the distance. As the doorway bangs to and fro, the depth of field is alternately restricted and extended.

These glimpses of an outside space beyond the interior one are an important way of encouraging the viewer to think beyond the limits of the frame. A particularly instructive example occurs during the black-and-white section of the film, when Ivan is shown playing the *drymba* inside a doorway. In a familiar composition, one half of the screen appears flat: the right-hand side of the frame is completely filled by the wooden beams of a *khata*, thus restricting the depth of field. On the left-hand side, Ivan is depicted in a doorway, with the outside space extending far behind him. However, as the camera slowly rises, it becomes apparent that the wooden structure is simply a façade – the *khata* has not been completely built. Around the edges of the doorway, the sky is thus visible. This shot provides an image of space continuing around a frame; it almost trains the viewer to perform this act imaginatively with regard to other spaces. Doorways are thus an important mechanism by which a sense of space beyond the frame is created. They also demonstrate an interest in the movement between near and far, or foreground and background. In this respect, doorways are similar to windows – both of them are in-between spaces, neither entirely inside nor outside. Windows have a particularly symbolic role in the film. After all, it is through a window that Marichka appears to Ivan following her death; and it is with a shot of a window, and the children peering through it, that the film ends. Windows are a transparent barrier; they present a surface, but one that you can look through. As we move to consider the outside spaces that are portrayed in the film, it will be seen that this interplay between surface and depth is a consistent factor in the treatment of space.

Shaping Space: Camera Angle, Focus and Depth of Field in Outside Spaces

In comparison to the five interior spaces of the film, over twenty outside spaces can be identified. These include the forest, the river, the pasture, the marketplace outside the church, the cemetery, the well-spring, the village path, the flower-strewn meadow, the hillside by the small chapel, and the camp-fire, along with many others. The reasons for this favouring of outside spaces are potentially numerous, but must include both a desire to represent the filmic subjects as a group of people who live close to nature and, additionally, an attempt to assure the viewer that the filming took place on location. Living close to nature does not necessarily imply living at one with nature. After all, the film begins with the literal crushing of Ivan's brother Oleko by nature's force. However, the filmic subjects appear equally as comfortable – if not more so – within a natural space as they are within a built one. Ivan, Marichka and Palahna are all seen lying contentedly on the ground, on grass, or on haystacks. In contrast, Ivan is the only character to be shown lying down on a bed inside – once – and even then, he finds no rest but is disturbed by visions of Marichka. Ivan's final resting place is, of course, the coffin for which Myko is seen measuring him up in the epilogue. As a child, Ivan had watched the nails being hammered into the wooden coffin at his father's funeral. Yet we do not see Ivan similarly encased. Instead, perhaps, we are allowed to keep the image of Ivan entombed directly into the earth, as he appeared to be when digging a grave during the black-and-white section. This particular image is one of many in which the filmic subjects are shown immersed within the natural landscape. As noted in the previous chapter, these include: Ivan falling into the snow as a child; Ivan and Marichka rolling amongst the flowers in the

meadow; Marichka's full submersion in the river when she drowns; and the locals being surrounded by fog when they search for her body. In addition to this, on different occasions, Ivan, Iura and the local girls are all seen immersed in the river's waters; Ivan is shown climbing a tree, literally placed within its branches; Iura and Palahna are enveloped in the violent winds of a storm; and when they are by the camp-fire, Ivan and Marichka are both viewed through its flame, drenched in its orange glow. As these examples demonstrate, the outside space that is presented encompasses a world in its elemental entirety: earth, air, fire and water are all depicted in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Moreover, the filmic subjects are embedded within these elements, and thus presented as part of the natural landscape. This visual motif reinforces the connection between people and place established in the film. Furthermore, through the focus on their bodily immersion, the viewer is encouraged to perceive the sensation of *being in* this space, where body and environment coincide.

Just as the filmic subjects are placed *within* the landscape, the filmmaker is also located in the outside spaces that the film constructs. This is primarily achieved through the positioning of the camera behind various types of natural barrier when shooting the filmic subjects outside. In the short time in which they are portrayed as children, Ivan and Marichka are filmed through barriers of bracken, blades of grass, flower stalks, tree foliage and flickering flames. These natural materials are effectively layered over the children so that they are perceived to be located *within* the landscape; at the same time, the camera (and notional filmmaker) is also positioned within the filmic space, observing the action from afar. Whilst this

technique establishes the filmmaker in the same location as the filmic subjects, it also suggests a distance between the two – a distance which is at times broken by the direct gaze of the filmic subjects, which disrupts the notion of the camera as unobserved witness to events. The technique also reveals a curious interplay between surface and depth, or near and far, which is characteristic of the film's treatment of space as a whole. By creating different layers within the frame, a sense of depth is created and the viewer's eye is drawn into the filmic space. At the same time as looking into the depth of field, however, our eye is also drawn to the objects in the foreground (grass or foliage, for example) the appearance of which is blurred or distorted due to the proximity of the camera, which they are almost touching. The viewer's eye moves between foreground and background as it perceives and constructs the space presented on the screen.

The movement between near and far is established as a fundamental concern of the film in its opening sequence, which, like much of the film, takes place in an outside location. This sequence contains one of the most memorable shots in the film: the camera falls to the ground from on high, as if taking on the point of view of a felled tree. Whilst this remarkable shot has deservedly received attention in various critiques of the film, focus tends to dwell on the question of the camera's subjectivity.³³⁷ Certainly, at times, the camera seems to *become* the landscape, revealing an interesting characteristic of the camera's relationship to space. In this instance, it becomes a tree; elsewhere, it becomes the water from which Ivan takes a drink, or in which he washes his wounds. Aside from its intriguing subjectivity, however, the shot in which the tree ostensibly falls and kills Oleko is fundamentally a

³³⁷ First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 175.

dynamic one, engaged in a movement from far to near. This is exemplified by the use of a wide-angle lens, which gives a distorted sense of space by exaggerating the distance between foreground and background. However, it is not just within the shot that this movement between near and far is conducted; it forms part of a six-shot sequence characterized by this dynamic. The sequence begins with a static close-up of Ivan's face. Although he is shown in semi-profile, the lighting on his face reduces the casting of shadows that provide a sense of depth, resulting in a flatter portrait. Ivan's face takes up the right-hand side of the screen; the left-hand side reveals a blurry image of the snowy forest behind him. This is a conventional close-up in which only the foreground plane is in focus; the shallow focus results in a restricted depth of field. The next shot reverses these elements. In a long-shot, Ivan is shown running through the forest towards his brother. Tree trunks pass close in front of the camera as it tracks Ivan's movement, and are also visible far in the background behind him. The vertical stripes of the tree trunks draw attention to the upward slope of the landscape; both foreground and background are in focus, producing a larger depth of field. The third shot returns to the static close-up, this time focusing on Oleko as he waves Ivan away. Depth is replaced with shallowness as our eye is drawn back to the foreground of the screen. It is in the fourth shot of this sequence that the camera mimics the movement of a falling tree – a movement which is then mirrored in the fifth shot as the camera slowly rises from its proximity to events on the ground to an aerial view of the action from on high. Having fallen from far to near, the camera thus reverses its path of motion, going from near to far. In the final shot of

this opening sequence, Ivan is shown running back through the forest in deep focus, thus culminating the oscillation that began with the first close-up of his face.

As the analysis of this sequence demonstrates, the film is constantly moving: from close-up to long-shot; from static shot to tracking shot; from shallow focus to deep focus; from the ground to the sky; from near to far. To be a viewer of this film you need to participate: your eyes need to refocus much like the camera refocuses. The camera moves around the space almost at will, exploring vertical and horizontal axes, and at times creating for the viewer a sense of an axis of depth. One could go so far as to say that the mountainous landscape is conveyed not through image so much as through camerawork. The film as a whole is characterized by the use of a mobile camera, but this is particularly true with regard to the filming of outside spaces.³³⁸ The moving camera thus creates an impression of the landscape itself, which constantly undulates from peak to trough. Furthermore, the frequent use of high and low-angled shots means that the image is viewed at a slope, expressing the experience of actually *being in* the mountains and thus s(t)imulating this experience for the viewer. In this way, the camera seems to offer the possibility of mastering this space – the viewer can access all areas. This feeling of mastery, however, only applies to isolated spaces and is counterbalanced by the inaccessibility of an overarching sense of orientation. Whilst the viewer is able to identify the individual spaces of the film's construction, she is unable to piece together how they connect with one another. Although on several occasions the filmic subjects are shown on pathways or *en route*

³³⁸ Of the 205 shots in which the camera is positioned outside, 88 (43%) involve the camera moving. By contrast, only 11 of the 98 shots inside (11%) involve camera movement. These occur in both scenes inside the church, during the Christmas celebrations inside Palahna's *khata-grazhda*, inside the tavern and during the wake inside Palahna's home.

to other destinations, an overarching sense of space remains elusive. This would seem to suggest a desire to keep something back, to refuse to present its subject as something that can be consumed in its entirety by the viewer in the manner of a traditional ethnography.³³⁹ At the same time, the capsule-like nature of the filmic spaces take on the shape of memories, which offer snapshots of the past but can never recall it in its entirety.

Colouring Space: Engaging the Viewer in the Creation of Filmic Spaces

First has also noted a sensation of disorientation created by the film:

In fact, most of *Shadows* is conducted in medium shots, which avoids both psychological exploration of the heroes and villains, while also giving the feeling of disorientation due to the absence of clear establishing shots. The rare long shot in Paradzhanov's film eliminates the element of horizon that characterizes the mountain vista, and effectively flattens the landscape to a pallet of colors and textures.³⁴⁰

Whilst we have instead attributed the spatial disorientation to a lack of interconnectivity between the filmic spaces, First's comment draws attention to the role of colour and texture in creating space. The outside spaces are distinguished by their infusion of colour. Vibrant greens and blues, along with more muted tones, form blocks of colour against which the filmic subjects are portrayed. By immersing the characters in these colours, a sense of continuity is achieved, as if the colour extends beyond the boundaries of the frame. This creates an impression of a complete world in which the filmic subjects are situated; and, through the saturation of the film with

³³⁹ Marks associates traditional ethnography with this kind of visual consumption. Marks, *The Skin of the Film*, pp. 133 & 230.

³⁴⁰ First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 171. Nebesio has made a similar comment: 'Very often Paradzhanov uses only one type of shot in a sequence (for example, medium) which makes the completion of the narrational space by the viewer impossible.' Nebesio, 'Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors', p. 45.

these colours, the viewer experiences the chromatic specificity of this 'world'. When Ivan leaves Marichka to find work on the pasture, her last view of him is surrounded by trees as he climbs up through the forest. In this long-shot nothing is seen except for the trees. As a result, Ivan appears against a block of colour – the entire frame is saturated in the deep green of the foliage. This is, in fact, the scene with which First illustrates the comment cited above. Whilst First associates the use of colour and texture in this scene with a disorienting effect, it is here argued that the location is affirmed through these very means, without the need for 'clear establishing shots'. Precisely through devices such as colour and texture, the film powerfully orients itself in a particular locale. Furthermore, it does so in a way which involves the viewer in its (co-)creation. The intensity of a frame filled with the single colour of the forest expresses the expanse of green that confronts Marichka. This is achieved differently to an establishing shot but is no less effective (and arguably more so, by virtue of its intensity). Moreover, the single colour draws attention to the difference that does exist in the frame – texture – in order to awaken the sense of touch and evoke a perception of what it *feels* like in this world. Finally, rather than flattening the mountain vista, the whole image conveys a sense of height through the length of the tree trunks, which extend beyond the frame. This tendency for things to extend beyond the limits of the frame is an important means by which a sense of space is created. It encourages the viewer to fill in the space around the frame, participating in the filmic world's construction. Although this particular image is not flattened in terms of height, the colour block in general does have a flattening effect in terms of

depth. This is most obviously displayed when the sky is used to form a backdrop of colour.

The sky is, in fact, an important part of the filmic world that is portrayed. It is shown in many different states: the deep blue of early morning, when the children are sitting by the camp-fire; the grey-blue of dusk, when Ivan and Marichka stand amongst the tree cages, symbolic of their own state of entrapment; and the spring sky filled with fluffy white clouds when Palahna steals away from home to perform a fertility ritual. Perhaps the sky is most effective, however, when it is seen without colour and simply appears as an expanse of white. This is particularly arresting during the winter scenes, when it becomes impossible to detect the horizon between the sky and the snow-covered earth. The sky and snow provide a completely white canvas on which the filmic subjects are placed. At times, objects are staggered within the frame, positioned at different heights and distances from the camera, to create a sense of a multi-planar, and thus three-dimensional, space. At other times, the sky and snow simply form a flat screen against which the filmic subjects are portrayed. In both cases, the unbroken whiteness of the screen creates a feeling of continuity and suggests the existence of a space beyond the frame, a space blanketed in snow. It also accentuates the filmic subjects as points of colour and difference within the shot, thus drawing attention to the patterns and textiles of their clothing. Sometimes they are dressed in brightly coloured clothes, which contrasts with the background against which they vibrantly stand out; on other occasions, their clothing blends into the background, making them appear part of the landscape itself.

A particularly striking example of both these techniques occurs during the sequence which begins with Ivan and his parents erecting a cross at Oleko's grave. The camera is placed behind some bracken, locating the filmmaker within the scene, and it is positioned at a low angle, highlighting the slope of the hill at the top of which the Paliichuks are positioned. In the distance, behind them and to the right, a row of other gravestones and some trees can be seen. In effect, three planes are established: the foreground, where the camera is located; the middle plane, where the Paliichuks are standing; and the background which shows the cemetery. This positioning (or spatial layering) combats the compression of space that occurs through the lack of distinction between the white sky and the snow, despite the deep focus of the shot. Our eye is seemingly drawn into the illusion of deep space at the same time as being repelled. Ivanko then stumbles down the snowy slope towards the camera. The crunching of the snow under his feet reveals the only difference that can be detected between the white sky and ground: their texture. Significantly, this difference in texture is relayed to the viewer through the soundtrack, suggesting that our senses other than the visual should be awakened. Ivan also blends into this land of whiteness, dressed in a light-coloured *serdak* (felt coat) and *kholoshni* (trousers). The viewer's eye is drawn to these garments by the red piping along the edges of his *serdak* – the only glimpse of colour in the frame. As the eye roams over his clothing, the textures stand out as points of difference – the matte *sukno* fabric (a heavy woollen felt) seems to absorb the light, in contrast to the reflective surface of the snow. Behind Ivanko other people are seen trekking up the slope, reminding the viewer of the different planes that exist in this expanse of white. It is a confirmation

of depth that is immediately contradicted at the beginning of the next shot which cuts to a nearby group of women playing the *drymba*. The camera has moved nearer to the filmic subjects, and the space behind them also seems to have become compressed; it is, in effect, a flat white screen against which they are placed. Unable to look beyond them, our eye pulls back and runs over the women and their colourful outfits. With the quick and unsteady movement of the hand-held camera, we struggle to take in the different colours and floral patterns of the *khustky* (scarves) tied in their distinctive style around the women's heads. There is too much detail to absorb. The occasional upward movement of the camera reveals glimpses of figures standing on a slope behind the women, suggesting a sense of depth, which is then quashed as the camera falls back down and the blanket whiteness returns. Ivan then directs our gaze to another group of women who consecutively throw their *khustky* around their shoulders, as if displaying them for our admiration and demonstrating how they are tied around the *peremitka* (long white strip of linen worn around the head like a wimple) that they are wearing. Again, the camera moves so quickly as to blur the image; we are simply left with an impression of colour, pattern and texture. It is only when Ivan is called to the church by his mother that we are given the opportunity to see the headdress clearly, and in a way that we can process. Our eye is drawn to Ivan's mother, positioned in the centre of the frame, and to the white crescent of her *peremitka*, which stands out as the brightest object within it. Tied around her *peremitka* is a *khustka* decorated with a floral pattern in the traditional Hutsul colours of green, red and purple. Having been presented with a surfeit of detail, we are finally able to see the overall picture.

This technique is used throughout the film to acquaint the viewer with the Hustul world: following an initial bombardment of information, objects are placed into context and thus understood in retrospect. This works both to stimulate a process of remembering in the viewer – crucial to the postmemorial work of the film – and to create the sensation of the filmmakers’ experience, in which the unfamiliar gradually becomes the familiar. It is also, in effect, a repetition of the movement between near and far with which we have characterized the film’s treatment of space – a close-up detail followed by a contextualizing long-shot. All of the elements so far described – the sky, its colour, the movement from near to far, and from detail to contextualization – are combined in the opening sequence of the seventh chapter (‘Budni’), when Ivan and Palahna are shown making haystacks. The sequence begins with a close-up shot of a wooden pouch hanging from a *cheres* (wide leather belt with buckles to which various items can be attached). A hand pulls a flint-like instrument from the pouch before an editing cut is made to another close-up, this time of two hands sharpening a scythe with a similar looking instrument. The scythe is held up against a pure white background – probably the sky – which gives the appearance of a flat screen and thus compresses our sense of depth. All our attention is focused instead on the detail being shown in the foreground. A transition is then made to a close-up of a scythe cutting some flower-strewn grass. Occasionally we see the feet of the scythe-operator, shod in *postoly* (shoes made from a single piece of leather). The entire frame is filled with the flowery grass. Following these three close-ups, in which our sense of background is minimized, we are presented with a shot of Palahna on top of a haystack, with the Carpathians rolling in the distance behind her. This is

one of the most traditional mountain vistas in the film, and the sense of depth is accentuated by the spatial compression of the preceding shots. We are given time to absorb the scenery as Palahna treads down the hay in a circular movement, a movement that she repeats and which perhaps encourages us to imagine the mountains encircling Palahna. However, it is the next shot that provides a more vivid sense of space, one which the viewer co-creates through the use of colour. As Ivan sweeps up a pitchfork full of hay, the low angle and position of the camera mean that he is presented against a backdrop of pure sky. The glorious blue colour fills the screen, giving a sense of wholeness such that the viewer can imagine its continuation beyond the limits of the frame. Moreover, with the intensity of the colour a sense of the air and space surrounding Ivan as he stands at the top of a mountain is forcefully evoked. Perhaps making use of the preceding image of the mountain vista, the viewer is able imaginatively to fill in the space surrounding Ivan and participate in its construction. As the camera moves closer to Ivan, it clearly brings into view the *cheres* he is wearing over his shirt. By putting it into context, we understand the close-up image with which the sequence began: the *cheres* is an item of clothing that Hutsul men traditionally wear for carrying out their work. With his bodily movements, Ivan demonstrates the reason for the width of the *cheres* belt, which was designed to support the back. Finally, as Ivan approaches the haystack and Palahna slides down to meet him, the vibrant blue sky that previously filled the screen turns entirely white. The draining of colour – maybe simply due to a patch of cloud overhead – accentuates the draining of passion in their relationship as Ivan's ardour

fades. Palahna slides down Ivan's chest, and over his *cheres*, from which the rather phallic-looking pouch is now missing – an ironic symbol of his disinterest.

Clothing Space: Materials, Textures and Memory

As the above example shows, both colour and clothing are used symbolically, as well as in the construction of filmic space. The use of clothing is a particularly important aspect of the film's treatment of space, one which continues the movement between detail and contextualization and, at the same time, forges a connection with memory. On numerous occasions, the frame is filled with close-up images of different items of clothing. The transition from childhood to adulthood is made by Ivan pulling a white shirt over his head; Marichka's fatal fall (the transition from life to the after-life, if you will) is illustrated by a close-up of her feet, shod in *postoly*; ³⁴¹ as noted above, the seventh chapter opens with a close-up of the *cheres*; and the following chapter ('Rizdvo') begins with a procession towards the camera of various Hutsul costumes for the festive occasion. Obviously, clothes are intimately associated with space through their regional specificity. For many in Ukraine, national costume is a source of pride and an important marker of identity. The *vyshyvanka* – the colloquial name for an embroidered shirt – is perhaps the most well-known and well-loved item in the Ukrainian wardrobe. It is worn on important occasions and state holidays and, particularly in western Ukraine, as part of everyday attire. Whilst Ukrainian national costume has perhaps become overly political in recent times, its role in defining space

³⁴¹ The *postoly* have disappeared by the time Marichka's body is laid out on the beach, perhaps swept away by the rushing water.

must not be overlooked.³⁴² The *vyshyvanka* not only speaks of its Ukrainian origin but also of the particular region in which it was made. The knowing eye could detect where a person hailed from by the clothes on their back. Embroidery is thus an important craft within Ukraine and different techniques exist to suit local styles with their own particular patterns and colours. Traditionally, the thread was coloured according to local formulas using bark, leaves, flowers, berries and so on. In this way, the local environment is literally reflected in the colour of the embroidery.

In general, Hutsul embroidery is distinguished by its favouring of geometric patterns – particularly diamonds, along with squares, triangles, circles, crosses and other shapes – and in its wide range of colours (red, green, yellow, blue, orange and black are commonly used). Red, ranging from the darkest shade to an intense orange-gold colour, predominates. However, every village in Hustul'shchyna has its own traditional motifs, composition and colour palette. In Verkhovyns'kyi *raion*, for example, the range of colours tends to include purple shades. The stitches applied in the embroidery of a particular region reflect the materials and patterns that are used there. Bukovyna embroidery, for example, is noted for its use of gold and silver thread, metallic discs ('*lelitky*') and beads (*biser*). Whilst a number of different stitches are used in Hutsul'shchyna (Shukhevych lists twelve in his five-volume work *Hutsul'shchyna*), the most widespread and distinctive to the region is the *nyzynka*. This is an old stitch which is worked primarily on the reverse of the fabric to give a

³⁴² The fact that newly-elected President Viktor Yanukovich bought a *vyshyvanka* at the *Sorochyns'kyi Iarmarok* (Annual National *Vyshyvanka* Fair) in August 2010 made headlines.

clear black outline. In the Hutsul style, this is then filled in with different coloured threads.³⁴³

The relationship between clothing and space in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* can be examined from two perspectives: the use of clothing to define space; and the ways in which filmic space affects the portrayal of clothing. A good example of this two-way relationship can be found in the scene when Marichka says goodbye to Ivan in the forest. In a recent article Larysa Kadochnykova has recalled the testing conditions under which this scene was shot, one which involved icy water being pumped up from the river to act as the rain underneath which they are standing:

Koly pochas' ziomka i pustylu vodu, ia vid kholodu vzhe ne pamiatala ni tekstu, nichoho. Ivan zniav kapeliukha i nadv meni na holovu vin mene vriatuvav. [...] Nas pereodiahly – i znovu vse spochatku. I tak raziv chotyry chy p'iat'.³⁴⁴

Indeed, in the final version of the film, at least two different shirts can be identified during the sequence! Of particular interest, however, is the shirt that Marichka wears just after Ivan has left and she remains under the water alone. Following the deep focus of the previous shot, in which the couple were circled by the camera with the forest extending far behind them, Marichka is now shown with the short focus of an extreme close-up. The blurry background resists attempts to plunge into its depths.

³⁴³ This description of Hutsul embroidery comes from the website of the National Museum of Folk Art of Hutsul'shchyna and Pokuttia. See Irina Fediv, 'Odiah, tkany i vyshyvka', <<http://hutsul.museum/collection/overview/fabrics/>> [accessed 27 June 2011]. Volodymyr Shukhevych, *Hutsul'shchyna*, 5 vols (Lviv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1899–1908).

³⁴⁴ 'When the filming began and the water was released, I couldn't remember my lines or anything because of the cold. Ivan took off his hat and put it on my head and saved me. [...] We were re-dressed and then – all over again from the beginning. And so it was, four or five times.' Larysa Kadochnykova, 'Vin buv zemnoiu i vodnochas hezemnoiu liudynoiu', *Kino-Teatr*, 2011.3 <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=1143> [accessed 8 July 2011].

Instead, our gaze is kept on the foreground, on Marichka, her shirt and, in particular, the embroidery on her sleeves, positioned in the centre of the frame. The orange, red and yellow threads are so thickly and tightly sewn that, when wet, they appear like snake-skin, glistening as Marichka turns. Our attention is thus drawn to how the embroidery *feels*, to the texture of the material. As the restricted depth of field brings our attention to the foreground, we are also made aware of the surface of the clothing. At the same time, the embroidery functions to define the space, as it can be mapped to Kosmach, a village in Kosivs'kyi *raion*, famed for its arts and crafts. Kosmach embroidery is noted for its autumnal colours – reds, oranges and yellows – which are sewn in a thick line such that no white cloth is visible.³⁴⁵ A particular characteristic of Kosmach embroidery is the decoration on the sleeves of a woman's shirt. In contrast to other regions, where the embroidery covers the whole sleeve, the Kosmach style concentrates on the *vustavky* – horizontal insets of embroidery that are sewn separately and attached to the sleeve by a narrow patterned strip. (Earlier, during the Easter celebrations, Marichka is shown wearing a more elaborately embroidered shirt, as befits the festive occasion, in which the entire sleeve is patterned.) The basic principle of *vustavky* is the stacking of bands of embroidered pattern, which are framed by a narrow, three-rowed stripe (*snurok*). The upper and lower rows of the *snurok* are embroidered in a dark or bright red thread; the middle row of the *snurok* is called a *pereklydynka* (translator), because it alternates all the colours included in the *vustavky*. Kosmach *vustavky* can thus be divided according to the number of bands that are stacked: one, one-and-a-half, two or three bands. The most common is the one-and-a-half banded *vustavky*, on the lower part of which is sewn the entire pattern,

³⁴⁵ *Ukraintsy*, ed. by N. S. Polishchuk and A. P. Ponomarev (Moscow: Nauka, 2000), p. 298.

with half a row repeated above it.³⁴⁶ This clearly describes Marichka's shirt: one-and-a-half banded *vustavky* on which the *snurok* is located at the bottom. The *perekladynka* is clearly visible with its alternating red, orange and yellow stripes, reflecting the colours used in the general figure-of-eight pattern. The pattern itself looks strikingly similar to a pattern called *lumerovi*, depicted in a recently published volume on Hutsul embroidery based on material from the National Museum of Folk Art of Hutsul'shchyna and Pokuttia.³⁴⁷ In this particular shot, the clothing works to define the space, whilst the filmic space draws attention to the material properties of the clothing.

Kosmach (situated around twelve kilometres from Verkhovyna) is one of the oldest and largest villages in Hutsul'shchyna. Whilst Kosmach is not the precise village in which the narrative is located, it is not inconceivable for Marichka to be wearing a shirt from this nearby town, famed for its style of embroidery. In fact, the practice of buying items of clothing from elsewhere is referred to in the film. The wedding ceremony of Ivan and Palahna is accompanied in the soundtrack by a song in which the following lyrics are repeated:

Chervoni choboty, choboty,
Kosivs'koi roboty, roboty.
A v Kosovi зробleni, robleni,
V Kryvorivni nosheni, nosheni.³⁴⁸

In the soundtrack, therefore, the connection between clothing and space is made explicit. The *choboty* are identified with the places of their production (Kosiv) and

³⁴⁶ *Hutsul's'ka vyshyvka z koleksii Natsional'noho muzeiu narodnoho mystetstva Hutsul'shchyny ta Pokuttia im. I. Kobryns'koho*, ed. by Olena P. Nykorak (Kyiv: Rodovid, 2010), p. 154.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

³⁴⁸ 'Red *choboty* boots, | Of Kosiv workmanship. | Made in Kosiv, | Worn in Kryvorivnia.'

wearing (Kryvorivnia). The latter is, of course, the locale in which the wedding takes place, thus mapping the song onto the narrative. Furthermore, when the song ends on these lyrics, the camera cuts to a close-up shot of Ivan and Palahna's footwear. In actual fact, the shoes that they are wearing are *postoly*, not *choboty*. However, this slight discord between image and sound only serves to draw attention to the *postoly* and encourages the viewer to remember an earlier scene in the film. For this is not the first time these traditional Hutsul shoes have been noted. When they meet as children, Ivan throws Marichka's ribbons into the river, whereupon she says defiantly:

Nichoho, u mene ie druhi, mai lipshchi. Nenia kupila meni novu zapasku, postoly i merezhani kapchuri. Ia sia obuiu faino, ta i budu divka!³⁴⁹

The three items that Marichka mentions are in fact all shown in the shot of Ivan and Palahna's feet on their wedding day. As Ivan walks around Palahna, her orange, woollen *kapchuri* encased in the leather *postoly* become the focus of the camera's gaze. Like those Marichka had referred to, Palahna's *kapchuri* are decorated at the top with yellow embroidery. Palahna then turns to her left, as if to present the camera with a different view of these garments, and in so doing reveals the embroidered hem of her *zapaska*, tied around the back of her linen shirt. Palahna is modelling the items that Marichka talked of wearing as a grown-up. In making these connections with an earlier scene, the film calls upon the viewer to remember Marichka, much like – one might assume – Ivan is also remembering his first love. In this way, the past makes its presence felt – literally so, in the items of clothing which carry this particular memory and whose different textures (leather, wool and cotton) fill the frame. Palahna's *zapaska* falls to the floor and Ivan's hand reaches down to raise her shirt, exposing

³⁴⁹ 'No matter, I have others, even better ones. Mum bought me a new *zapaska* (apron skirt), *postoly* and embroidered *kapchuri* (thick socks). I will be dressed nicely and be a big girl!'

the skin of her legs, which draws the viewer's gaze with its unexpected softness. Texture is thus accentuated in the shot through the focus on skin and hands, the things through which we feel the world around us.

Gradually, then, the discussion of space in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* has led to a consideration of surface, texture and the sense of touch. In the case of clothing, and its role in defining space, attention has also been drawn to its function in evoking memory. All these concerns – surface and depth, memory, and the sense of touch – are central to the concept of 'haptic cinema', particularly as elaborated by Marks. Let us now consider what is meant by this term and how it contributes to our understanding of the function of space in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

'Seeing is believing, but feeling is the truth'

As Mark Michael Smith reminds us in his history of the senses, 'seeing is believing' is only the first half of the old English adage; our tendency to forget the second half of the phrase speaks of modernity's privileging of the visual sense.³⁵⁰ Gradually, however, this preference for the ocular is being counterweighed in film studies by a growing interest in the other sensorial experiences of the 'viewer'. Traditional psychoanalytic approaches to film spectatorship, which accorded privilege to sight in their theories of viewer identification, have thus given way to different ways of theorizing cinema that recognize its capacity to engage other senses. The burgeoning field of film sound studies, for example, calls attention to the sonic dimension of what is, after all, an audio-visual medium; phenomenologists have highlighted the embodied response of the viewer; and exciting new work has been spurred by the

³⁵⁰ Mark Michael Smith, *Sensing the Past: Seeing, Hearing, Smelling, Tasting, and Touching in History* (Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 2007), p. 93.

concept of ‘haptic cinema’.³⁵¹ Here, theorists are considering the ways in which cinema stimulates a tactile way of looking in which ‘the eyes themselves function as organs of touch’.³⁵² In examining the treatment of space in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the implicit theme running through this chapter has been touch: how is the viewer encouraged to experience the filmic space, to *feel* the Carpathians as they are presented? This focus on the sense of touch, and feeling with one’s eyes, is not meant to imply a lack of interest in the aural. Far from it: the role of sound, including its function in constructing filmic space, will be examined in detail in the following chapter. Here, however, the focus of our inquiry lies in the visual means by which cinema stimulates a multi-sensory response.

In *The Skin of the Film*, Marks seeks to understand how audio-visual media represent non-audiovisual sensory experiences, such as taste, smell and touch. She observes that ‘many new works in film and video call upon memories of the senses in order to represent the experiences of people living in diaspora’.³⁵³ These works are labelled ‘intercultural cinema’ – a term she acknowledges the limitations of, but which is intended to avoid the ‘loadedness’ of alternatives (‘hybrid’, ‘Third cinema’, ‘postcolonial’, ‘marginal’, ‘interstitial’, etc.). Intercultural cinema, she explains, can be ‘produced wherever people of different cultural backgrounds live together in the power-inflected spaces of diaspora, (post- or neo-)colonialism, and cultural

³⁵¹ In 2007, the journal *Music, Sound, and the Moving Image* was founded as ‘the first international scholarly journal devoted to the study of the interaction between music and sound with the entirety of moving image media’. Barker provides a phenomenological approach to film studies in her recent addition to the literature on haptic cinema (Barker, *The Tactile Eye*).

³⁵² Marks, ‘Video and Haptic Erotics’, p. 332.

³⁵³ Marks, *The Skin of the Film*, p. xi.

apartheid'.³⁵⁴ Her own interest lies in film and video produced between the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s by cultural minorities living in Western metropolitan centres, principally in the United States and Canada. Central to Marks's argument is the claim that the organization of the senses ('sensorium') varies both individually and culturally.³⁵⁵ Intercultural works, positioned at the intersection between two or more cultures, therefore appeal to sensorial organizations other than the ocularcentrism of the Euro-American societies in which Marks, and the majority of the filmmakers whom she studies, reside. By offering haptic images, these films 'facilitate the experience of other sensory impressions as well'.³⁵⁶

As it is employed within film studies, the term 'haptic' is traced to the art historian Alois Riegl (1858–1905) and his descriptions of ancient Egyptian artwork. Riegl drew a distinction between a haptic style of art, emblematic of Egyptian works, in which the object adhered to a plane, and an optical style in which 'objects relinquished a tactile connection to the plane', becoming distinguished from the ground and thus giving rise to the illusion of depth.³⁵⁷ Intrinsic to this distinction between haptic and optic was the relationship between the viewer and the viewed: haptic works required the viewer to come up close and, paradoxically, kept her at a distance, external to the image; optical works allowed for a greater space between the viewer and the work, thus facilitating an imaginative act of identification with the work.³⁵⁸ The haptic image, for Marks, is one that invites 'a look that moves on the

³⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 1.

³⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 195.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 2.

³⁵⁷ Marks, 'Video and Haptic Erotics', p. 335.

³⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 335–36. For other contributions on haptic cinema, see Noël Burch, *Life to those Shadows*, trans. and ed. by Ben Brewster (London: BFI Publishing, 1990); and Antonia Lant,

surface plane of the screen for some time before the viewer realizes what she or he is beholding. Such images resolve into figuration only gradually, if at all.³⁵⁹ This is a particularly narrow definition of a haptic image which suggests a kind of agnosia, or inability to recognize visually that which is being shown. Instead, Marks's haptic images 'prevent an easy connection to narrative, instead encouraging the viewer to engage with the image through memory'.³⁶⁰ The haptic image requires the viewer to use her memory of the senses to imaginatively fill in the gaps. It appeals to 'knowledge in our bodies and memory in our senses'.³⁶¹ Whilst such appeals are increasingly employed in mainstream movies to intensify the viewing experience, they are supplementary to the other forms of representation at their disposal. However, as Marks notes, 'in some cases it is more crucial for cultural history to reside in the memory of the senses. This is the case particularly when official histories cannot comprehend certain realms of experience, or when they actively deny them'.³⁶² Such is the case with intercultural cinema, Marks argues. Thus the haptic image offers a means of appealing to a different way of knowing (a different sensorium), and a means of accessing a cultural history that is carried in the memory of the senses.

'Haptical Cinema', *October*, 74 (Autumn 1995), 45–73. Burch has examined how techniques such as lighting, camera movement and placement contributed to a gradual development of the illusion of deep space – a three-dimensional space that the viewer can imagine being in, and thus touching; and Lant has identified a movement between depth and surface in early cinema. The interplay between depth and surface has been examined in the context of early Soviet filmmaking by Emma Widdis (See Emma Widdis, 'Faktura: Depth and Surface in Early Soviet Set Design', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 3 (2009), 5–32). In many respects, in their treatment of space, *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and the poetic school can be seen to enter into dialogue with this earlier period.

³⁵⁹ Marks, *The Skin of the Film*, pp. 162-63.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 177.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. xiii.

³⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 223.

In applying Marks's theoretical model to *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the intention is not to suggest that the film (or the poetic school in general) is an example of intercultural cinema; the films and videos which form the focus of Marks's research are identified as a specific movement which emerged between 1985 and 1995.³⁶³ More fruitful is to draw upon Marks's concept of haptic visuality as a means of accessing the relationship between cinema, the senses, and cultural memory. In bringing this into contact with Hirsch's notion of postmemory, we can begin to understand how the treatment of space in the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is used in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* to engage in postmemorial work. Central to this is Marks's emphasis on the relationship between the viewer and the screen, in which the viewer is required to participate and draw on her own memory to help construct the filmic space.³⁶⁴ As Marks notes, 'a film or video (or painting or photograph) may offer haptic *images*, while the term haptic *visuality* emphasizes the viewer's inclination to perceive them'.³⁶⁵ We should bear this distinction in mind as we now turn to examine the use of haptic images in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

Haptic imagery in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*

The most obvious example in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* of the use of haptic images, in Marks's strict definition of the term, occurs at the beginning of the fourth chapter. The chapter is introduced with the one-word intertitle '*Polonyna*' (Pasture) – one of only two which provide a specific location – thereby attuning us to the upcoming

³⁶³ It is of course possible to trace the lineage of these films back to European experimental film (Marks specifically mentions Chris Marker and Jean Rouch, for example).

³⁶⁴ Here Marks draws upon Henri Bergson's notion of 'attentive recognition'. Ibid., p. 48.

³⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 162.

creation of a new cinematic space. However, rather than being presented with an establishing shot of this new location, we are confronted with a static shot that seems to repel all attempts to plunge into the illusory depth of the screen. The frame is entirely filled with the grey-white colour of an unknown object. Trying to *place* this object, our eye travels over the screen, taking in the volcanic-rock-like surface of the material being shown. It looks other-worldly, a sensation which is heightened by the circular white pattern just off-centre, reminiscent of a planet. It is, in fact, a very detailed image of a stone. We are only able to recognize it as such in retrospect (itself an act of remembering); it is followed in quick succession by five other extreme close-ups of similar surfaces, which we are gradually able to perceive as stones. Each of the six images presents a different stone or patch of stone, some covered with lichen, others not, in such extreme close-up that it is difficult to ‘consume’ the image. Instead, we ‘feel’ the image with our eyes, and in so doing are alerted to the fact that there are different ways of knowing objects and the space around us, other than the (optical) visual. In our first encounter with the pasture, we are asked to ‘feel’ (and remember), as well as to see.

Shortly afterwards we are confronted with six more static, extreme close-up shots in fairly quick succession. This time, having learnt from our prior experience, we recognize the object more quickly: we are being shown different types of wood. Some wood is splintery, some smooth, some oozing resin, some freshly sawn, but all are shown in such detail as to reveal their different textures. Finally, there follow seven more extreme close-up shots, this time a medley of different materials which make up the ground below our feet: mud, stone, sand, plants and water. In total, the

pasture is introduced with nineteen haptic images of the different materials that might be encountered there. In Marks's words, these images invite a way of looking that

tends to move over the surface of its object rather than to plunge into illusionistic depth, not to distinguish form so much as to discern texture. It is more inclined to move than to focus, more inclined to graze than to gaze.³⁶⁶

Instead of consuming the images as representations of stone or wood or earth, our eye travels over the surface of the screen and we perceive their different textures – the hard, cool surface of the stone; the brittle bark ready to flake off at our touch; the viscosity of the mud; and the graininess of the sand. In looking at the image, we remember other sensory encounters so that we are able to come into contact imaginatively with the screen.

The use of these haptic images displays a concern to present the pasture as a space in which you need to engage all your senses – perhaps in a different way from that to which you are accustomed, suggestive of a Hutsul-specific sensorium. However, as Marks points out, the haptic image cannot (nor is it intended to) provide ‘a “sensurround” fullness of experience, a total sensory environment’ – rather, it calls up the limits of the audio-visual medium and the limits of sensory knowledge.³⁶⁷ The haptic image speaks of loss, and the desire to overcome it, but ultimately, the inability to do so. In a way, then, the haptic image illustrates postmemory's relationship to the past. Whilst the past is irretrievable, postmemorial works nonetheless seek to reconnect with it. The way in which the haptic images in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* are used illustrates this. Fundamentally, this involves a project to encourage in the viewer

³⁶⁶ Ibid..

³⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 192.

a haptic visuality: the film does not just present us with haptic images, it teaches us how to see them.

The first six extreme close-ups of the stones are followed by a long-shot of Myko standing at the top of a hill, with the mountains behind him. This is the classic establishing shot – an optical image inviting us into its illusory depth – that we might have expected would open the fourth chapter. In the foreground of the shot is a large, grey stone, similar to that which has just been the focus of our ‘graze’ in the preceding shots. A connection is thus established between the haptic images and the shot which follows. This movement between haptic and optical, or between surface and depth is then repeated with wood: after the six close-ups of different types of wood, Myko is shown in a long-shot, with two tree trunks in the foreground. In the final oscillation of this sequence, the camera moves from the haptic images of different ground surfaces to a long shot of Myko in which the camera is placed on the ground, viewing the scene through blades of grass. The grass invites us to look at the surface of the screen, at the same time as looking *through* it to the depth beyond.³⁶⁸ The previous haptic images of mud, sand and stone are associated with the ground-level position of the camera in this shot; we imagine the surface on which the camera is resting. By moving between haptic and optical images in this way, the materials that the viewer has come into contact with in the haptic images are then placed within the narrative. The haptic images engage the viewer’s memory and then the ‘remembered’ material is placed into the narrative. In this way, the viewer is able to

³⁶⁸ This is reminiscent of Widdis’s description of the images of lace in *Predatel'* (The Traitor, 1926, directed by Abram Room). See Widdis, ‘*Faktura*’, p. 23.

claim the narrative as her own – the remembering of the film’s narrative is extended to the viewer, thus widening the postmemorial circle.

Conclusion

In its introduction to the pasture, the film presents us with two ways of knowing this space – haptically and optically. In its repetitive movement between the two, we practice how to view haptically; in a sense, the film *teaches* us haptic visuality. Furthermore, if we look more broadly, we can see how this instruction is contained within the film as a whole. The oscillation between near and far, detail and contextualization, surface and depth, in which the film has consistently been engaged is a means of familiarizing the viewer not only with the filmic world, but with the two kinds of visuality – haptic and optical. It conveys the experience of an ethnographic encounter, at the same time as encouraging the viewer to engage with the film through her memory. This project to stimulate within the viewer a haptic visuality is thus an intrinsic part of the film’s treatment of space and of its status as a postmemorial work.

CHAPTER FOUR

Sound and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode

In examining the functions of time and space within the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, the preceding chapters have largely ignored in their discussion of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* the use of sound. Whilst this deliberate omission risks the charge of replicating the ocularcentrism of much film criticism, it is hoped that the following chapter will redress the balance. This chapter responds to calls for a more sonically informed understanding of film and takes sound as its central concern.³⁶⁹ It seeks to ascertain the importance of the aural dimension of film for the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. Cinema is, of course, an audio-visual art and, as will become apparent, the discussion of sound in film cannot fruitfully be isolated from a consideration of the image. In essence, what is at stake is the relationship between the audio and the visual.

The relationship between sound and image can be considered to have both temporal and spatial dimensions; commonly, discussion of the former relates to the question of synchronization, whilst the latter refers to the distinction made between on-screen and off-screen sound.³⁷⁰ Accordingly, this chapter will examine how the

³⁶⁹ The special issues of *Yale French Studies* and *Screen*, along with the establishment of the journal *Music, Sound and the Moving Image*, are significant markers in the development of film sound studies. See the special issues entitled 'Cinema/Sound', *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980); and 'On the Soundtrack', *Screen*, 25.3 (May–June 1984).

³⁷⁰ William Johnson, 'The Liberation of the Echo: A New Hearing for Film Sound', *Film Quarterly*, 38.4 (1985), 2–12 (p. 7). Metz points out that the on-screen/off-screen distinction refers to the *source* of the sound, rather than the sound itself. See Christian Metz, 'Aural Objects', trans. by Georgia Gurrieri, *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 24–32 (pp. 28–29). Nonetheless, as Doane highlights, the notion of off-screen sound designates a particular relationship between sound and image which is significant: see Mary Ann Doane, 'The Voice

sound-image relationship interacts with the functions of time and space identified in the preceding chapters. Specifically, this concerns the use of sound (and corresponding image) to create an awareness of multiple temporalities, and to evoke a sense of the space in which the narrative is located and performed. Divided into two parts, the chapter will first identify the different kinds of sounds that are heard – and not heard – in the film in order to account for the development of a regionally specific acoustic world. The use of these sounds to complement the space of the image will be considered, and the ways in which they are layered together to create – and, importantly, to teach – an acoustic way of knowing specific to this locale. In this respect, the analysis draws on the work of anthropologist Steven Feld. A former student of Rouch, Feld has pursued ethnographic work in and through the medium of sound. Determined that ‘ethnography should include what it is that people hear every day’, Feld started to use the term ‘acoustemology’ to describe ‘one’s sonic way of knowing and being in the world’.³⁷¹ In his first paper at graduate school, Feld put forward the following questions: “‘What about an anthropology of sound? What about ethnographies that are tape recordings?’”³⁷² He has continued to ask these questions and, I would suggest even more crucially, has added a third: “‘What about ethnography as tape editing?’”³⁷³ It is Feld’s acknowledgement – further, his incorporation – of processes of editing within his concept of acoustemology that makes his work fruitful for theorizing film sound.

in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space’, *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 33–50 (p. 39)).

³⁷¹ Steve Feld, ‘Doing Anthropology in Sound’, *American Ethnologist*, 31 (2004), 461–74 (p. 462).

³⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 463.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 464.

In describing how he edited *Voices in the Forest*, a thirty-minute ‘soundscape’ of a day in the forest with Kaluli people, which he made in 1982, Feld explains that it was constructed ‘using tape editing as a compositional technique with a multitrack recorder, layering and overlapping different recordings from the 24-hour cycle’.³⁷⁴ The concept of layering features heavily in Feld’s work. In relation to his *Voices of the Rainforest*, it is connected with the evocation of a sense of space: ‘There’s a lot of deep space on the recording because we layered the tracks on a multitrack recorder. I recorded in a way so that you can hear the height of sound and the depth of sound in the forest.’³⁷⁵ In more recent work on European sounds, Feld accords a temporal dimension to his sonic layers:

I’m fascinated by relationships of bells and music, for example, a church bell with the same resonant decay time as one of the oldest organs in Finland. Or bells and space, for example, when walking with a shepherd in Italy and hearing, a kilometer away, the funeral bells from the church overlapping the bells of his 50 sheep. These are historically layered relationships in sound, like the way belled flocks move through the countryside, making place audible.³⁷⁶

With their layered sounds, Feld’s compositions use recorded sound not as a ‘copy’, but as a means of evoking a way of hearing (or acoustemology) that is particular to a specific time and place. Thus, Feld’s acoustemology offers a way of embracing both the mediated nature of recorded sound *and* the specificity of sound to a particular time and space. He manipulates the recorded sound, creating aural layers that not only evoke temporal and spatial dimensions, but also express an acoustemology, a way of hearing specific to that locale. In this way, the concept of acoustemology provides a

³⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 465.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., p. 467.

³⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 469. Here Feld cites Panayotis Panopoulos, ‘Animal Bells as Symbols: Sound and Hearing in a Greek Island Village’, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9 (2003), 639–56.

framework for thinking about the role of sound in the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. In *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the temporal and spatial layering identified in the preceding chapters is complemented by an aural layering which evokes not only the Carpathian world of the film's construction, but also an acoustemology.

Whilst the creative editing of Feld's soundtracks makes his work fruitful for theorizing sound within film studies, ironically it is this same editing process which he feels has presented an obstacle for the future of sound studies within his own discipline:

Until the sound recorder is presented and taught as a technology of creative and analytic mediation, which requires craft and editing and articulation just like writing, little will happen of an interesting sort in the anthropology of sound.³⁷⁷

In a 2010 article for the *Annual Review of Anthropology*, however, a group of scholars responded to Feld's call.³⁷⁸ Noting an 'archival impetus' underlying anthropological field methodology with sound, they asked: 'How might the discipline of anthropology develop if its practitioners stopped thinking of the field recording only as a source of data for the written work that then ensues and rather thought of the recording itself as a meaningful form?'³⁷⁹ These scholars set out to answer the question of what a sounded anthropology might be, finding particularly useful the concept of 'acousmatic' sound within film studies.³⁸⁰ This term has been developed by the film theorist Michel Chion to refer to situations in which we hear sounds without seeing their source. The authors conclude that 'discussions of film sound that

³⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 471.

³⁷⁸ David W. Samuels, Louise Meintjes, Ana Maria Ochoa, and Thomas Porcello, 'Soundscapes: Toward a Sounded Anthropology', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39 (2010), 329–45.

³⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 322 & 330.

³⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 329.

focus on the acousmatic enter the purview of anthropology because they strongly implicate relationships of sound, place, and space.³⁸¹

What begins to emerge, therefore, is a situation in which the study of recorded sound can fruitfully draw upon debates within anthropology and film studies in mutually enhancing ways. The following examination of the role of sound with the Experiential Ethnographic Mode aims to do just this. Inspired by Feld, the first part focuses on the ways in which the different sonic elements are layered together to create a sense of space and an acoustemology specific to it. The second part takes inspiration from Chion's notion of the acousmatic and investigates the relationship between what is seen and what is heard, between image and sound. The interaction between audio and visual tracks, it will be seen, creates and problematizes the distinction between diegetic and non-diegetic spaces. It provides a means of 'giving voice' to the local non-professionals who took part in the film so that the story is perceived as theirs. The acousmatic sounds thus create temporal layers: the temporality of the narrative and that of its narration.

Part One: Layers of Sounds in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*

Although by no means inevitable, one of the consequences of combining recorded sound with image was the division of the former into separate tracks: dialogue, effects and music.³⁸² Different sounds required different recording conditions, and the

³⁸¹ Ibid., p. 333.

³⁸² Altman, Jones and Tatroe have examined how the 'multiplane sound system' developed during the early years of sound film. Rick Altman, McGraw Jones and Sonia Tatroe, 'Inventing the Cinema Soundtrack: Hollywood's Multiplane Sound System', in *Music and Cinema*, ed. by James Buhler, Caryl Flynn and David Neumeyer (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 2000), pp. 339–59.

separation of music, effects and dialogue into individual tracks facilitated their editing and mixing. Doane explains that:

Direct sound, the sound which is recorded during shooting, consists only of dialogue and some sound effects. Most of the sound effects and the music are recorded later and this necessitates the establishment of specialized departments within the studio structure. Dialogue which is not recorded on location or which is marred by background noise is postsynchronised. The stratification, the continual subdivision which the sound track undergoes, is aligned with the aim of sustaining a rigid hierarchy of sounds. [...] Dialogue is given primary consideration and its level generally determines the levels of sound effects and music.³⁸³

In analysing the soundtrack, this tripartite division tends to be replicated, although the hierarchy may differ slightly. Théberge notes that:

For the most part, this strategy has been extremely productive: we now have a substantial body of literature devoted to the study of music in film and a relatively smaller, sporadic, but nevertheless critical, mass of scholarship addressing sound and dialogue as well.³⁸⁴

Yet he joins a number of critics in calling for an integrated approach to analysing the soundtrack.³⁸⁵ Théberge suggests the notion of silence provides one such approach. There is much to commend in this suggestion, particularly his championing of the various possibilities of silence. The division of the soundtrack into dialogue, music and effects obviously overlooks those significant sections of film in which there is no sound (or only 'room tone', which Théberge terms 'almost silence' and which he

³⁸³ Mary Ann Doane, 'Ideology and the Practice of Sound Editing and Mixing', in *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, ed. by Elisabeth Weis and John Belton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), pp. 54–62 (p. 58).

³⁸⁴ Paul Théberge, 'Almost Silent: The Interplay of Sound and Silence in Contemporary Cinema and Television', in *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*, ed. by Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), pp. 51–67 (p. 66).

³⁸⁵ See, for example, Altman et al, 'Inventing the Cinema Soundtrack'; Anahid Kassabian, 'Inattentive Engagements: The New Problematics of Sound and Music', *Cinema Journal*, 48.1 (2008), 118–23; and Mark Kerins, 'A Statement on Sound Studies: (with apologies to Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, and Grigori Alexandrov)', *Music, Sound, and the Moving Image*, 2.2 (2008), 115–19.

rightly points out must still be considered as a form of silence).³⁸⁶ Furthermore, he draws attention to the importance of listening to the absence of individual components of the soundtrack, rather than merely focusing on their presence. Certainly, it is important to incorporate silence – in all its guises – within an integrated approach to the study of the soundtrack. Ultimately, it is questionable whether Théberge’s approach offers a way of analysing the soundtrack in its entirety rather than continuing to focus on the individual elements – dialogue, music, effects – albeit with the important addition of a fourth, namely silence. An integrated analytical approach need not be constrained by the categories imposed on the soundtrack in the production process. As Johnson points out, ‘even though speech, music and sound effects may be produced separately, they clearly have no functional autonomy.’³⁸⁷ Speech can function like music or effects, just as music can convey information. The following analysis of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* therefore resists allocating sounds to a particular track and instead identifies the core sonic groupings which make up the film. Of these groupings, the voice is found to be particularly significant, and so is taken as a point of access through which to identify the ways in which sounds are layered in the film to evoke an acoustemology. Here, it must be noted that the voice is not to be confused with the dialogue track. As the analysis demonstrates, the use of the voice in the film extends across each of the three sound tracks – as dialogue, as effects, and as music. In approaching the voice in this way, we are able to appreciate the multiplicity of its functions; indeed, as will become apparent, in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* the verbal capabilities of the voice are not necessarily paramount. Ultimately,

³⁸⁶ Théberge, ‘Almost Silent’, p. 51

³⁸⁷ Johnson, ‘The Liberation of the Echo’, p. 4.

by analysing the sonic groupings that make up the soundtrack and the ways in which they interrelate, we can understand how they work to represent the filmic world's acoustemology.

The Sounds of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*

The individual sounds that are heard in the film can be allocated to one of eight sonic groupings. These are, in the order that they are introduced into the soundtrack: silence; material objects; the natural environment; the human voice; (regionally specific) musical instruments; bells; animal sounds; and the instrumental score composed by Skoryk. Each of these groupings contributes to the construction of an acoustemology by establishing the kinds of sounds that are heard (and, indeed, not heard) in the filmic world. The nature of this world is evoked through the sounds of water, wind, fire and snow, which create a sense of the local environment. This is enhanced through the sounds of material objects – most notably the axe as it strikes against wood.³⁸⁸ This is, in fact, the first sound heard in the film after the initial opening silence, this giving rise to an appreciation of the importance of this material here and, potentially, an association with the mountain forests. The centrality of the church to this community is made audible through the pealing of the church bells on numerous occasions. Other bells draw attention to the importance of animals in this environment. The sheep are heard through the bells round their necks and through the noises they make. Cows, horses, dogs, and birds are heard throughout the film, and

³⁸⁸ Of course, these recorded sounds may or may not have been made with an axe. The sounds referred to in this analysis are to be understood as 'rendered' sounds. This term is used by Chion to express how 'the film spectator recognizes sounds to be truthful, effective, and fitting not so much if they *reproduce* what would be heard in the same situation in reality, but if they *render* (convey, express) the sensations – not necessarily auditory – associated with the situation'. Chion, *Film, A Sound Art*, p. 488.

the occasions on, and frequency with which they are heard contribute to our sonic understanding of the filmic world, along with the absence of other types of animal. The instrumental score has a number of functions, particularly with regard to the evocation of mood, for example by heightening the dramatic tension. However, it can also be seen to add to the acoustemology through the sounds and rhythms of the music itself, which are inspired by the regional styles. Paradzhanov had been careful to select a composer from the region, feeling that composers in Kyiv would not be able to write about the Carpathians. He travelled to L'viv, where he listened to the music of a number of local composers, eventually deciding upon Skoryk, who had graduated from the L'viv conservatory in 1960.³⁸⁹ Skoryk initially refused Paradzhanov's request to collaborate on the film. However, he was eventually won over and even joined the crew on location.³⁹⁰ The music that he would write for the film was later incorporated into his 1965 work 'Hutsul's'kyi tryptykh' (Hutsul Triptych).

As Skoryk acknowledges, the instrumental score is only a small part of the music of the film:

Spivpratsia nad "Tiniamy" bula vel'ma tsikava. Zvychaino, u tomy fil'mi ie moia muzyka, ale bil'shist' muzyky my zbyraly.³⁹¹

Indeed, in addition to Skoryk's score, the soundtrack is filled with music. A host of regional instruments are heard, ranging from the *trembita* to the *lira* (similar to the

³⁸⁹ Tetiana Kozyrieva, 'Pochuty pochuttia. Kompozytor Myroslav Skoryk. "Paradzhanov prosyv stvoryty dlia "Tinei..." til'ky henial'nu muzyky"', *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, 34 (13 September 2008), <http://dt.ua/CULTURE/pochuti_pochuttia__kompozitor_miroslav_skorik_paradzhanov_prosiv_stvoriti_dlya_tiney_tilki_genialnu_-54788.html> [accessed 25 November 2011].

³⁹⁰ Ibid..

³⁹¹ 'The collaboration on *Tini* was really interesting. Of course, my music features in that film, but the majority of it is music that we gathered.' Ibid..

hurdy-gurdy), the *volynka* (a bagpipe-like instrument), the *drymba* (mouth harp), the *sopilka* and *dentsivka* (wooden pipes), and the *tsymbaly* (a kind of hammered dulcimer). The overwhelming presence of music in the film suggests a deep musicality to this region, where even the twinkle of a star is rendered by the sound of a xylophone. Significantly, the musicians are the local cast, who were called upon to travel to Kyiv for the sound recording – no easy feat in the case of the *trembita* players:

Hutsuliv navit' vozyly do Kyieva, zapysuvaly ikh u pavil'ioni. Takykh zvukozapysiv doty ne bulo. I navit' teper ne mozna znaity... A shche pam'iataiu, iak nam treba bulo zapysaty trembity... Na vidkrytomu povitri tse vazhko bulo zrobyty, i Paradzhanov desiatero trembitiariv razom iz trembitamy zaledve zapkhav u litak i pryviz do Kyieva... Prychomy instrumenty vezly u pasazhyrs'komu saloni.³⁹²

This quotation from Skoryk reveals two interesting points: the attempt (and failure) to record the sound (possibly synchronously with the image) on location; and a belief that, irrespective of the time and place of the recording, the nature of the sound was so intrinsically bound up with the region that it simply had to be part of the film. The importance of maintaining this link between sound and place – a link which does not depend upon where the sound is recorded but rather upon the particular qualities of the sound itself – is nowhere more apparent than with regard to the recording of the Hutsuls' voices. As we have noted in Chapter One, although it was customary for republican films to be dubbed into Russian for release onto the Soviet screen, the

³⁹² 'They even brought the Hutsuls to Kyiv and recorded them in the studio. There had never been these kinds of sound recordings until then. And even now you can't find the like... I still remember how we had to record the *trembity*... It was difficult to do this in the open air, and Paradzhanov crammed ten *trembita* players into a plane together with their *trembity* and brought them to Kyiv... The instruments were carried in the passenger cabin.' Ibid..

filmmakers fought to preserve the original soundtrack of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*.

Recalling the incident at a later date, Paradzhanov said:

Ale koly mene vyklykaly v Glavk, skazaly: “Serhiu Iosypovychu, treba zrobyty moskovs'kyi vaiant, rosiis'kyi variant.” Ia kazhu: “Iak zhe tse mozhe buty?? Maty Ivana oplakuie svoho cholovika:

(Spivaie) Petryku mii dorohyi, na koho ty mene lyshyv?

Tse toi variant.

(Spivaie) Petia-petushok, na kogo ti menia ostavil?

Tse rosiis'kyi variant. Iak mozhe buty? Mozhete zrobyty subtytry, mozhete postavyty dyktora, ale iak peredaty aromat tsykh holosin' zhinochykh. A trembitu iak mozhna zrobyty na moskal's'kyii lad, na moskovs'ky movu?³⁹³

Interestingly, Paradzhanov describes the sound of the lamentations through reference to aroma or flavour (*aromat*), suggesting an appreciation of the potential for film sound to stimulate the other senses. Furthermore, the significance of the voice appears to rest upon its musical qualities – he *sings* the lamentations, and then makes an association with a musical instrument (the *trembita*). Indeed, the interview begins with Paradzhanov singing a song from the film (‘Verbovaia doshchechka’ (The Willow Bridge)), which he repeats later on in the discussion, along with a *koliadka* (Christmas carol) which also features in the film (‘Vo Vifliemi nyni novyna’ (Today there is news in Bethlehem)).

Given the importance ascribed by the filmmakers to the original soundtrack and their resistance to the film’s dubbing, the following analysis will focus on the

³⁹³ ‘But when they called me to Glavk [the Main Administration], they said: “Serhii Iosypovych, you have to make a Moscow version, a Russian version.” And I said: “How exactly can that be done?? Ivan’s mother mourns her husband: (He sings [in Ukrainian]) Petryk, my darling, to whom have you left me? That is that version. (He sings [in Russian]) Petia-dear, to whom have you left me? That is the Russian version. How can it be? You can do subtitles, you can add a voice-over, but how can you convey the aroma of the women’s *holosinnia*. And how can you do a *trembita* in a Muscovite way, in the Russian language?’ Cited in Oleksyk-Bleiker, ‘Serhii Paradzhanov’.

role of the voice.³⁹⁴ This sonic grouping is not to be confused with the dialogue track. As implied earlier, one of the most significant aspects of the use of the voice is the concentration on its musical quality rather than the words that are spoken. Whilst it is tempting to conclude that the importance of retaining the original soundtrack reveals a desire to promote the Ukrainian language in the face of Russification, the quotes from Paradzhanov suggest a slightly different note – or, at least, an additional one. The voice is somehow imbued with a regional flavour that permeates the film, lending it in particular a musical quality. It is this, I would argue, that the film seeks to convey. The film was made at a time when there was great enthusiasm for the supposed authenticity offered by synchronous sound recording; moreover, as noted above, the filmmakers at least attempted to record sound on location. Yet the connection between sound (in particular, voice) and space extends beyond the place of its recording. Here, the voice does not rely on synchronous recording to avow its authenticity through the perfect coordination of speaking mouth to spoken word. After all, as Chion notes, one can never be certain that the character on-screen is speaking the words that are heard.³⁹⁵ Moreover, Soviet audiences were accustomed to a mismatch between speaker and spoken, through the proliferation of dubbed films. Instead, the voice is used much like the *trembity* which were brought to Kyiv for recording – as an instrument in an orchestra of sounds which render the experience of

³⁹⁴ In focusing on the voice, we identify within the film (and replicate in our analysis) the ‘vococentrism’ noted by Chion: ‘the privilege accorded to the voice over all other sonic elements, in the same way that the human face is not just an image like the others. Speech, shouts, sighs or whispers, the voice hierarchizes everything around it. [...] Call this *vococentrism* if you will. Human listening is naturally vococentrist, and so is the talking cinema by and large.’ Michel Chion, *The Voice in Cinema*, ed. and trans. by Claudia Gorbman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), p. 6.

³⁹⁵ Chion asks ‘is there not a suspicion of dubbing behind every sound and speaking image in the cinema?’ Chion, *Film, A Sound Art*, p. 178.

being in that location. With this in mind, let us now turn to examine the role of the voice in the film's soundtrack.

Voice

Two things are immediately apparent with regard to the use of the human voice in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*: the multiplicity of its manifestations and, within that, the relatively minor role allocated to verbal intercourse, or dialogue. In the opening sequence, we hear eight different voices (at least) before there is what sociologists would term an 'adjacent pair', which is to say two utterances that are adjacent, produced by different speakers, and logically follow on from one another.³⁹⁶ Ivan and Oleksa's voices are both heard shouting, independently of one another, in the forest; we then hear their mother praying at Oleksa's grave. This is followed by the singing of an unseen *lirnyk*. Next we hear a woman chanting 'koniki, koniki, koniki' (horses, horses, horses), referring to items she is selling. The madman then approaches Ivan and says:

Be-e-e! Chuesh, khlopchiku? Be-e-e! Nema ovechky! Nema ovechky! Be-e-e!³⁹⁷

Ivan's mother's voice is heard once again as she calls:

Ivanku! Ivanku, khody siudy, khody siudy dytynko! Khody! Ne treba divit'sia, to skazhenyi. Ne treba divit'sia...idy.³⁹⁸

Then, as Ivan moves into the church, we hear two male voices united in song before finally, the following simple exchange takes place:

³⁹⁶ Jack Sidnell, *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 64.

³⁹⁷ 'Baa-a-a! Do you hear, boy? Baa-a-a! There are no lambs! No lambs! Baa-a-a!'

³⁹⁸ 'Ivanko! Ivanko, come here, come here child! Come here! Don't look, he's mad. Don't look....come here.'

(Ivan's mother): *Slava Isu!*

(Woman): *Slava Isu!*

(Priest): *Naviky Bohu!*³⁹⁹

In some four and a half minutes, we have heard voices shouting, singing, chanting and praying, with only the briefest actual exchange of words. Yet it is clear from the beginning that, in this world, the aural dominates the visual: Ivan is asked whether he hears, and is then told by his mother not to look. Perhaps the audience is similarly instructed: in this film, you will have to listen. The importance of hearing is stressed throughout the film by the repeated use of the verb *chuty* (to hear, to feel). The first words of the film are 'Olekso! Olekso! Chuiesh?' (Oleksa! Oleksa! Do you hear?) Ivan and Marichka frequently ask one another whether they can hear, as if they are united by a shared sonic sensitivity. As children, Marichka asks Ivan, 'Iva, chuiesh?' (Ivo, do you hear?), to which he replies, 'A chomu b ne chuty? A chuiu' (Why wouldn't I hear? Of course I hear it). They are referring to the sound of the invisible axe – an acousmatic sound *par excellence*, which serves to highlight the aural over the visual.⁴⁰⁰ The audience, too, can hear this sound, suggesting that they are invited into Ivan and Marichka's sonic world.⁴⁰¹

The importance of the aural world is further accentuated by the voice of the unseen *lirnyk*, a musician who, historically, would have been blind.⁴⁰² Up until the early twentieth century, individuals who had lost their sight, either at birth or following an illness or accident, might take up an apprenticeship to train as a *lirnyk* or

³⁹⁹ 'Glory to Jesus! | Glory to Jesus! | Glory to God forever!'

⁴⁰⁰ Chion alludes to the invisible axe in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* to define the 'acousmaton' – a sound that is imaginary or whose cause is not seen – in his glossary of terms (Chion, *Film, A Sound Art*, pp. 465–66).

⁴⁰¹ This is an example of co-audition, Chion's term to describe listening shared between two characters or a character and the audience. *Ibid.*, p. 472.

⁴⁰² Kononenko, *Ukrainian Minstrels*, pp. 9–10.

a *kobzar*. The repertoires of *lirnyky* and *kobzari* included *dumy* (epic songs), *psalmy* (religious songs), historical and satirical songs.⁴⁰³ Some minstrels would merely pass on these songs; others would adapt and renew the repertoire.⁴⁰⁴ In 1939, Ukraine's remaining *kobzari* and *lirnyky* were gathered together under Stalin's orders for a conference in Kharkiv, whereupon they were shot.⁴⁰⁵ The inclusion in the film of a recording of a *lirnyk*, which was made at the time of the filmmaking, is perhaps suggestive of an attempt to deny the eradication of these musicians in 1939.⁴⁰⁶ Although we cannot see him, we can still hear him – just as, we might imagine, he would not have been able to see us.⁴⁰⁷ Indeed, it is interesting to note that the *lirnyk* is heard on several occasions involving death: outside the church, following Oleksa's death, and again when Ivan's father is killed, and shortly before Ivan's death when he

⁴⁰³ Kononenko suggests that *kobzari* were once minstrels of the military, whereas *lirnyky* were probably always blind minstrels associated with the church. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, there was little to distinguish their repertoires and they were considered as one category of minstrel. See *ibid.*, pp. 154–5 & 9.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 120–22.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁰⁶ A blind musician was involved in the filmmaking. Interview with Vasyl' Khimchak (23 August 2010, Verkhovyna). The son of Iakutovych has recalled how the *lirnyk* was found: 'Nikoly ne zabudu, iak pid chas ziomok "Tinei" znaishly dyvnoho lirnyka. Tse buv litnii cholovik iz velycheznoiu chornoiu borodoiu i dovhym volossiam, skhozhyi na etiud V. Surykova "Utro streletskoi kazny". Takyi personazh dlia Karpat netypovyi. Odiahnenyi v neimovirno brudnu shynel' na hole tilo, na bosykh nohakh – poderti cherevyky. Siv vin ha ganochku bilia khaty [Sorukiv], de meshkav S. Paradzhanov. Zvukorezhyser uvimknuv mahnitofon, i todi lirnyk chy to prostohnav, chy proplakav tu pisniu, shcho zvuchyt' pered finalom fil'mu, koly Ivan ide z rozrubanoiu holovoioiu cherez zharyshche, vostannie... Svitylo skupe karpats'ke sonechko. Vsi stoialy pryholomsheni pochutym' (I shall never forget how they found the strange *lirnyk* during the filming of *Tini*. He was an elderly man with an enormous black beard and long hair, he looked like V. Surikov's study 'Utro streletskoi kazny' (Morning of the *Strel'tsy's* Execution). Such people are unusual for the Carpathians. He was dressed in an unbelievably dirty overcoat over his naked body, and on his bare feet he had torn boots. He sat on the porch by the [Soruks'] *khata*, where Paradzhanov was staying. The sound operator switched on the tape recorder and then the *lirnyk* either moaned or wept out that song which is heard before the end of the film when Ivan is walking with a gashed head through the burned field, at the end... The miserly Carpathian sun was shining. Everyone stood, stunned by what they had heard). See Iakutovych, 'Koly zhadiuesh Velykoho Maistra'.

⁴⁰⁷ In this way, the audio-viewer is perhaps placed in the position of *lirnyk* herself.

is wandering, injured, through the fields. Just as the film is capable of resurrecting the *lirnyk*, its performance ensures that the ancestors of whom it speaks are not forgotten either. As we hear the voice of the *lirnyk* who has *not* been silenced after all, perhaps the implication is that the film can re-forged our links with the past.⁴⁰⁸

The *lirnyk*'s song introduces another characteristic function of the human voice in the film: its use to imitate animal sounds. This can be seen in the first two lines of the song:

Oi, kuvala my zozul'ka,
Ta i bude kuvaty.⁴⁰⁹

Shortly after this is first heard, the madman approaches Ivan and makes the sound of a sheep. Later, when Ivan and Marichka are playing in the stream as children, they sing the following song:

(Ivan): Kum-kuma, kum-kuma, shcho varyla, shcho varyla?!
(Marichka): Buriak-borshch, buriak-borshch, buriak-borshch!
(Ivan): Buriaky-ky-ky-ky-ky! Buriaky-ky-ky-ky!⁴¹⁰

The children are clearly enjoying the sounds of words over and above their meaning, and in the Ukrainian language, 'kum-kum' is the sound a frog makes ('croak-croak', perhaps, or 'ribbit-ribbit').⁴¹¹ As an adult, Ivan is again heard making a range of animal noises during the eighth chapter ('Rizdvo'). For some forty-five seconds, we

⁴⁰⁸ An interest in wandering minstrels is another commonality between Dovzhenko and the filmmakers of the poetic school. For further details on Dovzhenko's use of *kobzari* and *dumy*, see Raymond Uzwyshyn, 'Between Ukrainian Cinema and Modernism: Alexander Dovzhenko's Silent Trilogy' (doctoral dissertation, New York University, 2000), <<http://rayuzwyshyn.net/dovzhenko/Introduction.htm>> [accessed 2 December 2011].

⁴⁰⁹ 'Oh, the cuckoo cuckooed, | And it will always cuckoo.'

⁴¹⁰ 'Godmother, godmother, what have you cooked? | Beetroot-borshch, beetroot-borshch, beetroot-borshch! | Beetroot-root-root-root! Beetroot-root-root-root!'

⁴¹¹ This is made more explicit in the novella, as Kotsiubyns'kyi describes how the frogs were croaking (kumkaly) in the stream before explaining that Ivan bent down and addressed his question to a frog. See Kotsiubyns'kyi, 'Tini zabutykh predkiv', p. 162.

hear Ivan walk round the inner yard of the *khata-grazhda*, where the animals are kept, feeding them one by one. At each stop he makes the noise of the particular animal he feeds (cows, sheep, a horse), to which they each respond. In this slow-paced stretch of non-verbal sounds we have time to appreciate the close proximity in which the Hutsul community live with their animals.⁴¹² Here, animals are your livelihood and you must be attuned to their needs.⁴¹³ Once Ivan has finished his feeding round, he pauses at the door and kneels down to make a prayer. This is one of the most striking sections of speech in the film, as we are given the opportunity to hear the beauty of Ivan's voice.⁴¹⁴ He almost seems to relish the sound himself, luxuriating in the individual words (note the rolled 'r' in particular) and the musicality of their phrasing. The whole sequence exhibits the versatility and beauty of the human voice, and the Ukrainian voice in particular. It is all the more ironic, then, when the poetry of Ivan's prayer is interrupted by the prosaic call of Palahna, in her deep, earthy tones: 'Ivane, vecheria hotova!' (Ivan, your dinner's ready!).

The importance of non-verbal (vocal) communication is of course highlighted in the film through the presence of the mute character Myko. This is something which was added to Kotsiubyns'kyi's text by the filmmakers – in the novella Myko speaks, and indeed it is he who verbalizes the stories told to Ivan on the pasture. Perhaps the decision to add this particular dimension to the character simply reflected a desire to play to the strengths of the actor, Leonid Engibarov, who had graduated from the

⁴¹² The animals are enclosed within the *khata-grazhda* for protection.

⁴¹³ Ivan Mykhailovych Zelenchuk was keen to impress upon me the significance of the image of the young calf under the table in the following scene during which Ivan and Palahna share their Christmas meal. Animals, he explained, are the most important thing for a Hutsul. Interview with Zelenchuk (Verkhovyna, 20 August 2010).

⁴¹⁴ This was, in fact, the scene which Mykolaichuk was given to audition for the role. His performance won him the part. Luhovs'kyi, *Nevidomyi maestro*, p. 47.

department of clownship at Moscow's School of Circus Arts in 1959.⁴¹⁵ By the time *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was being filmed, Engibarov had already begun to make a name for himself with his particular style of clownery, which took Soviet audiences by surprise, accustomed as they were to the usual repertoire of jokes and tricks.⁴¹⁶ As Peacock explains, Engibarov's 'particular talent lay in the combination of mime skills and acting to demonstrate a kind of "poetic sadness"'.⁴¹⁷ Certainly, these skills are put to use in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. This was not, in fact, Engibarov's first foray into film; the year before, he had starred in the film *Put' na arenu* (Journey to the Ring, 1963, directed by Levon Isaakian and Genrikh Malian) in which he had demonstrated that he could handle both the straight acting scenes, as well as those in which his circus training was exploited. Nonetheless, in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Engibarov is not given any words to speak. This is not to say, however, that he does not use his voice.

We are first introduced to Myko in the opening sequence of the fourth chapter (Polonyna), during which time we hear him both cough and issue a croaky call – as if in imitation of the other voice which has been heard in this sequence: a mountain call

⁴¹⁵ Indeed, both a 1962 version of the screenplay, written by Ivan Chendei with Paradzhanov's input (pri uchasti Paradzhanova), and the May 1963 version, by Chendei and Paradzhanov (s Paradzhanovym), include dialogue for the character Myko. RGALI, f. 2944, op. 6, d. 577 and d. 578. Engibarov was not in fact the filmmakers' first choice for the role of Myko; two other actors had previously been contracted to take on the part. Shortly before the crew departed for their second trip to the Carpathians in the summer of 1964, the Soviet State Circus Union (SoiuzGosTsirk) granted permission for Engibarov to join them for a short time whilst he was working for the Kyiv circus. He would be required to open the circus season in Volgograd at the beginning of June, but could join them for filming in the middle of July for approximately one week. See TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1724, ll. 33–36 & 87.

⁴¹⁶ Vladimir Vysotskii's poem *Engibarovu ot zritelei* (1972), written after Engibarov's untimely death, refers to this reaction of the audience. (For example, in the third stanza: Zrytel' nash shutami izbalovan – / Zhazhdet smekha on, triakhnuv moshnoi, / I krichit: "Da razve eto kloun! / Esli kloun – dolzhen byt' smeshnoi!")

⁴¹⁷ Louise Peacock, *Serious Play: Modern Clown Performance* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2009), p. 77. She uses the phrase 'poetic sadness' with reference to a description of Engibarov's style by the clown Slava Polunin on his website <www.slavasnowshow.com>.

performed by an unseen male. The mountain call is an example of a sound which does not fit neatly into any of the three tracks (music, dialogue, effects), or rather seems to straddle across them all. It is a single melodic line, and so has musical qualities, and yet it is conveying information, albeit non-verbally, and thus might be part of the dialogue – after all, Myko seems to respond to it. It is also an effect which creates a sense of space, a sense of the surrounding environment, through the sonorous reverberations suggestive of the height and undulations of the mountainscape. The rise and fall of the melody mirrors the shape of the landscape, which in turn shapes the sound through the pattern of sonic reflections. Sound and image work together to evoke a multi-sensorial perception of the landscape; the mountain call becomes a form of ‘echolocation’ – the system by which bats and other sonar-locating animals sense their surrounding environment. Just as Marks has identified a cinematic touching with our eyes, we might here be seeing with our ears.⁴¹⁸ Furthermore, sound encourages an embodied response: our bodies reverberate to the sounds that we hear, perhaps encouraging the audience to participate in the scene.

This introduction to the pasture seems to tell us that sounds are important in this location. They reflect and are reflected by the surrounding environment, and the information which they contain is not necessarily conveyed verbally. Myko in fact functions as a conduit through which pivotal pieces of information are conveyed to Ivan. When he becomes aware that something terrible has happened in the village, Ivan turns to Myko: ‘Myko, khoch ty skazhy pravdu?’⁴¹⁹ This positions Myko as the

⁴¹⁸ Marks, *The Skin of the Film*.

⁴¹⁹ ‘Myko, you at least will speak the truth?’

voice of truth, and the verb *skazaty* (to speak, to say) makes clear that here one does not need to use words in order to speak. Indeed, as Myko raises one finger and makes a plaintive cry, we understand that Ivan will find sorrow at the bottom of the mountain. Tellingly, at the end of the film, it is Myko who prompts Ivan to confront Palahna's adultery. Trying to separate Iura and Palahna in the tavern, Myko grunts and then spits at Iura, for which he receives a thump. Only after this is Ivan stirred to seek revenge, initiating a fight which results in a vicious blow to his head. Although Myko says no words, therefore, his voice is heard in the film, and to communicative effect. It is only in his final appearance – measuring Ivan's dead body for a coffin – that Myko's voice is absent, a silence that speaks of his sorrow and contrasts with the cacophony of voices that are heard during this sequence (the *holosinnia* and the shrieks from the funeral games (*zabavy*, such as *hrushka* or *lopatka*, were commonly played during these vigils in order to help the mourners forget their grief and to keep them from falling asleep)).⁴²⁰

⁴²⁰ Kotsiubyns'kyi attended a Hutsul funeral which made a deep impression on him: 'V sele popal na original'nyi obriad. Noch'iu umerla gde-to starukha – i vot s dalekikh izb (zdes' izba ot izby na neskol'ko verst) soshlis' liudi. Na skameike, pod stenoi, lezhit pokoinitsa, goriat pred nei svechi, a v izbe postavleny lavki, kak v teatre, i na nikh sidit massa liudei. Tut zhe, u pokoinitsy, v seniakh sobralas' veselit'sia molodezh'. I kakikh tol'ko igr ne bylo! Smekh razdavalsia bespreryvno, shutki, potselui, krik, a pokoinitsa skorbno somknula usta, i tepliatsia pokhoronnym bleskom svechi. I tak vsiu noch' (I found myself at an original custom in the village. In the evening an old woman had died somewhere – and so people were coming together from faraway *khaty* (here there are several *versts* between each *khata*). On a bench by the wall lay the deceased, candles were burning by her, and benches had been placed in the *khata* like in a theatre and a mass of people were sitting on them. Right here, near the deceased in the entrance hall, young people had gathered to make merry. And what games there were! Laughter was ringing out incessantly, jokes, kisses, shouts, the deceased's lips were sorrowfully closed, and the candles were glimmering with a funereal brilliance. And so it was the whole night). Letter to Oleksandr Aplaskino dated 1 September 1911, in Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v semy tomakh*, VII, 128-29 (p. 128). Shukhevych noted the following: "During such a vigil in Kosmacz I dared to ask one of the Hutsuls: 'Why are you enacting such a comedy at the side of the corpse?' The answer was: 'This is not a comedy! We are doing it in order to cheer up the members of the family and so that nobody shall fall asleep

The performance of *holosinnia* forms part of the funeral customs and rituals throughout Ukraine, although there are regional variations; in the Carpathians, it was not unknown for additional wailers to be hired to ensure sufficient levels of *holosinnia*.⁴²¹ These lamentations, generally performed by women, are obligatory at certain points during the funeral, including when the corpse is placed inside the coffin, during the procession to the burial, and after the coffin has been lowered into the ground.⁴²² Accordingly, in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, *holosinnia* are heard as the coffin is being prepared for Ivan's father and during the funeral procession shortly afterwards. In addition, we hear *holosinnia* as Ivan searches for Marichka's body and, as noted above, during the wake at Ivan and Palahna's home. *Holosinnia* are semi-improvised and, depending on the identity of the deceased, takes certain forms. As Koenig reports:

The lamentations are sometimes sung to appealing melodies. Their words, though usually improvised, contain certain stereotyped phrases which naturally vary with the age and sex of the deceased as well as with his relationship to the mourner. A parent, for example, laments a child as follows: "Oh you silver, golden angel of mine, why have you left us? Why have you chosen for yourself a wedding like this?" A father or mother is mourned thus: "Oh you, my only support! Oh, you my everything, why are you leaving me? Why do you refuse to give me your advice any longer?"⁴²³

This is very similar to the *holosinnia* heard during the film, for example after Ivan's father's death, during which two women's voices can be heard saying the following:

beside the body, because this is not allowed...". Cited in Samuel Koenig, 'Mortuary Beliefs and Practices Among the Galician Ukrainians', *Folklore*, 57.2 (1946), 83–92 (p. 87).

⁴²¹ Natalia Havryl'iuk, 'The Structure and Function of Funeral Rituals and Customs in Ukraine', *Folklorica: Journal of the Slavic and East European Folklore Association*, 8.2 (2003), 7–23 (p. 13); Koenig, 'Mortuary Beliefs', p. 90.

⁴²² *Ibid.*

⁴²³ *Ibid.*

Oi, bratchyku mii dorohyi, na koho ty nas lyshyv? Na koho ty svoho Ivanka lyshyv...⁴²⁴

Here, the women's voices overlap one another and form a musical accompaniment to the image, building to a crescendo that culminates in Ivan's mother's raw cry on the mountainside during the funeral procession. Her cry is embellished by the call of the *trembity*, and the two sounds reinforce one another: the voice helps explain the use of the *trembita* to communicate news of a death across the mountains; and the *trembity* suggest the musicality of the voice and of the *holosinnia*. Through the layering of these two sounds, the audience understands their significance – in short, the audience is taught how to hear in this environment.

The musicality of the voice is, of course, expressed most obviously in the film through song. In addition to the singing of the *lirnyk* already discussed, a number of other songs are heard in the film. These range from church music ('Presviataia Bohorodytse spasy nas' (Most Holy Theotokos, save us!), for example, is sung during the Easter service), to *koliadky* (Christmas carols) and folk songs. These songs – in particular, the *koliadky* – are known throughout Ukraine. Nonetheless, the region makes itself heard through the accents of the local residents whose voices were recorded. Furthermore, the style of singing itself is also indicative of a particular locale. In the previous chapter we noted that embroidery is an important craft within Ukraine, with local variations discernible to the knowing eye. Similarly, folk singing in Ukraine might be regarded as a sound that can be geographically pinpointed, at least by the knowing ear. The traditional form of folk singing in Ukraine is known as *bahatoholossia*, which translates as 'polyphony'. In English, the term polyphony is

⁴²⁴ 'Oh, my dear brother, to whom have you left us? To whom have you left your Ivan...'

customarily used to describe singing in which there are two or more independent melodic voices (rather than one voice or one melodic voice with an accompanying harmony), both of which move with rhythmic independence. However, this understanding of ‘polyphony’ only relates to one of the four types of *bahatoholossia* identified by the Ukrainian musicologist, folklorist and composer, Leopold Iashchenko.⁴²⁵ The other three types of *bahatoholossia* are: heterophony or simple *octavne dvoholossia* (two voices singing at octaves), which is the simplest form of *bahatoholossia*, commonly found in ritual and calendrical songs (the oldest and most conservative songs); songs of a homophonic-harmonic composition, in which the upper voice sings the melody and the other voices provide harmonies, with no melodic independence; and songs of an intermediate or mixed composition.⁴²⁶ According to Iashchenko, the most widespread type of *bahatoholossia* in Ukraine is the polyphonic form, in which the main lower voice is supported by an upper voice (*pidholosok*). Within this form, however, there are numerous regional variations. In the 1950s researchers from the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Socialist Republic undertook expeditions to record folk singing in Ukraine; on a number of occasions, having gathered people together to record a particular song, arguments would break out over the ‘correct’ way in which to sing it.⁴²⁷

Whilst the polyphonic *bahatoholossia* is sung all over Ukraine, Iashchenko finds that its prevalence is much lower in the western *oblasti* (including Ivano-

⁴²⁵ Leopold Iashchenko, *Ukrains'ke narodne bahatoholossia* (Kyiv: Akademii nauk Ukrain's'koi RSR, 1962).

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 49 & 149.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 137–38.

Frankivs'ka, where *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was filmed).⁴²⁸ Nonetheless, an expedition in 1953 recorded a number of interesting examples in the Kosivs'kyi raion of Stanislavs'ka oblast' (now Ivano-Frankivs'ka), sung by male choirs. The female villagers, however, fell behind their male counterparts in terms of the wealth of their singing repertoire. This contrasted with the other regions of Ukraine, in which the vast majority of choirs were female. Iashchenko explains this difference with regard to the traditional customs in the Kosivs'kyi raion: the men tended to gather outside in the evenings, walking and singing, whereas it was customary for the women to stay at home.⁴²⁹ Furthermore, Iashchenko distinguishes between the mountain and valley villages of Kosivs'kyi raion: *bahatoholossia* songs are rarely found in mountain villages and those which are sung tend to have been carried there from the valleys.⁴³⁰ Again, this reflects the way of life – in the mountains there is little opportunity for the development of a choir: there is a distance of around one hundred metres between each *khata*; they work primarily on their own plot of land; and young people tend to meet only at the weekends.⁴³¹

In this way, Iashchenko identifies a particular way of using the voice with a specific region and, additionally, provides a rationale to explain its provenance. Against this background, we might now turn to examine the folk singing in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Two folk songs are heard in the film, both of which occur during a wedding ceremony. Consistent with Iashchenko's findings, neither of these songs is

⁴²⁸ Ibid., pp. 62 & 133–34.

⁴²⁹ Ibid., p. 66.

⁴³⁰ Ibid..

⁴³¹ Ibid., pp. 66–67.

performed in polyphonic *bahatoholossia*. The first song is ‘Oi z zahir’ia misiachen’ko’ (Oh, the moon is coming from the village):

Oi, z zahir’ia misiachen’ko, z zahir’ia,
Oi, chas tobi, moloden’ka, z zastillia.
Oi, sidlaly syvi koni, sidlaly
Iak do shliubu divchynon’ku zbyraly.
Oi, klonysy moloden’ka, nyzen’ko,
Bo vzhe tvoia hirka dolia blyzen’ko.
Oi, zatsvila iablunochka, bilen’ko,
Zaplakala moloden’ka hiren’ko.⁴³²

This appears to be an adaptation of a traditional Carpathian wedding song. The first two lines of the song are featured in the description of a wedding that was held in the village of Orelets’ in Stanislavshchyna (today, Ivano-Frankivs’ka *oblast’*), recorded by V. Ravliuk in 1890.⁴³³ At the time of Kotsiubyns’kyi’s novella, therefore, a version of this song was sung in the region at weddings. It continues to be heard today: a longer version, which includes all of the lines almost exactly as they are heard in the film, was published in a 2008 account of contemporary wedding customs in Verkhovyna.⁴³⁴ The song is performed in the film by a group of male and female singers, accompanied by a violin. They sing in unison, with the male voices pitched one octave lower than their female counterparts. This could therefore be an example of Iashchenko’s ‘octavne dvoholossia’, the simplest form of *bahatoholossia*. The

⁴³² ‘Oh, the moon is coming from the village, from the village, | Oh, bride, it is time for you to get up from the table. | Oh, the grey horses have been saddled, saddled, | To take you, young girl, to the wedding. | Oh, bride, won’t you bow low, | Because your miserable fate is already near. | Oh, the apple tree has blossomed, so white, | The bride began to cry bitterly.’

⁴³³ *Vesillia: U dvokh knyhakh*, ed. by M. M. Shubravs’koi, 2 vols (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970), II, 183–214 (pp. 196 & 203). The first two lines of the song are also included in a collection of songs from Podillia (which corresponds today to an area in the Khmel’nyts’ka and Vinnyts’ka *oblasti*), published in 1976, albeit with a slightly different melody than that which is heard in the film. *Pisni Podillia: Zapysy Nasti Prysiazhniuk v seli Pohrebyshche, 1920–1970 gg*, ed. by S. C. Myshanych (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1976), p. 168.

⁴³⁴ Iaroslav Zelenchuk, ‘Hutsul’s’ke vesillia na Verkhovynshchyni’, *Ukrainoznavstvo*, 2008.2, 268–70 (p. 269).

voices joined in unison reflect the occasion which has brought them together: the community is gathered to celebrate a matrimonial union. The lack of a more sophisticated form of polyphonic *bahatoholossia* is perhaps indicative of a community which does not necessarily gather together on a daily basis.

The second folk song which is heard in the film comes shortly afterwards, during the wedding between Ivan and Palahna. This song – ‘Verbovaia doshcheka’ (The Willow Board) – also seems to be associated with the region, and is listed in a collection of folk songs from western Ukraine.⁴³⁵ Moreover, particular towns or villages from the region are referenced in the song itself, although it seems that these were customarily changed to suit the situation: a version recorded in 1864 mentions Krakow and L’viv; more recent versions of the song commonly refer to Kosiv and L’viv.⁴³⁶ In the film, the villages listed are Kosiv and Kryvorivnia:

Verbovaia doshchechka, doshchechka,
Bihla po nii Nastochka, Nastochka.
Na vse pole leliie, leliie,
Zvidky mylyi pryide, pryide.
Shchos’ Nastochtsi pryveze, pryveze.
Chervonii choboty, choboty,
Kosivs’koi roboty roboty.
A v Kosovi roblene, roblene,
V Kryvorivni nosheni nosheni.⁴³⁷

⁴³⁵ *Ukrains'ki narodni pisni v zapysakh Zoriana Dolenhy-Khodakovs'koho: Z Halychyny, Volyni, Podillia, Prydniprianshchyny i Polissia*, ed. by Adam Charnets'kyi (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974), pp. 80–81.

⁴³⁶ Ia. F. Golovatskii, ‘Narodnyia piesni Galitskoi i Ugorskoi Rusi’, in *Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, 3 (Jul–Sep 1864), pp. 177–320 (p. 191). See < <http://www.pisni.org.ua/songs/71565.html> > [accessed 29 November 2011].

⁴³⁷ ‘A young girl, Nastochka, Nastochka, | Ran along the willow bridge, willow bridge. | Dew was shining on the field, field, | From whence her love will come, come. | He will bring her something, something: | Red *choboty* boots, boots, | Of Kosiv workmanship, workmanship. | In Kosiv they were made, made, | In Kryvorivnia they were worn, worn.’

The song is accompanied by a piano and, like the previous folk song, is sung by a group of male and female singers. Here, however, the form of *bahatoholossia* is more complex. The melody is sung by the female voices, led by one woman whose voice sustains the note at the end of every other line. The male voices sing a separate harmony, with an independent rhythm. However, given that the lower voices do not lead the melody, this cannot be considered an example of polyphonic *bahatoholossia*, according to Iashchenko's definition. Instead, the song seems to fit his description of homophonic-harmonic *bahatoholossia*:

Melodiia tut zavzhdy prokhodyt' lyshe u verkh'omu holosi nezalezhno vid zahal'noi kil'kosti holosiv pisni. Reshta zh holosiv sluzhyt' zdebil'shoho harmonichnym fonom i samostiinoho melodychnoho znachennia ne maie.⁴³⁸

The presence of *bahatoholossia* singing at two points in the film highlights the significance of those occasions: weddings are a communal event and the most important ritual for a Hutsul family.⁴³⁹ At the same time, and taking into account Théberge's reminder to listen to silences, the absence of polyphonic *bahatoholossia* is also telling. The complex multi-part style of singing, common in other parts of Ukraine, is not heard here, reflecting a more isolated way of life in the mountains. When the community gathers together they sing in unison, but they may also spend a greater proportion of time apart than in other areas of Ukraine – on the pasture, for example, or in their own homesteads. This is not to say, however, that music and singing do not play a significant role in Hutsul life – far from it. As Iashchenko points out, instrumental music is highly developed in these western *oblasti* and, furthermore,

⁴³⁸ 'Here the melody is always carried out only by the upper voice, independent of the total number of voices in the song. The rest of the voices for the main part serve the harmonic background and do not have an independent melodic significance.' Iashchenko, *Ukrains'ke narodne bahatoholossia*, p. 149.

⁴³⁹ Zelenchuk, 'Hutsul's'ke vesillia', p. 268.

an individual style of singing has emerged in the area: the *kolomyika*.⁴⁴⁰ The *kolomyika* is a short song, usually comprised of just two lines of fourteen syllables each and ending in a feminine rhyme.⁴⁴¹ Although Iashchenko does not concern himself with the *kolomyika*, countless collections of these verses have been published, including those of Hnatiuk, which he sent to his friend Kotsiubyns'kyi in 1905.⁴⁴² This work greatly pleased Kotsiubyns'kyi when he first read it the following summer.⁴⁴³ He would recall the *kolomyiky* several years later, when reading other works by Hnatiuk, as he began to dream about going to Kryvorivnia:

Perehlianuv ia ti knyzhchky i podyvliaiu Vashu robotu. Adzhe, oprich znannia rizhnykh dialektiv, treba maty duzhe muzykal'ne vukho, shchob zlovyty usi odtinky hovoriv. Tse nadzvychaino tsynnyi material, iak etnografichni, tak i dialektolohichni. A shcho zh “Kolomyiky”? Zhadav pro kolomyiky – i zaraz, iak zhyvyi, vstav pered ochyma Bash obraz [...] Ia seriozno pochynaiu dumaty pro Kryvorivniu [...].⁴⁴⁴

For Kotsiubyns'kyi, therefore, the Hutsul voice was deeply associated with music, and in his novella he included a number of *kolomyiky*, which are also heard in the film. For example, at the beginning of the third chapter ('Ivan tai Marichka'), in which we see the blossoming friendship between the two children, the following *kolomyiky* are sung:

Oi prybihla z polonyanky bilaia ovechka,

⁴⁴⁰ Iashchenko, *Ukrains'ke narodne bahatoholossia*, pp. 66–67.

⁴⁴¹ Nataliia Shumada, 'Karpats'kyi pisennyi dyvotsvit', in *Kvitky Verkhovyny: Kolomyiky*, ed. by Iurii Boichuk (Uzhhorod: Karpaty, 1985), pp. 6–9 (p. 6).

⁴⁴² Letter to Volodymyr Hnatiuk dated 18 October 1905, in Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v semy tomakh*, VI (*Lysty (1905–1909)*), ed. by S. A. Kryzhanivs'kyi (1975), pp. 37–38 (p. 37).

⁴⁴³ Letter to Hnatiuk dated 6 September 1906, in *ibid.*, pp. 60–61.

⁴⁴⁴ 'I have looked over these books and I am amazed by your work. For, aside from the knowledge of different dialects, you have to have a very musical ear in order to capture all the tones of the voices. This material is of exceptional value, both ethnographic and dialectical. And what of [your book] *Kolomyiky*? I thought about the *kolomyiky* and then your face appeared before my eyes, as if real [...] I am seriously starting to think about Kryvorivnia [...].’ Letter to Hnatiuk dated 19 December 1908, in *ibid.*, pp. 106–07 (p. 106).

Liubliu tebe, faina liubko, ta i tvoi slovechka.

Oi iak budut' vivcharyky, bili vivtsi pasty,
Budut' moi spivanochky za kresani klasty.

Oi, kuvala my zozul'ka, ta i kolo potichka,
A khto isklav spivanochky – Ivankova Marichka.⁴⁴⁵

As this example shows, the first line of a *kolomyika* is usually concerned with nature.⁴⁴⁶ These lines are extracted from Kotsiubyns'kyi's text, in which they are sung by Marichka, who is closely associated with music. In the novella, after Marichka's death, Ivan sometimes hears her voice singing one of her *kolomyiky*.⁴⁴⁷ She is effectively heard, but not seen. In the film, however, Marichka's face appears at Ivan's window after her death, but she is silent. This difference can perhaps be explained through reference to the two media: film is able to treat silence as a presence. The absence of Marichka's voice speaks poignantly of Ivan's loss, for the film has also established a connection between Marichka and singing. She sings by the camp-fire as a child; and when we first see her as an adult, in the church, she is singing (perhaps it is for this reason that we immediately recognize her). After she has died, Marichka's voice is only heard in the film in song. Again, this contrasts with the novella, in which Ivan converses with (the wood nymph) Marichka in the forest, shortly before his death. The 1962 screenplay similarly included a dialogue between Ivan and Marichka in the forest, but at some point during production this

⁴⁴⁵ 'A white ewe came running from the upland herds, | I love you, my sweetheart, and your beautiful words. || When shepherds graze their little white sheep, | They'll twine my songs around their hats. || The cuckoo warbled for me by the stream. | Who composed this little song? Ivanko's Marichka.' These *kolomyiky* are taken directly from Kotsiubyns'kyi's text (Kotsiubyns'kyi, 'Tini zabutykh predkiv', pp. 163, 164, 173). The translations provided here are by Marco Carynnyk in M. Kotsiubynsky, *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, pp. 14–20.

⁴⁴⁶ Natalia Shumada, 'Oi dribnen'ka kolomyika, kolomyika myla', in *Kolomyiky: Zbirnyk*, ed. by Natalia Shumada (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1977), pp. 5–12 (p. 7).

⁴⁴⁷ Kotsiubyns'kyi, 'Tini zabutykh predkiv', p. 186.

was changed: in the film, we only hear her voice singing *kolomyiky*.⁴⁴⁸ Some of these *kolomyiky* are derived from Kotsiubyns'kyi's text, but others appear to have been written for the film. Furthermore, Ivan's voice joins Marichka's, demonstrating how the lines of a *kolomyika* are sometimes sung by alternate singers.⁴⁴⁹ In this way, Ivan is united aurally with Marichka after her death through the union of their voices singing *kolomyiky*. These songs were used by lovers to communicate secretly a place of assignation – a detail which lends sinister tones to the music, considering the fact that Ivan is about to join Marichka in the after-world.⁴⁵⁰

Thus far in our analysis we have noted how the voice is heard in many different ways in the film, both verbally and non-verbally, as music, dialogue and effect. The communicative function of the voice is not restricted to verbal messages; indeed, it is the musical and non-verbal communicative capabilities that are emphasized. This is particularly evident with regard to the representation of the relationship between man and animal, a relationship that is of central importance to the Hutsul way of life. If we now turn to examine one of the most climactic sequences in the film – that which leads to Marichka's death – we can see how all these elements are brought and layered together. The sequence begins with the mountain calls of the shepherds, as they are herding their sheep downhill through the forest, trying to protect them from a bear. Their voices mingle with those of the animals

⁴⁴⁸ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 6, d. 577.

⁴⁴⁹ *Kolomyiky* can be improvised, for example, during a dance in which each singer has to take one line. See Shumada, 'Karpats'kyi pisennyi dyvotsvit', p. 7. One theory as to the origin of the name *kolomyika* stems from the tradition of joining singing with dancing in a circle (*kolo*). Another theory posits that the name is derived from the town Kolomyia, in Ivano-Frankivs'ka *oblast'*. See Shumada, 'Oi dribnen'ka kolomyika', p. 9.

⁴⁵⁰ Raimund Kaindl, *Hutsuly: Ikh zhyttia, zvychai ta narodni perekazy* (Chernivtsi: Molodyi Bukovynets, 2000), p. 146. (Although the examples Kaindl cites are *kolomyiky*, he does not specifically use this word.)

around them: the sheep, a dog that is barking, and birds hooting in the night. Some shepherds drive the flock forward with their voices, while others issue the mountain call which rings out across the landscape, communicating danger. Thus we hear the height of the mountain forest, from the animals on the ground to those high up in the trees, and the undulating expanse surrounding them, through the echo of the shepherd's call. These sounds then transition to the instrumental score, composed by Skoryk, as the image cuts to Marichka wandering through the darkness. The birds and the dogs can still be heard beneath the score, creating a nearby yet distinct location.⁴⁵¹ Marichka is also in the forest and she too, of course, is in peril. The juxtaposition of these two situations helps us to understand the shepherds' cries, without the need for words. In turn, their voices assume an additional function during this sequence, much like that of the instrumental score, heightening the dramatic tension. The correlation between the mountain call and the instrumental score reflects a general symbiosis between voice and music in the film. As Myko's voice enters the soundtrack, the score fades out and the image returns to the shepherds. Myko cries out, but his voice is soon overwhelmed by the whistle of the wind, which is gathering pace. At this point, the *trembita* issue their strong, distinctive tones. Through the layering of these sounds – voice, wind, and *trembita* – we are taught how to hear in this environment. The *trembita* takes up the call of the shepherds. It is a vital means of communication; when words and voices are lost in the wind, the *trembita* can still be heard. Finally, at the end of this sequence, as the shepherds stop playing the *trembita*, Ivan asks: “*Chuiete?*” (Do you hear?). The implication is that Ivan is aurally attuned to

⁴⁵¹ By separating the different scenes aurally, two separate spaces are created. The use of sound to define diegetic space is discussed below.

Marichka's environment, yet it seems that he might also be addressing us: have we learned to hear in this environment too?

There are a number of ways in which the voice is used in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. These various functions provide different insights into a way of hearing specific to the Carpathian world of the film's construction. The relatively minor role accorded to dialogue suggests the importance of attuning our ears to non-verbal sounds in this environment; and the musicality of the voice is particularly emphasized. Regionally specific songs and styles of singing can, upon investigation, shed light on a way of life that has given rise to these forms of expression. One of the most significant aspects of the use of the voice is its combination, or layering, with other sounds. The sound of the *trembita* is layered with a widow's heartfelt cry, indicating the instrument's use to communicate news of a death. Later, the shepherds' mountain call is layered with the sound of the *trembita*, signifying its use to communicate on the pasture. To the knowing ear, the varying tones of the *trembita* impart different messages; the film endeavours to instruct us in this through the layering of its sound with the human voice. In these instances, we are not told how to hear with words – the voices do not speak. Instead, we are made to understand how to hear, through the music of the voice itself. In so doing, the film passes on knowledge experientially to the audience; through encouraging this participation, the film engages in postmemorial work.

Part Two: Acousmatic Sounds in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*

As noted above, the sound of the invisible axe in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* is a clear example of what is meant by the term 'acousmatic' – a sound, the source of which we

do not see. A voice, which can be heard but not seen, is accordingly termed an 'acousmêtre'. Chion acknowledges the wide scope of this term, which can encompass the sound of a character's voice which continues to be heard after she has left the screen (an 'already visualized acousmêtre') to the sound of an unknown, all-seeing entity.⁴⁵² The former serves to expand the sense of space to include that which lies beyond the frame; as Doane explains, this kind of off-screen voice 'validates both what the screen reveals of the diegesis and what it conceals'.⁴⁵³ A number of other cinematic devices, in addition to the acousmatic voice, can similarly function to expand the sense of space (see Chapter Three). The 'complete acousmêtre', however, is more ambiguous. Unlike the already visualized acousmêtre, which is located within the diegesis, or the documentary voice-over, which is located outside the diegesis, there are some acousmatic voices which seem to hover in-between these spaces, defying a dualistic diegetic / non-diegetic approach. This kind of acousmêtre

cannot occupy the removed position of commentator, the voice of the magic lantern show. He must, even if only slightly, have *one foot in the image*, in the space of the film; he must haunt the borderlands that are neither the interior of the filmic stage nor the proscenium – a place that has no name, but which the cinema forever brings into play.⁴⁵⁴

Tini zabutykh predkiv is filled with such acousmêtres. Their function, rather than necessarily to expand space, is to expand or multiply time. We have already come across one such usage of the acousmatic voice in Chapter Two. There, we noted that during the scene in which Ivan is sheltering in the little chapel, the voices of two unseen women are heard. These acousmêtres are remembering the scene which is being enacted on the screen. The disjunction between sound and image creates two

⁴⁵² Chion, *The Voice in Cinema*, p. 21.

⁴⁵³ Doane, 'The Voice in the Cinema', p. 40.

⁴⁵⁴ Chion, *The Voice in Cinema*, p. 24. Emphasis in the original.

temporal layers – the past of the diegesis and the present of its performance (or remembrance). This scene is part of a larger sequence in which a number of acousmatic voices remember the images that are presented on-screen. Chion, in fact, uses this sequence to illustrate his concept of ‘collective screen speech’ – acousmatic speech addressed to an on-screen character by various people off-screen or outside the diegesis.⁴⁵⁵ Admittedly, the particular scene within this sequence that Chion uses to explain his concept – the opening scene, in which two women discuss how Ivan has changed following Marichka’s death – is the only one in which the speakers are, in fact, shown to be present (and talking) within the frame, and thus are not acousmêtres. Thereafter, however, the sequence aptly illustrates his point.⁴⁵⁶

These off-screen voices, or acousmêtres, not only function to suggest a space expanding beyond the screen from which they are speaking. They serve to create layers of time so that the narrative is perceived as a memory being performed in the present. In this way, the film gives ownership of the story to the acousmatic voices and the non-professional participants to whom the voices belong. This effect can be discerned throughout the film, particularly with regard to the use of music and song. Here a distinction must be made between the score composed by Skoryk and the other music heard in the film which, borrowing Chion’s words, seems to have one foot in the image. The reason for this distinction is simple. The orchestra performing Skoryk’s score is never seen, nor is it expected to be seen; it is located in the orchestra pit, outside the diegesis. In contrast, the local musicians *are* seen at times

⁴⁵⁵ Chion, *Film, A Sound Art*, p. 360.

⁴⁵⁶ In one other scene in this sequence – when Ivan is seen playing the *drymba*, framed by a doorway – a woman is present on-screen with her young son. This woman is presumed to be the owner of the voice which we can hear, narrating the memory, yet she is not speaking as she looks to the camera.

during the film, within the diegesis. We know they are there; we just cannot always see them. The first musicians we see are the *drymba* players, outside the church, in the opening sequence. In fact, we hear them before we see them, a pattern which is then repeated with the *dentsivka* player selling his wares, and indeed throughout the film. We hear the *trembity* before seeing them; we hear the *sopilka* on the pasture, before seeing a man playing this instrument on the raft with Ivan; we hear the musicians during the dance sequence, before seeing the drummer beat his drums. In this way, the audience is taught to expect to see the non-orchestral musicians at some point during the film; they ‘haunt the borderlands’, to use Chion’s words. Perhaps the longest wait is for the ‘de-acousmatization’ of (the musician playing) the *volynka*, an instrument that is heard throughout the film and only finally revealed at the end, during the scene in the tavern.⁴⁵⁷

Interestingly, it is not necessary that the filmic subjects are actually the performers of the music being heard. Indeed, the audience has no way of knowing whether this is the case or not. One of the *drymba* players in the market scene outside the church was Hanna Iuriivna Kutashchuk, an expert player of Hutsul melodies from the village of Bukovets’ in the Verkhovyns’kyi *raion*.⁴⁵⁸ The Hutsul musician, Vasyl’ Hrymaliuk, played the violin along with his ensemble (only the drummer of which is visible on screen) during the dance sequence outside the church. (Hrymaliuk, known as Mogur, would go on to win an international competition in 1971.)⁴⁵⁹ On the other hand, during an interview, another participant of the film laughingly recalled how she

⁴⁵⁷ Chion uses the term ‘de-acousmatization’ to refer to ‘the process whereby an acousmètre visually materializes into the frame’. *Ibid.*, p. 473.

⁴⁵⁸ Viktor Babii, ‘Samobutnia muzyka’, *Sil’s’ki visti*, Kyiv, 9 February 1968.

⁴⁵⁹ Interview with Ivan Zelenchuk (Kryvorivnia, 23 August 2010).

was given a violin to ‘play’ during the tavern scene. Not knowing how to play the instrument, she was greatly amused by this task and, indeed, her smiles can be discerned.⁴⁶⁰ The point is that the regional instruments are given to the local, non-professional cast and the music is similarly understood as ‘theirs’. Of course, Ivan plays the *dentsivka* as a child and, as an adult, like Palahna, is seen playing the *drymba*, but this serves to embed these characters within the local cast who are, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the ones holding the instruments. In this way, the music narrates the story in a similar way to that in which the acousmatic voices comment on the images being shown in the sequence discussed above. Let us return to the two wedding scenes in order to explain this point further.

As we have noted, the first wedding scene, in which the procession of a bride and groom is viewed from behind a barrier of tree foliage, is accompanied by the song ‘Oi z zahir’ia misiachen’ko’. The sequence opens with a shot of Ivan in a tree, during which the song’s introduction is played by the violin accompaniment. A gun shot is then heard as the image cuts to the wedding procession. At this point, the group of male and female voices begin to sing, over which is layered the sounds of birds chirping.⁴⁶¹ As the camera moves, glimpses of the procession can be seen, and suddenly the camera pauses on a young man playing a violin. This conjunction of sound and image suggests that the song is being sung by the participants of the procession, which is then reinforced by a close-up shot of a gun being fired in which sound and image are united. This second gunshot heralds a break in the song, during which the sounds of the procession are heard: drums, a *sopilka*, the *tsymbaly*, whistles

⁴⁶⁰ Interview with Katerina Demydiuk, (Krasnoillia, 22 August 2010).

⁴⁶¹ The layering of human song and birdsong is another example of how the harmony in which the Hutsuls live with animals is presented in the film.

and whoops, and the continued birdsong. Finally, the song is repeated and, as the voices re-enter the soundtrack, a cut is made to a new scene in which Ivan meets Palahna. Both renditions of the song have a different quality to the interlude in which the procession is heard, suggesting that the recordings were made separately. Nonetheless, the relationship between sound and image – specifically, the images and/or sounds of the violin, the gun, and birds – has created the impression that the song belongs to the filmic subjects, whom we have just seen and heard during the procession. Therefore, the transition to the scene with Ivan and Palahna creates a layering of temporalities. The image moves forward in narrative time, whilst the sound stays with the filmic subjects of the preceding shot, i.e. the local participants who now provide a musical accompaniment to the subsequent images but one which is not being played from the orchestra pit, but from somewhere else – from the ‘borderlands’. The song – and the local cast to whom it is attributed – provides a commentary on the narrative. As they sing about the grey horse on which the bride will sit, we see Palahna enter the frame in which Ivan is standing next to a grey horse. The singers tell us that the next wedding will be for this couple. As the final lines of the song are sung (‘The bride began to cry bitterly’), the image cuts to a close-up of Palahna’s face, and we understand that this will not be a happy marriage.

The next sequence is, accordingly, the marriage between Ivan and Palahna, which is shown to the accompaniment of the song ‘Verbovaia doshchechka’. The only voices heard between these two wedding songs are, in fact, those of the local, non-professional cast – in this case, the women who wash Ivan in preparation for the ceremony. This creates a feeling of continuity between the voices singing the first

song, the local cast seen during the procession, the women washing Ivan, and the second song. Consequently, although we do not see the singers who are performing the second song, we understand them to be the local cast, perhaps those very same men and women who take Ivan and Palahna through the ceremony's rituals. Indeed, as we watch the ceremony unfold inside Palahna's *khata*, several of the men and women gathered there appear to be singing, although not in unison with the soundtrack. This disjunction between sound and image sustains the layering of temporalities, so that we perceive the temporality of the wedding's performance separately to that of the song. This is heightened by the impromptu wink to the camera given by one of the young men as the locals depart from Palahna's home. This wink pierces the temporality of the film's narrative with an awareness of that of its recording. As Ivan and Palahna are left alone together, they do not speak a word. Only the faint rustle of clothing and the sound of Palahna's necklace breaking are heard; the silence between them is palpable. During the total length of both wedding sequences (just under ten minutes), the only voices heard are those of the non-professional cast. Indeed, if we include the preceding black-and-white sequences, in which the acousmatic voices recall the scenes being performed, this total increases to a stretch of more than fifteen minutes in which theirs are the only voices to be heard. In this way, the film literally gives voice to the local cast, to whom, it asserts, the story belongs.

The regional folk music heard in the film is thus distinct from Skoryk's score in that we perceive it to be performed by (or at least to belong to) the filmic subjects who make up the background cast and whose on-screen appearance we anticipate. It

thus provides a kind of commentary on the events on-screen; the lyrics relate to the images such that the story is seen to belong to the local cast whose voices and music (we believe) we are hearing. When Ivan and Marichka say goodbye to one another in the forest, their voices interact with those of an unseen group of men and women singing a series of *kolomyiky*. The male voices sing, for example:

Oi dobranich, faino liubko, dobranich, dobranich.
Bo ia idu v polonynku do ovechky na nich.⁴⁶²

Unlike those sung by Marichka as a child, these *kolomyiky* were not written by Kotsiubyns'kyi for the novella. It is tempting to assume that these are locally known verses sung by the non-professional participants for the film.⁴⁶³ These *kolomyiky* are heard later in the film, during the scene in the tavern. This is one of the most interesting sequences in the film with regard to the use of sound and merits our close attention. In this scene, two pieces of music are replayed for the audience, which is thus called upon to perform its own audio-remembering.

The sequence opens with the sound of the *volyanka* as the portrait of Emperor Franz Josef I is shown. We have heard the *volyanka* earlier in the film, during the sequence of superimpositions and again in the eighth chapter ('Rizdvo'), yet we have seen neither the instrument, nor its player. Thus far, the *volyanka* has been an

⁴⁶² 'Oh, goodnight, dearest, goodnight, goodnight. | For I am going to the sheep on the pasture for the night.'

⁴⁶³ Indeed, it appears that these *kolomyiky* were recorded by Paraska Plytka-Horytsvit, a Hutsul writer, poet, artist and ethnographer, in her collection *Spivankie zapysani hutsulskiem hovorom u seli Kryvorivnia* (Songs written in the Hutsul dialect in the village Kryvorivnia). This handwritten collection was edited by Paraska and is kept in the museum dedicated to her life and work in Kryvorivnia. The book actually opens with the *kolomyiky* sung by the acousmatic voices heard in the film. My thanks go to Inna Shipilova for this information. Born in 1928, Paraska lived in Kryvorivnia and, one may assume, was aware of, if not involved in, the making of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. The fact that she includes these verses in her collection supports the idea that they were known locally.

acousmatic instrument, one which we can hear but cannot see, yet which we anticipate might appear. Therefore, as the *vatah* enters the tavern and we continue to hear this instrument, we do not know whether it is being played within the scene or at its borders. The *vatah* takes a drink, sits down, and we hear laughter, ostensibly from elsewhere in the tavern. The image then cuts to a different table on which a large group of Hutsuls are making merry. It is their voices and laughter which we can hear, although they are quickly subdued by the sound of male and female voices singing *kolomyiky*, which we may recognize as those first heard during the forest scene. All the while, the *volynka* has been playing, albeit forming a barely detectable layer under the *kolomyiky*. As the singing stops, the *volynka* is heard in full force again, and then suddenly it appears on-screen: a cut is made to a further table, at which Iura is sat, being entertained by a man playing the *volynka*. The de-acousmatization of this sound is very effective, because our ears momentarily struggle to now incorporate this sound within the diegesis. As the *kolomyiky* re-enter the soundtrack, we wonder whether this singing also comes from within the scene – perhaps from the table of Hutsuls we have just seen. This is reinforced by the appearance of a second musician, the violin player Katerina Demydiuk, who, as we know, did not play the violin at all, but who unites what we are hearing – the violin that introduces the song – with what we perceive to be located within the scene. In this way, the singing voices are also perceived to belong to the group of Hutsuls from whose table she has come. They may not be singing at this time, but the people on-screen are associated with the voices we can hear. The singing is almost de-acousmatized, as if brought within the diegesis, yet still hovering at a slight remove. As Ivan and Palahna enter the tavern, a

new strain of music is heard, which seems to pick up the acousmatic mantle that has slipped from the shoulders of the *kolomyiky* singers. This is the music that was played during the dance sequence outside the church, the musicians for which cannot now be seen. By combining the image of Palahna and Ivan with the sounds from an earlier diegetic moment, two layers of narrative temporality are created. The audio-viewer, to use Chion's term, is called upon to remember Ivan and Marichka, a happier couple than the one presented to us now. After Ivan and Palahna have sat down, the music fades and the sound of the *volynka* returns, over which we can hear a male voice reciting *kolomyiky*. Palahna sidles up to Iura, and Ivan joins the large group of Hutsuls. He sits at their table with his back turned to the camera, so our attention is directed towards the man facing us, who is addressing the group. This is, in fact, Petro Soruk, with whom Paradzhanov stayed whilst making the film, and whose *khata* is now a museum dedicated to it. Although his lips do not move exactly in time to the words, we understand that sound and image are to be perceived as in unison.⁴⁶⁴ Like those heard in the forest and in the tavern, his *kolomyiky* are also not derived from Kotsiubyns'kyi's text. Similarly, they seem to comment on the narrative, for example in the following *kolomyika* which speaks of the unfolding confrontation between Iura and the cuckolded Ivan:

Oi brate mii, tovaryshu, turyshu, turyshu.
Proshu tebe ne zrad' mene, liubyi tovaryshu.⁴⁶⁵

Furthermore, Soruk anticipates a *kolomyika* that will be sung shortly afterwards by Ivan to (the wood-nymph) Marichka:

⁴⁶⁴ This is an example of 'synchresis', the way in which the simultaneity of sound and image override the perception of realism. Chion, *Film, A Sound Art*, pp. 214–15 and 241.

⁴⁶⁵ 'Oh my brother, my comrade, my friend. | Please do not betray me, dear comrade.'

Oi Ievdoshko, soloden'ka, chichko rozmaita.
Koby my sy poliubyly khoch odnoho lita.⁴⁶⁶

Soruk appears to have addressed this *kolomyika* to his wife, Ievdokiia; when Ivan repeats it shortly afterwards, he substitutes the name 'Ievdoshka' for 'Marichka'. In this repetition, Ivan literally speaks Petro Soruk's words, placing the latter in the position of 'author'. Petro and Ievdokiia are translated into Ivan and Marichka, supporting the assertion that the story belongs to the Hutsuls who have taken part in the film.

The most intriguing use of sound in this scene, however, comes at the end, after Iura strikes Ivan with his axe. Suddenly, everything slows down: the image, which is solarized to wash out the colour, is played in slow-motion, creating an impression of Ivan's disorientation. This subjective point of view is matched by a subjective point of audition, with the slowed-down shouts of the tavern visitors occasionally piercing a loud, constant whirling sound, which continues to be heard when Ivan has left the tavern and spies on Palahna and Iura. This, I would suggest, is a recording of the *lira* played at a slow speed. Indeed, as the camera rests on Ivan's concussed face, the voice of the *lirnyk* is heard again, repeating his song from the beginning of the film. As the image cuts to a shot of Ivan wandering through the fields, the sound of a xylophone heralds the end of the whirling sound, so that only the *lirnyk*'s voice is now heard.⁴⁶⁷ He sings the following:

Oi, kuvala my zozul'ka,
Ta i bude kuvaty.
A ia khochu pro davnynu

⁴⁶⁶ 'Oh, Ievdoshka, my sweetheart, my colourful flower. | But that we could love each other, if only for one summer.'

⁴⁶⁷ The xylophone was earlier associated with the star upon which Ivan and Marichka both gazed; its repetition here, perhaps, indicates that they will soon be reunited.

Pravdu i skazaty.

Buly liudy velykany,
Po myli stupaly.
Malo-malo ta i do neba
Ruku ne siahaly.

Nipochomu dlia nykh buly
Hory ta dolyny.
Lisy hnulys' pid nohamy,
Iak tonki bylyny.

Buly liudy velykany,
Ta zhordily z syly,
Ily, pyly ta i hulialy,
Hospoda hnivyly.

Rano Bohu ne molylys'
Postu ne trymaly.
Ily, pyly ta i hulialy,
Sviat ne shanuvaly.

Staly baby charuvaty,
Dochok nauchaty,
Bat'ky synam voliu daly
Pyty ta huliaty.

Pidniav ruku syn na bat'ka,
A dochka na nen'ku.
Brat z sestroi provodzhaly
Nichkoiu temnen'ku.

Krov, iak vodu, prolyvaly,
Rizaly, vbyvaly.
I hrikhamy sviatu zemliu
Vsiudu ukryvaly.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁸ 'Oh, the cuckoo cuckooed | And it will always cuckoo. | And about the past | I want to tell you the truth. || Once there were people-giants, | In one step they could miles pass by. | And almost with their very arms | They could reach up to the sky. || For them, the valleys and the hills | Were very easy things to pass. | Under their feet the forests bent | As if they were thin blades of grass. || Once there were people-giants, | And their strength made them proud. | They ate, they drank and made merry, | And very angry did they make God. || They didn't pray to God at morning, | And they didn't keep to the fasts. | They ate, they drank and made merry, | And they didn't respect the feasts. || Old women began to practice magic, | And taught their daughters it to use, | Fathers gave their sons permission | To go out and drink and to carouse. || Son raised fist against father, | And daughter against her mother. | The darkness

The *lirnyk*, I would suggest, is the acousmêtre proper of the film. Unlike the other folk musicians, neither he nor his instrument is seen in the film, although his voice is heard at both beginning and end. Traditionally, the *lirnyk* would wander throughout Ukraine, telling tales of times gone by through his music, and thus keeping those memories alive. In essence, his role was to promote the continuation of cultural tradition, a function which he continues to fulfil in the film through his aural presence. The *lirnyk* passes down to us, his listeners, the film's narrative, framed by the lyrics of his own song. In so doing, his acousmatic voice performs the postmemorial work of the film by suggesting that these traditions continue to be passed down to the next generation and beyond.

The story he tells is taken from the second part of the *Lirnykovi dumy* (Epic Songs for the *Lira*) written by the Ukrainian poet Stepan Rudans'kyi in 1856.⁴⁶⁹ This work is a folk re-telling of the Old Testament and consists of five parts. The *lirnyk*'s song very closely follows the first eight verses of the second part (*Veletni* (The Giants)), with the addition of his own introductory verse about the cuckoo. The cuckoo is a bird closely associated with fortune-telling in Ukrainian culture, and so the *lirnyk*'s first verse establishes a narrative that looks both to the past and to the future. Rudans'kyi's poem about the giants evolves into a re-working of the story of Noah and the ark. One possible interpretation of the *lirnyk*'s song in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* could substitute the giant people for the various forces who had laid claim to this region in the recent past. This tumultuous period had changed society, provoking

of the night was spent | By sister with her brother. || Blood was spilt, like water, | They slaughtered and they murdered. | And with their sins all over | The holy earth was covered.'

⁴⁶⁹ Stepan Rudans'kyi, *Tvory v tr'okh tomakh*, 3 vols (Kyiv: Naukova dumka (1873), II, 7–116 (pp. 43–55).

the flood with which the past is erased. Yet Noah and his family live through the flood, suggesting that all links with the past are not broken. Just as Noah does, then, the voice of the *lirnyk* offers a link between the past and the present.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the final component of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode – its treatment of sound – which, it was argued, reinforced the characteristic layering of the other two components (space and time). The kinds of sounds that are used in the film were seen to evoke a sense of the Carpathian space in which the narrative takes place, not only through the regional specificity of these sounds, but also through the height and depth created by their layering and reverberations. The film thus develops an acoustemology, specific to this locale, and one which, at times, it seems to teach the audio-viewer how to hear. We are invited to participate in an aural experience which might be seen as an attempt to pass on a kind of aural way of knowing. Of all the sounds in the film, the human voice is found to be particularly variegated and used to great effect. The musical qualities of the voice are emphasized and the use of acousmêtres provides a means of giving voice to the locals who participated in the film. The disjunction between sound and image generated by the acousmêtres creates both spatial and temporal layers, such that the story is understood to be narrated by the local participants. Ultimately, a relationship between sound, space and time is established such that the film can be seen as a story belonging to a specific place, narrated by the people who inhabit it. In narrating the story, they are remembering it and the ‘ancestors’ of whom they speak; by inviting the viewer to participate in the experience, the film engages in postmemorial work. In this way, the acousmêtre of

the *lirnyk* functions as a synecdoche for the film as a whole: in hearing his voice, he continues to live on and fulfil his role of transmitting stories of the past from generation to generation.

CHAPTER FIVE

Casting Shadows: The Poetic School and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode

The extent to which *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was seen by the average Soviet cinema-goer is open to debate. Woll, for example, has stated that ‘*Shadows* barely ran in commercial theatres’.⁴⁷⁰ This assertion has been questioned by First, however, who explains that nightly screenings of the film took place at the Ukraina cinema in Kyiv from 27 September to 17 October 1965; he adds that ‘[t]hereafter, *Shadows* expanded beyond central Kyiv theaters, even showing regularly at several factory clubs until late November.’⁴⁷¹ Throughout the autumn of 1965 the film could be seen in major Soviet cities, and nearly eleven million tickets were sold across the Soviet Union.⁴⁷² Nonetheless, First admits that *Tini zabutykh predkiv* ‘was a festival film, functioning internationally and domestically to demonstrate the vitality of Ukrainian high culture’.⁴⁷³ Whilst the significance of the film for the non-elite Soviet viewer is a moot point, few would dispute the film’s impact on the Dovzhenko Studio and the filmmakers who were working there. This chapter investigates the after-effects of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Here, it must be noted that our attention remains fixed on the Dovzhenko Studio, rather than following the path of its director. This is consistent with the overall approach of the thesis which, rather than stressing the auteur status of the director, has sought to emphasize the collaborative nature of the film’s production, in which a collective of individuals took part, including, importantly, the

⁴⁷⁰ Woll, *Real Images*, p. 186.

⁴⁷¹ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, p. 193.

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*.

⁴⁷³ *Ibid.*.

Hutsul residents of Verkhovyna and its environs. Nonetheless, it is clear that *Tini zabutykh predkiv* marks an important turning point in the trajectory of Paradzhanov as an artist. It was also the last film he would complete at the Dovzhenko Studio. In the immediate aftermath of the success of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, Paradzhanov embarked upon *Kyivs'ki fresky* at the studio, a project intended to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War. Whilst *Tini zabutykh predkiv* had brought him acclaim on the festival circuit, Paradzhanov still had to tread carefully in light of the incident at the film's premiere in September 1965. This was the time of the trial of Soviet writers Andrei Siniavskii and Iurii Daniel', which is considered to be one of the events which heralded the end of the 'Thaw'. Indeed, even before shooting began on *Kyivs'ki fresky*, work was halted, and the film was shelved in early 1966. Only the screen tests, filmed by Oleksandr Antypenko, remain as testament to the experimental nature of the intended work.⁴⁷⁴ Thereafter, Paradzhanov found it increasingly difficult to work in Kyiv. A number of his proposals were rejected, including an adaptation of Kotsiubyns'kyi's *Intermezzo* (1908), and in 1973 the director was arrested in Kyiv on various dubious charges and imprisoned.

Whilst *Tini zabutykh predkiv* was the last film Paradzhanov completed at the Dovzhenko Studio, he did manage to edit the footage from the screen tests for *Kyivs'ki fresky* into a short film with a soundtrack. From this material it is possible to detect the development of his tableau-style filmmaking, which can be characterized as a succession of carefully composed static shots, the beginnings of which are

⁴⁷⁴ For further details about the project, see: James M. Steffen, 'Kyiv Frescoes: Sergei Paradjanov's Unrealized Film Project', *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 9: Ukrainian Cinema (December 2009), < <http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/steffen.shtml> > [accessed 12 June 2012].

evident in certain passages of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* (for example in the sequence of static head shots prior to the funeral of Ivan's father). This style of Paradzhanov's filmmaking reached its pinnacle in *Sayat Nova*. Paradzhanov had gone to Armenia after the debacle with *Kyiv'ski fresky* to make the documentary film *Hakob Hovnatanyan* (1967). Following his release from prison in 1977, he found work in Tbilisi at Gruziiafil'm, where he made *Ambavi Suramis tsikhisa* (The Legend of Suram Fortress, 1984) and *Ashiki Keribi* (Ashik Kerib, 1988). During this time, he also produced the short documentary film *Arabeski na temu Pirosmeni* (Arabesques on the Theme of Pirosmeni, 1985) at Mematiane, the Georgian popular science and documentary film studio. For his next project, *Khostovanank* (Confession), Paradzhanov returned to Armenia, where he died in 1990 before he was able to complete the film.

The multi-national nature of Paradzhanov's career is one of its distinctive features. For the purposes of this thesis, however, our focus will remain on Kyiv and the impact of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* on the filmmakers working at the Dovzhenko Studio. The significance of this film cannot fully be understood without reference to the style of filmmaking which it unleashed there. Fresh from his collaboration with Paradzhanov, camera operator Illienko soon began work on *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, in which he made his directorial debut. As will be discussed in greater detail below, this film in many ways takes its inspiration from and develops the aesthetic characteristics and themes of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Unfortunately, for over twenty years the general public was unable to see the film, which was banned from release upon completion. It was, however, viewed by those working at the studio, for

example during screenings to the artistic council. Shortly afterwards, in 1967, Leonid Osyka completed his first feature film for the Dovzhenko Studio, *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'*, which he followed in 1968 with *Kaminnyi khrest*. Again, in both these films the influence of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* can be detected through the prism of Osyka's individual style. Together with Paradzhanov, these two directors, Illienko and Osyka, stand at the forefront of a movement that became known as the Ukrainian school of poetic cinema. This chapter examines what is here understood by the term 'Ukrainian school of poetic cinema', through reference to a film by each of these directors – *Krynysia dlia sprahlykh* and *Kaminnyi khrest*. These two films, it is suggested, are the direct descendants of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, and together the three films constitute the inner core of the poetic school. This chapter traces the influence of *Tini zabutykh predkiv* specifically with regard to the use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode in these two subsequent films. The chapter provides some benchmarks for determining what constitutes the Ukrainian school of poetic cinema. The overarching aim is to understand why this style of filmmaking emerged at this time amongst these filmmakers. It will be argued that the films are distinctively 'Ukrainian' not necessarily by virtue of their focus on Ukrainian history or language, but rather through their preoccupation with a common theme: the relationship between the people and the land on which they live. This relationship was traumatically ruptured in Ukraine by the traumatic events of the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s, events which occurred when these filmmakers were children or just prior to their birth. The films act as testimony to the postmemorial response of the filmmakers to these events, which directly affected their parents' generation but which nonetheless continued to

echo for those who came afterwards. Of all the films of the poetic school, it is *Bili khmary* which most directly addresses the relationship between the people and the land; this chapter concludes with a consideration of this remarkable film which, ironically, has seemingly been forgotten. In its exploration of collectivization and dekulakization, *Bili khmary* points to the Holodomor as a consequence of these processes, and the silence which surrounded this tragedy. In its treatment of silence, the film highlights how and why cinema is particularly suited to deal with the postmemory of these events in the Soviet context.

Going Round in Circles to Identify the School

Around the same time that Gazda published his article proclaiming the emergence of a school of Ukrainian poetic cinema, Bleiman's article 'Arkhaisty ili novatory?' appeared in *Iskusstvo kino* and signalled its demise.⁴⁷⁵ This was cemented in 1972 by the ousting of Shelest, who, as noted in Chapter One, had been one of its official proponents, and confirmed by the assertion of his successor, Volodymyr Shcherbyts'kyi, who in 1974 made known his view that: 'Z poetychnym kino u nas pokincheno' (We are finished with poetic cinema).⁴⁷⁶ After this period, the occasional work was released which may be considered to fall within the scope of the school (such as, for example, Mykolaichuk's *Vavylon XX*, or his *Taka piznia, taka tepla osin'* (Such a Late, Warm Autumn, 1981). Nonetheless, the poetic school had passed its heyday, one which, with the benefit of hindsight, we might identify as the period between 1964 and 1972. It was only in 1989 that Dziuba published his response to

⁴⁷⁵ Gazda, 'Ukrains'ka shkola'; Bleiman, 'Arkhaisty ili novatory?'.

⁴⁷⁶ Cited in Briukhovets'ka, 'Proryv do vichnoho'.

Bleiman's 1970 article.⁴⁷⁷ Written nearly twenty years earlier, Dziuba's response entered an arena in which filmmakers and critics were considering the future path of Ukrainian cinema; in the early years of national independence, many looked to the 1960s and the poetic school as offering a potential model.⁴⁷⁸ In 2002, Briukhovets'ka's *Poetychne kino* was released which collated these articles, and others, for the first time. Whilst this volume contains a wealth of information, it does not include a clear definition of the school, nor provide the rationale behind the selection of the fourteen films listed in the filmography. Similarly, in his doctoral thesis, First neither describes what he believes to be the defining characteristics of the school nor lists the films which he considers belonging to it. Without wishing to be prescriptive, it is nevertheless necessary to establish some clear principles according to which our understanding of the school is formulated and upon which subsequent analysis can be based. What follows is offered in the interest of clarity and in order to facilitate discussion.

The Ukrainian school of poetic cinema can be defined as the feature films produced at the Dovzhenko Studio primarily between 1964 and 1972 (with some flexibility regarding the end date) that were filmed on location, involved the participation of local residents, and made use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. This definition immediately reduces Briukhovets'ka's list of fourteen films by two: neither Osyka's *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more* nor Serhiienko's *Vidkryi sebe* are feature films (the former is a short film, whilst the latter is a documentary film, produced at the Ukrkinokhronika studio). Maintaining this distinction is important, because one of

⁴⁷⁷ Dziuba, 'Vidkryttia chy zakryttia "shkoly"?'.

⁴⁷⁸ Nebesio, 'Questionable Foundations'.

the distinguishing features of the school, and one which makes its contribution valuable from the perspective of film studies, is the incorporation within fiction film of non-fiction practices, specifically the foregrounding of the relationship between the filmmaking process and the filmic product. Whilst the definition given here removes these two films from Briukhovets'ka's filmography, this is compensated for by making the following additions to her list: *Annychka*; *Bili khmary*; and *Taka piznia, taka tepla osin'*. Restricting the school to include only films produced at the Dovzhenko Studio is both pragmatic and a deliberate attempt to avoid limiting consideration of the films to questions of national identity. Here, the prefix 'Ukrainian' is understood to refer simply to the place of their production rather than to the content of the films. After all, *Vsuperech us'omu*, which was filmed on location in Montenegro and concerns Montenegrin history, has no Ukrainian content but must nonetheless be considered part of the school.⁴⁷⁹ Undoubtedly, the films of the school are often concerned with pivotal moments in Ukrainian history, but their focus remains very local, rather than necessarily national. It should also be noted that the films are not solely concerned with western Ukraine or the Carpathian region. *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, *Vechir na Ivana Kupala*, and *Propala hramota* are set in central Ukraine (specifically, Cherkashchyna and Poltava); *Bili khmary* deals with southern Ukraine; and *Sovist'* and *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'* take Kyiv as their main focus. Indeed, one must be careful not to consider the films set in the Carpathian region as a homogenous group. Certainly, *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and *Annychka* are set in the same locale, but this is different to the Bukovyna that is shown in *Bili ptakh z*

⁴⁷⁹ The film was a joint production between the Dovzhenko Studio and the Titograd film studio in Yugoslavia (where it was released under the name *Živjeti za inat*).

chornoii oznakoiu, or even the Pokuttia village of *Kaminnyi khrest*. The distinctiveness of these different locations is a fundamental part of the works. Common to all these films is an interest in the relationship of the people to the land on which they live, be that land in Hutsul'shchyna, Cherkashchyna or Montenegro. Ultimately, of course, this itself reflects the concerns of this generation of Ukrainian filmmakers which this chapter seeks to elucidate.

The Ukrainian poetic school can be visualized as a series of concentric circles, at the heart of which lies *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Those films which are situated nearest to this central point most closely conform to the above definition; and the two films lying closest to *Tini zabutykh predkiv* are *Kaminnyi khrest* and *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*. These three films form the inner core of the school and embody its defining characteristics. They are surrounded by a cluster of other films which display a number of commonalities with the inner core, such as the collaboration of non-professional local residents, and which includes *Annychka*, *Bili khmary*, *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*, *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'*, and *Sovist'*. Finally, there is an outer perimeter of films which more loosely display the aforementioned characteristics, within which can be situated the remaining films from Briukhovets'ka's list. Against this background, we can now proceed to our analysis of *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* and *Kaminnyi khrest*, the two films which, together with *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, form the inner core of the poetic school.

Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh

Iurii Illienko was born in 1936 in Cherkasy. As a young child he was evacuated from Ukraine during the Second World War to the relative safety of Siberia. After the war, his father found work in Moscow, where the family re-settled. In 1960 he graduated from the camera operator faculty of VGIK, where his brothers Vadym and Mykhailo also studied. He went to the Ialta film studio to shoot *Proshchavaite, holuby* (Farewell, Doves, 1960, directed by Iakov Segel'), which was awarded prizes in Lokarno, Prague and Melbourne, followed by *Des' ie syn* (My Son is Somewhere, 1962, directed by Artur Voitets'kyi), in which he began to experiment with a hand-held camera. As an emerging talent, Illienko was approached by Paradzhanov in 1963 to work on his new film, *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Not overly impressed by Paradzhanov's work to date, Illienko nevertheless heeded the advice of his mother-in-law, Nina Alisova, to not reject the offer in haste but to read Kotsiubyns'kyi's novella first.⁴⁸⁰ He was enthralled; and, in June 1963, he was transferred from Ialta to the Dovzhenko Studio. Illienko's work on this film – for which he was awarded a prize (for colour, lighting and special effects) at the Mar del Plata film festival – cemented his status as a new creative force at the studio and he went on to enjoy a long and fruitful career in Ukrainian cinema, including a stint as head of the State Fund of Ukrainian Cinematography of the Cabinet of Ministers between August 1991 and November 1992, until his death in 2010.

⁴⁸⁰ Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 20.

As a child, Illienko would spend the summer in Cherkasy with his grandparents, from whom he learnt the Ukrainian language.⁴⁸¹ At school in Moscow, his fellow students laughed at his Ukrainian accent.⁴⁸² The early extraction from his native land must have had a deep impact on Illienko; it is perhaps not surprising to learn that, having returned to Ukraine as an adult, Illienko chose to re-enact this narrative of return when he came to make his first feature film as a director. For the filming of *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, Illienko returned to the Cherkas'ka *oblast'* where he had been born. Filmed on location in 1965 in the village of Trushivtsi, in the Chyhyryns'kyi *raion*, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* involved the participation of local non-professionals, a fact which is explicitly stated in the opening credits: 'U fil'mi znymalys' kolhospnyky ta shkoliari Chyhyryns'koho raionu' (collective farm workers and schoolchildren of Chyhyryns'kyi *raion* are filmed in this motion picture). The story itself is centred on the theme of return, as the main protagonist – an old, yet seemingly healthy, man called Levko Serdiuk – summons his children back to their native village on the pretext of his imminent death. Whilst he waits for them to arrive, he sets about making his own coffin. For this he requires wood, which he takes from, among other places, the casing of a monument to commemorate the war dead which is being unveiled in the village. The villagers gather to watch the monument as it is erected, and they are also seen preparing a building in the traditional manner, using mud and straw. We watch Serdiuk at work, making vessels on his pottery wheel, and then distributing them around the village. We also see a neighbour, Maroika, curse Serdiuk for having let the well go to ruin. She pointedly notes that all his children

⁴⁸¹ Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁸² Ibid., p. 7.

have left the village. When Serdiuk's children finally arrive, he finds that they have brought wreaths in anticipation of his death. The children take the wreaths to the cemetery instead, to lay at the grave of their deceased mother. Serdiuk's favourite son, unable to come, has sent his wife, Solomiia, who brings a message which he has recorded onto tape for his father. The son's former wife then arrives by motorcycle but, upon seeing the heavily pregnant Solomiia surrounded by family, she departs without a word. Later, Serdiuk watches his family as they sleep, reunited at last. He dismantles the coffin and uses the wood to re-build the well.

Interspersed with this basic plot are a number of memory-visions which presumably represent Serdiuk's patterns of thought. In one memorable scene, for example, we watch Serdiuk carry water up the well, which, in his dream-world, is positioned horizontally. On other occasions, we witness scenes from Serdiuk's past, such as, for example, the occasion on which he felled a tree when his son was a young boy, a memory which is triggered by his search for wood for the coffin. Other memories show how the well has quenched the thirst of Serdiuk's family over the years; they also refer to his experience of war. Indeed, above all, the film is about memory, and like *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, was itself intended as a commemoration – this time, to the memory of the Second World War and to the twentieth anniversary of its end. As things turned out, the film was dedicated to the memory of Dmytro Miliutenko, the actor who played Serdiuk, and who died during filming.

Shot in black and white, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* lasts around sixty-eight minutes.⁴⁸³ Its structure follows that of the screenplay, written by Ukrainian poet Ivan Drach whilst he was studying at the screenplay-writing institute Vysshie Stsenarnye

⁴⁸³ The following analysis is based on the Ukrainian version of the film.

Kursy in Moscow.⁴⁸⁴ Overall, however, the film was deemed to have departed from the essence of the original screenplay. The reason for this can be traced to the decision to shoot the film in Trushivtsi. This village is located in an area known for its unusual topography: it is a landscape of sand dunes, by the Dnipro river.⁴⁸⁵

Illienko has remarked on the centrality of this landscape to the film that emerged:

I searched for a long time. [...] And there, in the very heart of Ukraine, between Cherkassy and Chigirin [Ukr. Chyhyryn], where the Tiamin River flows into the Dnipro, I found the perfect spot [*blagodatnye mesta*] – hills, black earth, such a swirl of earthly paradise. And, moreover, in the valley, I saw sand, real sand, dunes even (*barkhany, diuny*). And there stood a village, houses [*khaty*] with thatch roofs, and on the roofs – windmills. A Ukrainian village – standing on sand. How unnatural! I felt something in myself like a flash of lightening [*sic*], like a prophesy – suddenly the essence of the film was revealed. The landscape turned out to be the key, the prototype, the methodology even.⁴⁸⁶

In this quotation, Illienko clearly establishes the influence of the landscape upon the filmic product. It is interesting that he uses the word ‘methodology’, supporting the assertion of this thesis that in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, as an example of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, the filmmaking process is an integral part of the film itself. The images of sand stood in sharp contrast to the usual representations of the Ukrainian village (such as is found in Dovzhenko’s *Zemlia*), which typically stressed the fecundity of the rich Black Earth. The seeming unnaturalness of the landscape was accentuated by the particular properties of the film stock that was used, which had a limited tonal range, resulting in a stark black-and-white image.⁴⁸⁷

If the well-spring of the film’s title symbolized the life-source of the village, then the

⁴⁸⁴ TsDAMLUMU, f. 1127, op. 1, d. 77.

⁴⁸⁵ In addition, towards the end of the filming period, as winter set in, it was necessary to shoot some scenes in Tashkent.

⁴⁸⁶ As cited in First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, p. 228.

⁴⁸⁷ Illienko purportedly used expired film stock to achieve this look. First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, p. 230.

sandy landscape suggested it had now run dry. At least, that is how the SRK interpreted the film, when they came to view it, in February 1966:

Tvortsi fil'mu pishly shliakhom, ne peredbachenyim sstenariiem. U stvorenomu fil'mi dominuiuchymy staly tragichni sytuatsii, iaki zreshtoiu vyznachyly zalhal'ne pokhmure, minorne zvuchannia fil'mu, nezalezhno vid namiriv avtors'kohu kolektyvu. U ts'omu napriami diiut' asotsiatyvni plany, zokrema – obraz pisku, iak antypodu zhyvoi vody.⁴⁸⁸

It was recommended that the studio re-work the film, in particular by removing a number of scenes altogether, including that of the monument's unveiling and certain shots of the villagers ('in pyjamas', for example).⁴⁸⁹ Presumably, it was felt that these scenes did not portray the contemporary Ukrainian village in the desired light. Indeed, at a meeting between the SRK and the studio, one participant complained: '[Fil'm] proizvodit mrachnoe vpechatlenie o nashei deistvitel'notsi.'⁴⁹⁰ Others felt that the *typage* was wrong: 'oblychchia ukrains'kykh zhinok – dukhovno krasyvymy maiut' buty.'⁴⁹¹ Upon concluding the meeting, Ivanov returned to the images of sand:

Protystavlennia mertvoho pisku i zhyvoi vody. U mene skladaiet'sia taka kontseptsiiia, shcho pisok zadavyv krynytsiu i nemaie zhyvoi vody. Zvidsy i tsia pokhmurist'. Tut panuie smert'.⁴⁹²

He determined that the film could not be shown to the mass audience, and a limited distribution should be sought.⁴⁹³ Ultimately, however, the film was too problematic

⁴⁸⁸ 'The filmmakers have gone down a route that was not foreseen in the screenplay. In the film's creation, the tragic situations have become dominant, which have ultimately determined the film's general bleak, sad tone, independent of the filmmakers' intentions. The associated designs work in this way, in particular the image of sand, as the antipode of living water.' TsDAMLMU, f. 1127, op. 1, d. 176, l. 33.

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid., l. 34.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid., l. 40.

⁴⁹¹ 'There must be an inner beauty in Ukrainian women's faces.' Ibid..

⁴⁹² '[On] the contrast of dead sand and living water: I am left with the idea that the sand has crushed the well and there is no living water. This is where that gloom comes from. Here death reigns.' Ibid., l. 45.

⁴⁹³ Ibid., l. 46.

for even this and it was banned from release by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine (TsKKPU) on 30 June 1966.⁴⁹⁴

Certainly, sand is contrasted with living water, and the film does not shy away from depicting the realities of contemporary village life. In this respect, the sand can be seen to symbolize the threat posed to the continuation of a traditional rural life by the demographic changes brought about by war and outward migration. However, as we analyse the film in more detail, we shall see how it does not necessarily paint as bleak a portrait of rural life as the authorities feared. Instead, in spite of all the difficulties faced, it is asserted that life in the villages goes on and traditions are passed on between generations.

As in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* begins with sound (divorced from any accompanying image). Indeed, as with the earlier film, sound plays a hugely important role in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, one which may initially be overlooked because of its apparent simplicity. Despite a scarcity of dialogue – even more so than Paradzhanov's film, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* also displays the barest minimum of 'adjacent pairs' – the film is filled with sounds. These include the sound of wood, sand, metal, mud, Serdiuk's ceramic pots, voices, horses, and, of course, water. Before any opening image, as the credits roll, the sound of a woman screaming during childbirth is heard. (In this way, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* seems to begin from where Dovzhenko ended in *Zemlia*.) There follows the sound of a woman singing a folk song ('Oi hore, hore z takoiu hodynoiu | Prokliala maty maloiu dytynoiu'),

⁴⁹⁴ Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 59.

which, in the absence of an instrumental score, becomes the film's theme tune.⁴⁹⁵ This song is layered over the sound of children's voices shouting words which cannot quite be made out. A second folk song then enters the soundtrack ('Sered vsikh ia tebe budu vyhliadaty. | Sered vsikh ia tebe, mii didusia, budu vyhliadaty.')⁴⁹⁶ The two songs interweave with one another, and a final sound – that of bells tolling, suggestive of the passing of time (but also a sign of calamity) – enters the mix. In this fabric of sounds, the centrality of the (grand)parent-child relationship is established. As the first sequence begins, these sounds fade out and instead we hear Levko Serdiuk pulling up a bucket full of water from a well. He pours the water into a wooden barrel and repeats his action. Suddenly, he pauses by the well as the children's voices re-enter the soundtrack. Serdiuk's sudden stillness suggests that he, too, hears these voices, and that they are in fact the sounds of his memories. In the audio-visual relationship two juxtapositions are established: past and present, and young and old. A cut is then made to a close-up of some old family photographs. As the camera roams over these pictures, the young voices, thick with reverberation, seem to be resonating across the years, from past to present. They are shouting 'Ia! Ia!' (I! I!), as if asserting their existence and the fact that they are, indeed, the individuals in these photographs – Serdiuk's children. The camera moves vertically, rather than horizontally, so that the photographs do not present the passage of time so much as the coexistence of multiple temporalities; they do not progress from

⁴⁹⁵ 'Oh, woe to this hour, | The mother cursed her small child.' This song features in *Starshyi boiaryn*, a story written in 1944 by Todos' Os'machka who, like Illienko, hailed from Cherkas'ka *oblast'*, and in which the story is set, suggesting that it is local to the area. Todos' Os'machka, *Starshyi boiaryn* (Neu-Ulm: Prometei, 1946), p. 9.

⁴⁹⁶ 'Out of everyone, I will look out for you. | Out of everyone, my grandfather, I will look out for you.'

beginning to end but rather pool up to form a well of memories. We then watch Serdiuk inside his *khata* as, one by one, he turns the framed photographs to face the wall on which they are hanging. He pauses momentarily on a framed newspaper clipping, which appears to be an article about his son who died during the war. Deciding to leave this item alone, he instead moves to the mirror; this too he turns towards the wall, after looking at his own image for several moments. As Havryl'iuk explains, this particular action is connected with death rites in Ukraine:

Concern for the living is expressed through the custom of covering all mirrors. It is said that glancing into a mirror right after looking at the body of the deceased will cause jaundice. The same belief accounts for the prohibition against children playing with mirrors at any time. Those who are about to pay their last respects to the dead are supposed to avoid looking into a mirror or else "a young person in the family will die." According to another explanation, mirrors are dangerous because the glitter of the mirror's surface intensifies the suffering of the dying and so all mirrors must be covered during the last minutes of life. It is also thought that the mirror itself will be affected (become murky or grow pale) if it is not turned toward the wall when someone dies.⁴⁹⁷

By turning the mirror to the wall, then, Serdiuk introduces the plotline concerning his preparations for death. By turning the photographs to the wall, he symbolically attempts to turn his back on his children. In the May 1966 re-workings of the film, it was suggested that a voice-over be heard during this scene explaining that: 'Da tak obidelsia ded na detei svoikh, i takaia gorech' podstupila k gorlu... kogda vy zhivy-zhivekhon'ki na menia gliadet' ne khotite, to zachem ia na vashi patrety [*sic*] gliadet' dolzhen?'⁴⁹⁸ Yet, for Serdiuk, it is not as simple as that. The old man sits down and

⁴⁹⁷ Havryl'iuk, 'Funeral Rituals in Ukraine', p. 12.

⁴⁹⁸ TsDAMLNU, f. 1127, op. 1, d. 176, l. 61. These suggestions came after a discussion of the film on 4 May 1966, which the head of Derzhkino, Ivanov, concluded ominously with the following: 'Ia schitaiu, chto fil'm mozhnet sushestvovat' tol'ko dlia opredelenного zritelia. Vypuskat' fil'm na ekran nel'zia. V fil'me prisutstvuet dekadentskaia poetika. Ia ne razdeliaiu uvlecheniia i vostorga v smysle poiskov khudozhnika. Rekomenduiu ubrat' kadry

the children's voices again enter the soundtrack; he cannot escape his memories so easily. Interestingly, here the enduring connection is an aural one: the image may be covered, but the sound can still be heard. In the next shot, a young woman with dark hair is seen through a window, with her hand outstretched as if beckoning the camera/viewer towards her. Behind her in the distance is a windmill. This shot is a beautiful example of the interplay between depth and surface, as discussed in Chapter Three. The viewer's eye wanders over the texture of the interior wall of the *khata*, where the camera is positioned, which is located in the foreground. At the same time, the woman draws us into the image, into whose depth we are invited to plunge. This woman is Serdiuk's late wife, Paraska, as she was in her youth; what we are plunging into, therefore, is Serdiuk's memory. Just as the window marks the transition between inside and outside space, it here marks the divide between the exterior and interior worlds of our protagonist. The composition of this shot is reminiscent of the scene in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* in which a vision of Marichka is seen through a window. This similarity is all the more striking given the fact that Paraska is played by Kadochnykova, who had earlier performed the role of Marichka. In point of fact, Kadochnykova plays two roles in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*: the dark-haired young Paraska and the blonde Solomiia, Serdiuk's pregnant daughter-in-law. It is with an image of Solomiia falling softly to the ground that the film ends. This occurs in the epilogue to the film, after Serdiuk has started to re-build the well. In this dream-like sequence we see Serdiuk carry an uprooted apple tree across the sandy landscape, perhaps with the intention of replanting it elsewhere. Solomiia follows behind him,

ustanovleniia pamiatnika i zaputannogo tsepiani Levka. Fil'm neobkhodimo pokazat' TsK. Takzhe rekomenduii pokazat' fil'm riadovomu zriteliu.' *Ibid.*, ll. 58–59.

picking up the apples as they fall and collecting them in her skirt. Suddenly she releases her skirt and the apples fall, as her hands move to touch her stomach and she drops to the ground. This, one assumes, is the initial stages of her labour. In this way, the film possesses a cyclical structure, beginning with the sound of the event with which it ends. The image of the apple tree also recalls the famous shots of fruit in *Zemlia*, so that, as it began, the film ends with an allusion to this earlier work. This cyclical structure is, of course, suggestive of the circularity of life, and of continuity – a factor which is enhanced through the dual casting of Kadochnykova in these two roles. Significantly, Solomiia has no blood connection to Serdiuk, and yet she fulfils this function of continuity. Like *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the film provides a looser definition of descendants than one strictly tied to genetics. The final image of Solomiia fades to black, and the acousmatic voices of the children shouting ‘Ia! Ia!’ re-enter the soundtrack. As it began, so too the film ends: with sound. This time, the voices asserting their existence seem to come not from the past and from Serdiuk’s memories, but from the present or, possibly, the future. They are the voices of the next generation, of Solomiia’s unborn child – and, implicitly, of us.

As the above analysis shows, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* displays a similar layering of time, space and sound to that which we have identified in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. Thematically, it also is concerned with the issue of the transference of memory between generations, and specifically the threat posed to this by both the tragic losses incurred as a result of the Second World War and, more generally, by urbanization. Trushivtsi, which is located in the centre of Ukraine and was occupied by the Nazi forces between 1941 and 1943, and thus, like the rest of the country,

suffered great losses during the war.⁴⁹⁹ 780 of the village's residents were called up to join the Red Army, and 380 did not return from the field; every third family suffered a personal loss.⁵⁰⁰ The war had a devastating impact on the population of Ukrainian villages, such as Trushivtsi, which was compounded by a growing movement from villages to towns. Rapid industrialization had led to the urbanization of the population, which accelerated in the aftermath of the war.⁵⁰¹ We can see how the demographic changes are reflected in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* through Levko's children: one son has died in the war; the others have left the village. Nonetheless, despite these strains on the intergenerational relationship, the film asserts a continued connection between past and present. Levko's son may have died, but he is still remembered (demonstrated by Levko's inability to turn this son's photograph to the wall, and through the unveiling of the monument to the war dead). Similarly, although his other sons have left the village, it is the moment of their return that the film depicts. Moreover, Levko's grandchild, it is implied, is born in the village, representing the continuation of generations. In this way the film raises issues central to the concept of postmemory and engages in postmemorial work through its attempt to re-assert intergenerational connections. Interestingly, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* is filmed primarily from the perspective of Levko, who represents the first generation. This accords with Hirsch's insistence that postmemory is a structure and not an

⁴⁹⁹ Magocsi calculates that Ukraine suffered the loss of 4.1 million civilians and 1.4 million military personnel. Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, p. 684.

⁵⁰⁰ As reported in the history of Trushivtsi provided on the Chyhyryns'kyi raion website <<http://www.chyhyryn.com/index.php/uk/content-layouts/2010-10-17-11-46-37?start=1>> [accessed 21 August 2012].

⁵⁰¹ See Roman Szporluk, 'Urbanisation in Ukraine since the Second World War', in his *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2000), pp. 139–60.

identity position. *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* aptly demonstrates that cinematic examples of postmemorial work do not have a predetermined perspective from which to consider the intergenerational structure.

Both *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* end with a look towards the future and towards the next generation. In this respect, the films suggest an air of hope and the possibility of continuation and renewal. This interpretation goes against the general trend to view the films as odes to a lost way of life.⁵⁰² Certainly, the films do look to the past and to a traditional way of life that has been passed down from generation to generation, a transmission which appears to have suffered or be threatened with some kind of rupture. Yet, as this thesis has argued, through their use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, the films present the past as something which has not been forgotten and can yet be reconnected with. Central to this is the collaboration with local non-professionals who took part in the filmmaking process. In *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, one of the lead roles was awarded to one such local woman: Levko's neighbour, Maroika, is played by Fedosiia Lytvynenko from the village of Borovytsia.⁵⁰³ This is an important role about which opinion diverged during production. As early as December 1964, when the screenplay was being considered by the studio, it was suggested that there was too much cursing by Maroika ('nadto bahato Maroichynykh laiok'), and that this was reminiscent of Dovzhenko's memories of his great-grandmother in his autobiographical work

⁵⁰² Bleiman criticizes the films for being too oriented towards the past (Bleiman, 'Arkhaisty ili novatory?' pp. 70–71). First concludes his thesis with the observation that 'this dissertation is about people who failed, and who wrote and made films about failure and loss' (First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 320).

⁵⁰³ TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1931, l. 38.

Zacharovana desna (The Enchanted Desna).⁵⁰⁴ In the film, Maroika is the keeper of memory: she is shown digging a hole for a new well – the symbolic repository of memory and tradition – and later, in the cemetery, she silently gathers the wreaths left by Serdiuk's children on the wrong graves and takes them to their rightful place – the gravestone of their mother, Paraska. The children may have left the village and forgotten, but Maroika is still there and remembers. It is significant, therefore, that this character is played by one of the local, non-professional cast.

In fact, it could be argued that not only Maroika but all the villagers function in this manner.⁵⁰⁵ Despite the absence of Levko's children, the villagers are shown on several occasions gathered together in situations of remembering. We see them constructing a building, for example, in the traditional manner using mud and straw. In this sequence, they are filmed in the style of a documentary which highlights the temporality of the recording, emphasizing that these people continue to live in this village. The young women and girls treading down the mud barefoot are thus perceived as evidence of the successful transmission of traditional knowledge. This is made explicit by the editing cuts which present close-up shots of the seven subject's faces in quick succession and in chronological order, moving from the youngest (a girl of around eight years old) to the oldest woman. This is repeated three times to underline the point, before the camera finally rests on an image of the youngest girl's face, who then turns to the camera and smiles. The insinuation is clear: Levko's children may have left, but these young women are still there. Moreover, following

⁵⁰⁴ TsDAMLUMU, f. 1127, op. 1, d. 176, l. 4.

⁵⁰⁵ In this respect, First is too quick to dismiss their role: 'Illienko [...] employed peasants from the Chyhyryn district as extras, functioning more generally within the *massovki*, but also as ethnic decoration' (First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 230).

his return home, Levko's son Petro is only ever seen barefoot, as if he too cannot resist feeling the earth beneath his feet. The implication is that for the viewer, as for Petro, it is not too late to reconnect with one's past. On another occasion, young and old stand together and watch the unveiling of a monument to commemorate the war dead, itself an act of collective memorialization. Illienko has recalled the filming of this particular event:

Ia ryzyknuv stvoryty iliuziiu spravzhnosti. Liudiam po radio oholosyly, aby pryishly na vidkryttia na nediliu. A my vyrishyly reportazhno znimaty, iak use vidbuvaie't'sia, zauvazhu – dlia liudei naspravdi.⁵⁰⁶

Indeed, at a meeting between the SRK and the studio, the film's editor Oleksandr Syzonenko, explained:

Vse znyalos' na naturi, deiaki kadry znyalys' skrytoiu kameroiu (plachut' zhinky, koly vstanovliuiet'sia pam'iatnyk). Tsi liudy otaki vony i ie. My ikh ridko, na zhal', bachymo.⁵⁰⁷

In this interplay between fiction and non-fiction, the film very much accords with trends elsewhere in Europe and, indeed, within the Soviet Union. As discussed in the Introduction, the Italian neorealists had experimented with a documentary-style aesthetic. Closer to home, moreover, Andrei Mikhalkov-Konchalovskii was making the film *Istoriia Asi Kliachinoi, kotoraiia liubila, da ne vyshla zamuzh* (The Story of Asia Kliachina, Who Loved But Did Not Marry, 1966) around the same time as Illienko was filming *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*. Also filmed on location in a rural village (in the Gor'kovskaia (now Nizhegorodskaia) *oblast'* of Russia), Mikhalkov-

⁵⁰⁶ 'I took the risk of creating the illusion of authenticity. It was announced on the radio that people should come to the unveiling on Sunday. And we decided to film everything that happened, like reportage, how it really was for the people who were there, so to speak.' Cited in Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 67.

⁵⁰⁷ 'Everything was filmed on location, and some shots were filmed with a hidden camera (the women crying when the monument is being put up). These people are just as they are. We see them rarely, more's the pity.' TsDAMLMU, f. 1127, op. 1, d. 176, l. 35.

Konchalovskii's film similarly informs its viewers of the non-professional status of the actors who took part (in fact, only three actors were professional). In recalling the filmmaking process, the director has revealed how he also took to concealing the camera: given the inexperience of his filmic subjects, he resorted to the use of multiple cameras to minimize the extent to which they played up to the camera (the actors did not know which camera was loaded with film).⁵⁰⁸ Whilst Mikhalkov-Konchalovskii's film might arguably be considered an example of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, it nevertheless does not form part of the poetic school, according to our definition. *Istoriia Asi Kliachinoi* was not produced at the Dovzhenko Studio, but at Mosfil'm, where it constituted something of an outlier and, like Illienko's film, was banned from release for a similar length of time.

Mikhalkov-Konchalovskii's film is a useful reminder of the interactions and interconnectedness of the Ukrainian poetic school with filmmaking trends beyond its parameters. Yet there are, of course, other points of distinction which differentiate the school. Unlike *Istoriia Asi Kliachinoi*, which is wholly set within the present, for example, the films of the poetic school are (at least partially) set in the past. The use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode to deal with events set in the past is a particularly interesting feature of the poetic school. It has the effect of foregrounding the relationship between past and present, and the theme of memory, with which the films are ultimately concerned. In Chapter Two, we identified the various ways in which the past is located within the filmmaking present in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. In *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* we find this, for example, when Serdiuk recalls felling the

⁵⁰⁸ See Andrei Mikhalkov-Konchalovskii, *Vozvyshaiushchii obman* (Moscow: Kolleksiia 'Sovershenno sekretno', 1999), pp. 39–40.

tree when his son was a young boy. This memory is presented through a particularly interesting combination of static shots, which look like photographs, of Serdiuk cutting down the tree, and moving, documentary-style footage of the villagers who are watching the event. The documentary-style filming – and its juxtaposition with the static images – highlights the temporality of the recording, so that, whilst the sequence is presented as located within the past, the villagers are perceived as belonging to the filmmaking present. In this way, a living connection is forged between past and present, bridging the divide between those years. During another sequence, Serdiuk remembers learning of his son's death during the war. We hear the words of a telegram being read out, informing Serdiuk of the sad news, whilst we see a succession of close-up shots of aged women's faces, looking mournfully into the camera with sorrowful, tear-filled eyes. These moving shots leave no doubt in the viewer's mind that these women have experienced the loss of which the words are speaking. The sound is coming from the narrative past; the documentary-style filming of the women's faces positions them within the filmmaking present.

The use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* when dealing with events set in the past is similar to its usage in *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, whereby the past is shown to be something that is being remembered in the filmmaking present. Unlike this latter film, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, as we have noted, also contains narrative elements that are set in the (filmmaking) present. (A similar movement within the narrative between past and present can also be found in *Bili khmary*, which is discussed below.) Here, too, however, the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is used to establish a connection between past and present:

villagers are seen in the filmmaking present remembering and performing tasks in the traditional manner. When they are shown constructing a building using mud and straw, the camera participates in the action, moving along with the bucket of water that is being passed from hand to hand. The dynamic camera conveys to the viewer a sense of the experience, and the focus on hands and feet – the things through which we feel the world around us – during this sequence provokes us to imagine what it might be like to be in that environment. In this way, the viewer is invited to participate herself in the action and in the passing down of tradition. The Experiential Ethnographic Mode acts as a counter to the forgetting that seemingly threatens the traditional way of life.

Ultimately, whether dealing with the narrative past or the narrative present, the use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode in *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* is one of the principal mechanisms by means of which the film deals with the issue of memory and its transference between generations. Whilst the film outlines the threat posed to the passing down of memory and a traditional way of life, it is the Experiential Ethnographic Mode which attempts to re-forge a connection between past and present, and young and old. In this lies the postmemorial work of the film.

Kaminnyi khrest

Four years Illienko's junior, Leonid Osyka was born in 1940 in Kyiv. From early childhood he displayed an interest in and talent for art, which led to his enrolment at the Odesa Theatre and Art School, where he specialized in make-up artistry and portraiture. Upon graduation, he tried to win a place at VGIK, but was initially unsuccessful. In the spring of 1959, however, he received a letter from Sergei

Gerasimov inviting him back to Moscow, where he was finally admitted onto the directing course.⁵⁰⁹ As a student, Osyka gained experience working on Denysenko's *Son* at the Dovzhenko Studio, during which time he also put together the coursework piece *Dvoie* (Two, 1964), in which the roles were performed by Mykolaichuk and Antonina Leftii.⁵¹⁰ Following this, Osyka's next work was the short film *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more*, again featuring Leftii, this time as a young woman who takes her daughter to the beach for her first swim. Intended as his graduation piece, the work was charged with formalism by the diploma commission.⁵¹¹ However, this pronouncement seemingly did not hinder the young director, who instead defended his diploma with his next film, *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'*.

Although Osyka's most celebrated work, *Kaminnyi khrest*, constitutes the main focus of this section, it is worth considering briefly these earlier pieces for the insights which they bring to our analysis. As already noted, *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more* is a short film which lasts just under fifteen minutes. It is based on a screenplay written by Ievhen Khryniuk and Osyka, and was shot in colour by camera operator Mykhailo Bielikov, with Sofiia Serhiienko acting as sound operator. The images are accompanied by the music of Volodymyr Huba, and the film is entirely without dialogue, although human voices are heard in the opening sequence. This sequence begins with a long take in which the camera performs a slow panorama of a crowded beach. The screen is entirely filled with bodies, which the camera surveys in a detached, observational style. Indeed, bodies are the focus of the film – in particular,

⁵⁰⁹ Oleksandr Bezruchko, 'Osoblyvosti tvorechoi i pedahohichnoi dial'nosti Leonida Mykhailovycha Osyky', *Kul'tura i Suchasnist'*, 2 (2010), <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/kis/2010_2/30.pdf> [accessed 3 June 2012].

⁵¹⁰ Unfortunately, the work has not survived. Briukhovets'ka, *Leonid Osyka*, p. 25.

⁵¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

their interaction with the surrounding environment. The camera pauses, and it becomes apparent that we are watching a young woman in a white dress weave her way through the crowds. She is holding in her arms a young girl, played by Tania Malysh, also clad in a white dress. The clamour of the crowds fades away as Huba's experimental music enters the soundtrack. The woman sits on the sand amidst the crowd and undresses the young girl. A cut is then made to a long shot of the naked Malysh, standing all alone on the beach by the sea. The crowds disappear for the remainder of the film as we focus on the interaction between environment and individual. Above all, the film tries to stimulate our tactile sense, to awaken our sense of touch so that we might feel how the bodies we are watching interact with the world around them. An aerial shot of the rippling sea fills the screen so that we almost do not recognize it, and our eye instead lingers over its textures and surfaces. Then suddenly a male swimmer breaks into the space of the screen, followed by another and then another. The preceding haptic image of the water has stimulated our senses so that we might understand through our own body the experience of the swimmers'. Images of skin draw attention to our sense of touch. We watch a young woman smear her skin with mud, the properties of which no doubt promise to make it as soft as the young girl's skin, the beauty of which we see in the next shot as she stands at the shoreline bathed in sunshine. We are made aware of skin, for example when the young man stands with arms lifted bathing himself in the rays of the sun, or when his back is shown half-covered with sand. We see the mother's outstretched arms as her fingers part to release from her palms the shells that she is holding – another, altogether different texture and material emanating from this environment. She is then

seen buried beneath these shells, with only her head and two hands visible. In this static shot – the composition of which is reminiscent of Paradzhanov's style – the body is entirely encased within the surrounding landscape, making us aware of flesh interacting with its environment. The young girl slowly places two shells over her mother's eyes, so that she may no longer see and only feel. Drops of water are then gently sprinkled onto the woman's skin, adding another texture to the composition. Each of these sequences contributes to our growing awareness of the sense of touch, which reaches its culmination in the final episode in which the young girl takes her first swim in the sea. Both mother and daughter are immersed in the water and encased in its embrace. As the girl moves from the safety of her mother's arms and splashes out on her own, we almost feel with her the sensation of liberation as her body supports itself in and through this new environment.

An interest in the relationship between people and their natural surroundings is also displayed in Osyka's next film, *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'*. Shot in black and white, and lasting just over sixty minutes, the film reunites Osyka with a number of artists with whom he worked for *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more*, including Bielikov and Huba. *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'* (which originates from a screenplay-writing competition entered by writers Lina Kostenko and Arkadii Dobrovol's'kyi in 1962) has a complicated production history. Their screenplay, entitled *Perevirte svoi hodynnyky* (Coordinate Your Watches), was awarded second place which, according to the conditions of the competition, meant that it would be taken onto the screen. Accordingly, in 1964, *Perevirte svoi hodynnyky* went into production at the Dovzhenko Studio under the directorship of Vasyl' Illiashchenko, another recent

graduate from VGIK.⁵¹² Based on real events and characters, the screenplay concerned the wartime experiences of three Ukrainian poets, Volodymyr Bulaienko, Leonid Levyts'kyi and Fedir Shvyndin. However, when the studio came to view the filmed material in December 1965, work was halted and, in early 1966, the crew was strengthened with the addition of Osyka, to whom the film was officially passed in April 1966 for re-working.⁵¹³ First notes that the original budget and timescale were maintained, meaning that Osyka's film crew had to stay in Kyiv and 'shoot exclusively on the studio grounds'.⁵¹⁴ As a result, he concludes that 'the look of *Love Awaits* resembles Paradzhanov's artless *mise-en-scène* in *Kyiv Frescoes*, with a focus on medium interior shots, and frequent cutaways of objects of material culture'.⁵¹⁵ In actual fact, of the 1805 metres of film which made up the final edited version, only 296 metres were shot in the studio (the scenes inside Iarina's *khata* and the poet's flat).⁵¹⁶ In addition to filming in Kyiv *oblast'*, the film crew spent thirty-eight days shooting in Kaniv (a town situated in the Cherkas'ka *oblast'*, around one hundred miles from Kyiv), where, inter alia, they filmed the scenes with the poet stranded by the river Dnipro, along with two days filming in L'viv.⁵¹⁷ Whilst First overlooks the extent of location shooting that the crew were able to include, his assessment is

⁵¹² Briukhovets'ka, *Leonid Osyka*, p. 31.

⁵¹³ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 729, l. 5. Illiashchenko had already produced 1500 metres of material by the end of 1965, 162 metres of which Osyka planned to incorporate into his re-worked version. However, it was eventually decided that even this small amount of footage could not be used. *Ibid.*, l. 8.

⁵¹⁴ First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 246.

⁵¹⁵ *Ibid.*.

⁵¹⁶ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 729, ll. 9 & 17. Nonetheless, it appears that Illiashchenko had planned to shoot in a much wider range of locations, including Krakow, Oster, Ovruch and L'viv. *Ibid.*, l. 27.

⁵¹⁷ In addition, a small amount of footage (twenty metres) of St Petersburg's Piskarev memorial park is included in the film, along with archival footage of combat. *Ibid.*, l. 27.

nonetheless valuable in drawing attention to the particular role that Kyiv plays in Osyka's film. Indeed, the film opens with a panorama of the city, as the camera roams over its distinctive skyline, with the tall chimney stacks and high-rise buildings that extend along the river Dnipro. As the camera surveys its surroundings, a voice-over begins to recite a poem by Semen Gudzenko:

Ia rodilsia v etom gorode, ros.
Mne ne nado v etom gorode, roz,
Mne ne nado v etom gorode dach,
Mne ne nado zdes' udach i neudach.
Tishiny by mne kashtanovoi s vesny,
Ia by nachal iunost' zanovo, pust' s voiny.
Tol'ko bylo b to gorenje, tot poryv,
Chtob moe stikhotvorenje na obryv
Vyvelo menia bezumnogo v noch' odnu
Iz pritikhshogo, neshumnogo – na voynu.

The words of the poem therefore emphasize this focus on place, and Gudzenko (like Osyka) was indeed born in Kyiv, in 1922. As First notes, Gudzenko was not in fact Ukrainian, and always wrote in Russian.⁵¹⁸ However, we might assume that it was Gudzenko's associations with Kyiv, the city in which he was born and about which he wrote, that led Osyka to use his poetry in the film. (Indeed, such an understanding supports our assertion that the poetic school is less concerned with the 'national' but rather is concerned with a more local conception of the relationship between people and the space in which they live.) It is Gudzenko's poetry which lent Osyka the title for his re-working of the original screenplay, stemming from the poem 'Moe pokolenie' (My Generation), which is recited towards the end of the film. The (restricted) choice of shooting location therefore had a distinct influence on the work that emerged. Perhaps for this reason, Kostenko was unable to associate the

⁵¹⁸ First, 'Scenes of Belonging', p. 241.

completed film with her original screenplay, writing to the chief editor of the studio, Vasył' Zemliak, in October 1966 with the request that her name be removed from the credits:

Oskil'ky pislia ponovlennia roboty nad fil'mom 'Zvirte svoi hodynnyky' vsi epizody byly napysani abo tvorcho pereosmysleni rezhysyrom L. Osyko, i faktychno nichoho z napysanoho mnoiu ne uviishlo v kartynu, - proshu zniaty moie im'ia z tytriv. Pytannia avtorstva polyshaiu na rozsud L. Osyky. Z povnym pravom L. Osyka mozhe postavyty v tytrakh svoie im'ia.⁵¹⁹

Osyka's film takes only one narrative thread from the original screenplay – that of the poet Bulaienko. Nonetheless, the poet is never named in the film and perhaps becomes an amalgamation of both Bulaienko and Gudzenko, both of whose poetry is heard in the film, and both of whom are listed in the opening title:

Pamiati poeta-soldata
V fil'me ispol'zovany stikhi Vladimira Bulaenko
Semena Gudzenko.⁵²⁰

The narrative follows the poet's journey from his family home to join the troops fighting at the front. After narrowly escaping death in combat, he experiences life in occupied territory before joining a group of partisans. A plot to blow up a German train goes awry as the partisans come to believe that the train is in fact carrying passengers. The poet rushes to stop the train in its tracks, before it reaches the bomb. A gunfight then ensues between the Germans and the partisans, during which the poet manages to open the door to one of the train wagons, only to discover that it contains not people but Ukrainian earth. The fertile black soil spills out of the wagon, so that

⁵¹⁹ 'Insofar as all the scenes were written or creatively re-thought by the director L. Osyka after work on the film *Coordinate Your Watches* was renewed, and practically nothing written by myself has made it into the film, I ask you to remove my name from the credits. I leave the question of authorship to the judgement of Osyka. Osyka has every right to put his own name onto the credits.' TsDAMLMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 1782, l. 2.

⁵²⁰ This analysis is based on the original version of the film held at the Dovzhenko Film Studio. Both Russian and Ukrainian are heard in the film, although the titles are in Russian.

the poet is immersed within it. Although we do not witness the event, it is implied that he is then shot by one of the German soldiers who approaches him.

What is particularly interesting about the film is the way in which Osyka embeds this narrative within a documentary fabric – one which pertains in particular to Kyiv. As we have noted, the film opens with a panorama of present-day Kyiv accompanied by the recital of Gudzenko's poem. As the camera pans round, we see various individuals, some of whom notice the camera and whom we understand to be ordinary Kyivans also gathered there to enjoy the view. The poem finishes and the camera focuses on the stone surface of a wall before a cut is made to a close-up shot of another granite surface. Initially, we are unable to recognize what we are seeing. The haptic image instead invites us to roam over its surface, exploring its texture with our eyes. We hear a tapping sound, and a cut is then made to a shot of an engraver's hands at work on a memorial plaque. He is chiselling the date '1944' next to a long list of names – the war dead. At this point a new voice-over begins. A woman is heard to recollect:

Provozhala... duzhe vazhko meni bulo, iak ia ioho provozhala. Znaiete, iak maty provozha syniv. Duzhe plakala, duzhe. Vse. Bulo obidno duzhe.⁵²¹

A second voice then continues, this time speaking in Russian with a Ukrainian accent, followed by a third voice speaking in Ukrainian. As they talk and recollect saying goodbye to their sons, who were going off to war, we watch various engravers at work, before the camera performs another slow panorama, this time of a military cemetery. The camera travels over the stone plaques before coming to rest on one which is as yet unmarked. The voices fall silent, and the credits then inform us that

⁵²¹ 'I accompanied him... it was very difficult for me, how I accompanied him. You know, how a mother accompanies her sons. I cried a lot, an awful lot. That's it. It was very painful.'

they are in fact the recordings of non-professional actors, in essence the oral histories of the mothers of soldiers who died in combat. The way in which the languages weave between Ukrainian and Russian, and at times *surzhyk* (a hybrid of the two), corresponds to the linguistic fabric of Kyiv, and it is tempting to conclude that the recordings were taken in that city. In this way, Osyka uses documentary recordings of present-day Kyiv and its inhabitants to narrate the story which is set in the past. The voices punctuate the narrative past. Thus, for example, when the poet meets Tania, with whom he is in love, one of the women is heard recollecting her son's wartime romance. At the end of the film, when the poet is covered in earth, a woman recalls:

Prikhodit nemets. Nam pokazal syhat' i vse. Kogda my ikh sprashivali: "Zachem eto?" a oni govoriat, chto eto zemlia ochen' khoroshaia. I my vashu zemliu budem syhat' na svoiu i u nas budut urozhai khoroshie. Kazhdyi ofitser imel pravo vyvozit' sebe odnu platformu.

This scene brings together the key themes of the poetic school: memory and the relationship of people to the land on which they live. It is the final scene of the narrative past. A cut is then made to a sequence of various shots of memorial cemeteries before the camera performs a final, slow panorama of military gravestones as two women's voices are heard recollecting how they learnt of their son's death. Much like the poet is embedded within the Black Earth, the narrative past is embedded within a documentary-style super-narrative, set in the filmmaking present. In this final shot, we are led to understand that underneath these plaques lie the remains of countless soldiers, who, in death, are also encased within the Black Earth. Yet the preceding image of the poet standing alive amidst the earth suggests that these soldiers live on – in our memory, and in the very land of which they are now a part.

Osyka's preoccupation with the relationship between people and the land around them, evident in both *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more* and *Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt'*, finds its greatest expression in his next film for the studio, *Kaminnyi khrest*. The film, which can be divided into two parts, with an introduction and an epilogue, is closely based on two short stories by Ukrainian writer Vasyl' Stefanyk: 'Kaminnyi khrest' (The Stone Cross, 1899), a story about an old man who reluctantly leaves his native village and emigrates to Canada, and 'Zlodii' (The Thief, 1900), which tells of a man who is caught red-handed attempting to rob a peasant house and of his subsequent treatment and punishment by the owner and his neighbours. In Osyka's adaptation, the latter story is inserted into the former and the two are united by making the central character of 'Kaminnyi khrest' (an old man called Ivan Didukh) the homeowner of 'Zlodii'. The fundamental association between the two stories, however, can perhaps be traced to this earlier preoccupation of Osyka's. The introduction, based on the opening section of Stefanyk's 'Kaminnyi khrest', shows Ivan Didukh labouring over his unforgiving plot of land (Stefanyk refers to this as 'the highest and the worst in all the village' (shchonaivyshchoho i shchonaihirshoho nad use sil's'ke pole)), located on a hill.⁵²² It begins with an aerial shot of Didukh driving his horse and cart up the slope. A deep ravine in the earth – a symbolic presentiment of the forthcoming separation facing Didukh – divides the screen into two, with the old man slowly making his way up the left-hand side. We then watch him continue on his path, as he slowly climbs barefoot up the steep hill, to the mournful notes of Huba's stirring melody. With each editing cut, the camera moves

⁵²² Vasyl' Stefanyk, 'Kaminnyi khrest', in *Novely* (Uzhhorod: Karpaty, 1977), pp. 40–50 (p. 41).

successively closer to its subject. The opening shots are filmed in such a way as to emphasize the commonality between Didukh and his land, of which he is, in essence, a part. When we see Didukh in close-up, we notice that the lines on his face mirror the cracks on the dry earth; and that his body is shaped by the contours of the land, bent over from having climbed the hill for so many years. Indeed, a piece of the land actually embeds itself into his body: he stops to extract from his foot a splinter which, unable to remove, he hammers into his heel instead. The theme of emigration, of one's removal from one's homeland, is then introduced when Didukh shouts at a bird, who is merrily chirping away:

Lety sobi het' do neba, i skazhy tvoiemu bohovi, nai meni durnu ptakhu ne posylaie z spivom. Koly takyi vin motsnyi, nai meni v Kanadu ne zasylaie.⁵²³

Finally, the camera reverses its opening movement by making a series of cuts to successively distant shots until eventually all we can see is the land, into which Didukh has seamlessly blended. This final shot lasts several seconds, long enough for our eye to cease identifying the image and instead to explore the textures and surfaces which it presents. In so doing, we are encouraged to feel the land as Didukh does with his bare feet. In this respect, *Kaminnyi khrest*, along with *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* and *Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more*, display the same fascination with hands and feet that we identified in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* and, latterly, *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*.

⁵²³ 'Fly yourself off to Heaven and tell that God of yours not to send me a stupid bird with its song. If he is so powerful, let him not send me to Canada.' This line is, in fact, adapted from Stefanyk's story 'Syny' (The Sons, 1922), which concerns old Maksym, whose two sons have died fighting for Ukrainian land. Several other lines during the film's introductory sequence are taken from this later story. In this way, the theme of descendants is interwoven into the film: old Maksym has no direct descendants in 'Syny' to whom to leave his land. Despite Maksym's lack of an heir, Osyka's film, as we shall see, presents the villagers as belonging to the filmmaking present, thereby suggesting that life in the village continues.

Having clearly established in the introduction an interest in the relationship between individuals and the land on which they live, the film moves straight into the first section, based on the story *Zlodii*. In the highly charged and atmospheric scenes which follow, we watch how old Didukh surprises a thief in his yard, whom he wounds with a pitchfork. The old man then takes the thief into his home, where they are joined by Didukh's neighbours, Mykhailo and Heorhii. Both interloper and invited guests are treated to the host's hospitality alike, as the fate of the thief is decided. Mykhailo begins his questioning thus:

A skazhy nam, choloviche, zvidky ty zabriv u nashe selo, chy ty blyz'kyi, chy dalekyi?⁵²⁴

This seemingly innocuous question (to which the thief replies, 'Ia zi svita' (I am from the world)), provides a pointer to how the two stories are connected. The thief is a stranger to these lands. It does not matter where he is from; the point is that he is an outsider. The dialogue continues, and we realize, along with the thief, that his punishment is to be beaten to death. He is destined to die in lands that are unfamiliar to him. There will be no funeral; there will be no cross on his grave. As the transition is then made to the next section of the film, the link between the two stories is made clear: Didukh is shown hauling a stone cross up the steep slope of his land. He, too, is destined to die in unfamiliar territories, but he will make sure to erect a cross to his memory on his native soil before departing.

During this second section of the film, the story returns to Stefanyk's 'Kaminnyi khrest' and we watch the villagers gather at Didukh's *khata* to bid their farewells. Didukh asks his guests if they will say a mass for him and his wife when

⁵²⁴ 'Tell us, man, from where you have come into our village. Are you from near or far?'

news reaches the village of their death, and explains that he has left some money with which to pay for this. He then tells them how he has erected a cross on his land and asks that they do not omit his old plot when they bless their own. In this way, Didukh ensures that the thief's fate is not to be his own. A group of blind musicians then begin to play a *hutsulka* and the villagers break out into dance. Didukh calls his family into the *khata* as it is time to get changed (*po-pansky* (in the nobleman's style)) for the journey. When the family re-emerge, the villagers almost do not recognize them in their new outfits. Didukh asks the musicians to play him a polka and he dances with his wife. His is then forcibly carried back inside by his sons, presumably so that they may begin the journey. With this the film moves to the epilogue, in which a church service is heard whilst we watch the family leave their home. The whole village has gathered to accompany them on the first part of their journey out of the village. Finally, the family are alone, walking over Didukh's plot of land. They pause as they pass the stone cross before heading off into the distance. As the family disappear over the horizon, the camera pulls back to reveal the last focus of its gaze: the stone cross.

Self-evidently, the film is concerned with people's connection to the land on which they live. Furthermore, like the other films of the school which we have so far examined, it is also concerned with the issue of memory. The final words of the film are 'vichnaia pam'iat" (eternal memory), sung in unison during the funeral service which accompanies the epilogue. These words ring out as we see a long shot of the villagers gathered outside the church, having bid their farewells to Didukh and his family. As we have now come to expect from the poetic school, these villagers are

played by non-professional actors, native to the area in which the film was shot, and the implication is that they have stayed in the village and they have remembered. This is perhaps made more explicit during the gathering at Didukh's *khata* in the second section of the film, when Heorhii says to the old man:

Tsia zemlia ne hodna stil'ky narodu zderzhity ta i stil'ky bidi vitrymaty.
Muzhyk ne hoden, i vona ne hodna, oboie vzhe ne hodni.⁵²⁵

Yet the image then cuts to a static shot of a group of aged men sitting on the grass talking. They do not notice the camera, which observes them for some twenty seconds in the documentary-style way of filming, which is characteristic of this section. The shot seems to undermine Heorhii's words, written by Stefanyk almost seventy years earlier. Certainly, these men have endured hardships – that much is inscribed onto their bodies. Yet they have survived; they do persist. And they have stayed: *Kaminnyi khrest* was filmed in Rusiv, the village in Ivano-Frankivs'ka *oblast'* where Stefanyk was born. Rusiv is located in an area of western Ukraine historically known as Pokuttia, and much of Stefanyk's work – including 'Kaminnyi khrest' and 'Zlodii' – was set in this area. In fact, 'Kaminnyi khrest' is based on real events, and the character of Ivan Didukh is modeled on that of Ivan Akhtemiichuk, one of the first peasants from Rusiv to emigrate to Canada.⁵²⁶ As with *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, the story of *Kaminnyi khrest* belongs to the place in which it is set and, accordingly, following Paradzhanov's example, Osyka set off with his crew to Rusiv in order to make his adaptation. In total, they spent 123 days filming on location in Rusiv and neighbouring villages Beleluia and Stetseva, between September 1967 and January

⁵²⁵ 'This land is not able to support so many people or so many misfortunes. The peasant is unable to do so and the land is unable; both are unable.'

⁵²⁶ Briukhovets'ka, *Leonid Osyka*, p. 42.

1968. Shooting began slightly later than planned, however, necessitating an additional trip to Ashgabat in January 1968 in order to film the scene in which Didukh carries the cross up the hill. During this scene, the old man was required to wear light clothing, which was not feasible in the height of winter in Rusiv.⁵²⁷ The seasonal changes experienced by the film crew are reflected in the film so that, as with *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, we witness the duration of the filmmaking process through the landscape. This is perhaps unintentional, but it is nevertheless effective. When the villagers are gathered outside the Didukhs' home, the camera wanders through the crowd of people, almost becoming part of the scene yet at the same time maintaining the detached air of an observational documentary. During this long take, the camera performs a series of 360 degree turns so that we see the surrounding landscape from all angles, extending for miles into the distance. (The long takes during this section of the film suggest the camera cannot tear its gaze away from the scene, much as Didukh finds it difficult to tear himself away from the village.) It is autumn and the villagers are wrapped up warmly in their sheepskin coats (*kozhukhy*), yet the sun is shining. When the musicians arrive, they sit down on the grass and join those who are picnicking there. Shortly afterwards, when the Didukhs emerge from their *khata* dressed in their new clothes, the grass is covered with a smattering of snow, which forms a slippery surface on which Didukh slides during his polka dance. Finally, during the epilogue, the Didukhs drive their cart through the thick snow of winter which has completely covered the landscape. The second half of the film, therefore, progresses from autumn to winter whilst at the same time presenting itself as a continuous stream of events. One might expect this to disrupt the illusion of

⁵²⁷ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 1212, l. 6.

continuity, yet the changes in the landscape actually mirror the emotional development of this section as the Didukh family detach themselves from the village. The key stage in this process is the moment when they emerge from their home no longer wearing traditional local clothing, which also marks the transition in the landscape from autumn to winter.

This pivotal moment in the film is also enhanced through the use of sound. As the Didukhs are presented in their new garb we hear the eerie four-note leitmotif that has hitherto been associated with the group of blind musicians. Previously, this sound has endowed the musicians with a strange quality and presented them as somehow 'other'. Similarly, when the notes are heard in conjunction with a new group – the Didukhs – we understand that they too have become 'other'. The blind musicians are an interesting example of how the filmmaking process evolved spontaneously on location. As Chernetsky has noted, 'these were, in fact, an actual wandering group of musicians who performed at local village weddings and celebrations, the filmmaker's lucky find'.⁵²⁸ The musicians certainly were a lucky find (and provide another layer of intertextuality with *Tini zabutykh predkiv* in which the voice of a *lirnyk* is heard throughout the film), yet they are not the only musical performers in the film: Didukh, Mykhailo and Heorhii sing the folk song 'Oi z-za hory kam'ianoï' (Oh, Behind the Rocky Mountain) during the second section of the film. This song is an ode to the passing years and is therefore particularly suited to the films of the poetic school with their focus on time and memory.⁵²⁹ During the farewell scene outside the Didukhs' *khata* the villagers can also be heard seemingly breaking out

⁵²⁸ Chernetsky, 'Visual language', p. 278.

⁵²⁹ Indeed, the song also features in *Bili khmary*, where it is sung by a young boy to a group of elderly men.

into spontaneous song as they sit on the grass enjoying their picnic. In fact, the villagers' voices are heard throughout this section in snatches of conversations that are picked up as the camera roams amongst the crowd. In this way, the Pokuttia accent permeates the film – even in its dubbed Russian version, where the villagers' voices can still be heard in the background. The desire to stay true to Stefanyk's writing and keep the Pokuttia dialect was a priority for the filmmakers. Before filming even began, at a studio meeting to discuss the screenplay in May 1967, Osyka explained that they would try to maintain the 'stefanovskii dialekt'.⁵³⁰ In September 1967, it was agreed that a language consultant be present during filming and sound editing in order to keep the dialectical colour of Pokuttia (*dialektychnyi movnyi koloryt Pokuttia*).⁵³¹ The filmmakers may well have hoped to follow in the wake of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, and for the film to be shown on all-Soviet screens in its original version. This was not to be the case, however, and the film was dubbed into Russian at the Dovzhenko Studio in April 1968.⁵³²

The filmmakers were clearly concerned with maintaining an aural link between the place in which the story is set and the people who live there. Fundamental to this was the use of local, non-professional actors, whose voices are heard in the background, forming a kind of melodic accompaniment. The function of these actors, however, was not limited to that of background cast. Didukh's wife is played by Kateryna Mateik, a peasant woman from Rusiv, whose performance was

⁵³⁰ TsDAMLUMU, f. 1127, op. 1, d. 291, l. 9.

⁵³¹ TsDAMLUMU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 2082, l. 19.

⁵³² Responsibility for producing the dubbed version of *Kaminnyi khrest* was handed to the original director, which was not always the case.

commended in the studio's final conclusions on the film.⁵³³ Indeed, a number of non-professionals were awarded speaking parts that had originally been intended for professional artists. An established actress (Liubov Komarets'ka) was scheduled to play the role of Timofeikha, but this was in fact performed by a local collective farm worker; Iakiv was supposed to be played by a theatre actor from Zhytomyr but was actually played by Volodymyr Rohuzhinskii from the theatre in nearby Kolomyia; and the role of 'Horbatyi (hunchback) Andrii' was intended to be played by an artist from the folk theatre but was instead given to a collective farmer from the village Beleluia.⁵³⁴ In terms of casting, the filmmaking process clearly had a deep impact on the filmic product. Perhaps the most interesting choice of casting in this respect is the elderly woman who is the last person to leave the Didukhs' *khata* when the family go inside to change their clothes. One by one, a stream of villagers come out of the *khata* and cross themselves. Finally, the last person leaves and closes the door behind her. She crosses herself several times and says: 'Vo im'ia Ottsa i Syna i Sviatoho Dukha. Amin'" (In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen). This woman was a resident of Beleluia and the last remaining witness of the emigration of the Akhtemiichuk family at the time of filming.⁵³⁵ In saying her prayer, she demonstrates that the past continues to be remembered in the (filmmaking) present; she effectively fulfils Didukh's request that he be remembered in the village. It is therefore fitting that the final image of the film is that of the stone cross. The Didukhs have departed, but the stone cross remains and they will be remembered. And we should not overlook the fact that the camera (and thus the viewer) remains in the village too.

⁵³³ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 1211, l. 26.

⁵³⁴ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 1212, l. 25.

⁵³⁵ Briukhovets'ka, *Leonid Osyka*, p. 46.

In Osyka's work we have traced the development of a particular theme: the relationship between people and the land on which they live. This theme is most clearly elaborated in *Kaminnyi khrest* and, as we have seen, is a theme shared by Illienko's *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* and Paradzhanov's *Tini zabutykh predkiv*. More specifically, each of these films, which we have termed the inner core of Ukrainian poetic cinema, deals with a perceived rupture in the relationship between people and the land, and in the flow of memory between generations by means of which this relationship has endured. Ivan dies without leaving any heirs; Serdiuk's children have all left the village; and the Didukh family reluctantly decide to emigrate. At the same time, however, the films also suggest the possibility of overcoming this rupture and of bridging the divide. This is achieved through the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. By going out on location and filming non-professional actors in their own environment, the films attempt to portray a way of life that *has* endured and that *is* remembered. By means of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, moreover, a sense of that filmmaking experience is imparted on the film which, in turn, evokes in the viewer the sensation of being there herself. In this way, the films seem to reach out to the viewer in an attempt to engage her in the processes of remembering that are being shown on screen. In light of this, it is suggested, the films serve as useful illustrations of postmemorial work.

The postmemorial nature of the films of the poetic school is reflected in their acute concern with the parent-child relationship. The filmmakers are drawn to the theme of memory flow between generations, and to a way of life that existed prior to their birth. Their films display a preoccupation with the relationship between the

people and the land, a relationship which has been transformed by the various traumatic events of the recent past. Of all the films, it is *Bili khmary* which most directly tackles this issue. Whilst this film does not belong to the inner core of the poetic school (although shot on location, the film makes no direct reference to the participation of non-professional local residents, and the collaborative nature of the filmmaking process is less evident than in the works that constitute the school's inner core), it merits attention alongside these works given the insights that it brings to our discussion of the postmemorial nature of the school.

Bili khmary

Rolan Serhiienko, who had joined the studio in 1963, had recently made the documentary *Osviychennia v liubovi* (Declarations of Love, 1966), in which he portrayed different generations of Ukrainian women and their relationship with the land. It was on the basis of this film that the Dovzhenko Studio management decided to entrust him with the adaptation of studio editor Oleksandr Syzonenko's novella *Bili khmary*, believing that it would particularly suit his artistic manner. Born in 1923 in a small village in Mykolaivs'ka *oblast'*, southern Ukraine, Syzonenko had moved to Kyiv in 1962 and begun working at the Dovzhenko Studio as a writer and editor. His novella, written during 1963 and 1964, tells the story of a man travelling from Kyiv to his home town to see his dying father. It presents itself as a stream of consciousness, as the protagonist moves between events taking place in the present to recollections of the past, principally of his childhood during the early years of collectivization, in which his father took an active part. Most of the events take place in the village of Novooleksandrivka, where the protagonist (and Syzonenko himself)

was born, and the nearby town of Bashtanka, where his father is lying in hospital. Whilst in many respects the argument as to the postmemorial nature of the film *Bilikhmary* might reasonably be extended to encompass the original novella, we will here restrict ourselves to considering the potential of cinema as a medium for postmemorial work.

For the filmic adaptation of this work, it was decided that the narrative should be composed of two strands which would be distinguished stylistically: the son's journey across present-day Ukraine would be filmed in the style of a documentary to contrast with the memory sequences set in the past.⁵³⁶ It was presumably with this in mind that the studio deemed the work so suitable for Serhiienko. Shooting began in Mykolaiivs'ka *oblast'* in October 1967, and by July 1968 the film was completed. Shot in black and white, the film lasts just over sixty minutes. Its plot is straightforward: a man is driving from Kyiv to his home town, Bashtanka, to reach his dying father who is in hospital there. During his journey across Ukraine, he reflects upon various events in his father's life. He gives a lift to an old woman who recognizes him from his youth, and they discuss the past. When the son arrives at the hospital, his father at first cannot see him, but recognizes him by his voice. The son spends the night at his childhood home, and when he returns to the hospital the next day his father dies.

Intertwined with this simple plot is another storyline, which takes place some thirty or so years before the son's journey. This storyline shows the father as a young man in Bashtanka engaged in the collectivization of the land sometime in the early 1930s. The son is also present in this storyline as a young boy of around nine years

⁵³⁶ For more on the stylistic distinction between the two narrative strands, see JJ Gurga, 'Remembering (in) Ukrainian Cinema of the 1960s: Rolan Serhiienko's *White Clouds*', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 5 (2011), 353–70.

old. We see the father, Sashko, struggle over the dekulakization of his rich neighbour, Lutsenko. As Lutsenko leaves the village, he warns Sashko that not everyone will hand over their keys as peacefully as he has done. Stepan Andrieiev, a representative from the Central Committee, arrives to assist in the collectivization, and stays with Sashko's family. Things seem to be going well when a representative from the ObKom (Regional Committee) arrives with a new and unachievable plan for the collective farm. Sashko looks in horror at the new plan as he realises that 'on the basis of this plan the people and the collective farm will be left with no bread'. Andrieiev stands up to the ObKom representative, whom he accuses of serving the kulaks, and sends him away from the village. However, victory is short-lived as Andrieiev is murdered, ostensibly by kulaks. Sashko gives an impassioned speech at Andrieiev's funeral as the coffin is pulled along by a tractor.

The two storylines are intercut with one another, thus creating the impression that the narrative set in the past is to be interpreted as the son's memories during the journey to his dying father. This reflects the narrative structure of the novella, although the latter incorporates a much wider range of memories than the film, which focuses only on collectivization. Clearly, there are strong parallels with Dovzhenko's *Zemlia*, which also deals with the early years of collectivization in Ukraine. *Zemlia* also depicts the introduction of tractors to the peasant farmers, an old man's death and a young man's murder. In *Bili khmary*, Serhiienko therefore enters into dialogue with his former teacher. In some respects, however, it might be characterized as a polemic. Whilst *Zemlia* deals with voluntary collectivization, *Bili khmary* looks further ahead and introduces a level of central interference through the presentation of

the ObKom's new plan to the collective farmers. Furthermore, Serhienko's representation of the kulak, Lutsenko, is far more ambivalent than that which Dovzhenko provides. The stunningly beautiful images of plenty, for which *Zemlia* is renowned, find a hollow echo towards the end of Serhienko's film, when the father and son are depicted standing in a field littered with watermelons.⁵³⁷ This strange image strikes a note of discord with the well-known images of ripe fruit with which *Zemlia* concludes.

Whilst the film certainly looks back – towards the 1930s and towards Dovzhenko – it also looks forward, and is an experimental and daring film, both thematically and stylistically. One of its more innovative techniques lies in the treatment of time and point of view; here, two points must be noted which are crucial to understanding how the film engages in postmemorial work, and which differ from the original novella. In the film, the memories which are prompted by the father's imminent death relate solely to collectivization, suggesting the centrality of this period for the intergenerational relationship and, arguably, the cathartic nature of its recollection. However, there are three scenes in the film which cannot be located in time. All that can be stated about these scenes is that they occur at some point in time between the collectivization and the son's journey. Curiously, the first of these unlocatable scenes is the opening scene of the film, in which two men are seen at an airport. Their conversation is not heard, only the diegetic sound of the airplane engines and the non-diegetic accompaniment of a song. This opening scene – the second longest in the film – remains impenetrable until near the end. It is only some fifty minutes into the film, when the son enters his father's hospital room, that we

⁵³⁷ *Bashtan* is the Ukrainian word for melon-field.

recognize retrospectively the two men from the opening scene. In this way, the viewer is called upon to perform her own act of remembering. The novella does not operate in such a way and, instead of the scene at the airport, it describes how the father used to visit his son in Kyiv during the autumn.⁵³⁸ There is no suggestion of this level of contact between father and son in the film; indeed, the absence of their voices in the soundtrack during the airport scene perhaps suggests a degree of estrangement. Yet even with the two men now identified, the opening scene remains un-locatable in space and time. The film's cyclical structure and inclusion of scenes from unknown 'time-spaces' present the act of remembering as a non-linear experience of time, in which the viewer participates. By encouraging the viewer to experience the sensation of remembering, the film engages in postmemorial work.

The viewer's retrospective recognition of the son introduces the second point to note: the son's journey is shown in the absence of his body. These sequences are filmed from a moving vehicle and simply show the passing landscape. In most cases, but not all, these images are accompanied by an acousmatic voice, which we may take to be the voice of the son (hereafter referred to as the narrator), reflecting upon his father's life. However, we never actually see the narrator on his journey. Again, this contrasts with the novella, in which the narrator interacts with a number of individuals on his journey, and whose physical presence is highlighted in the ninth sentence, which states simply 'Os' moia ruka' (here is my hand [on the car door]).⁵³⁹ The absence of the narrator's body in the present moment of remembering problematizes the question of point of view. This is further compounded by the

⁵³⁸ O. Syzonenko, 'Bili khmary', in *Vybrani tvory*, 2 vols (Kyiv: Dnuprio, 1983), I (*Romany*), 21–199 (p. 23).

⁵³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

fluidity with which the memories are ascribed to an 'owner'. In his opening monologue, the narrator says:

Mabut' vy, bat'ku, za tsi nochi samotnosti i khvoroby peredumaly vse svoie zhyttia. Ia tezh vse zhadaui po tsii dorozhi. Vse zhadaui. Vse.⁵⁴⁰

From these opening words, three possibilities are established: the memories which follow are those of the son, those of the father, or possibly the father's memories mediated by the son's imagination.⁵⁴¹ There are a small number of memories, however, which feature neither the son nor the father, and so it is unclear who is remembering. These include the filming of the peasant farmers gathered outside the stable, the scene in which Andrieiev is confronted by a horde of angry women, and the following scene in which he attempts to justify to a group of male peasants the importance of providing the State with their grain. Interestingly, the villagers' complaints to Andrieiev are witnessed by the son in the novella. The decision to shoot these scenes without the son's presence suggests that they might carry a different significance in the film. What is striking about these memories is the presence of older men and women who feature not as main characters, but as background cast, and whose faces – or bodies – are given attention over and above their voices. Moreover, the use of documentary-style techniques in the filming of these people – the extreme close-ups of their faces, the use of the returned gaze, and the observation-style camerawork – is particularly arresting. The decision to distinguish the past and present stylistically, through the use of documentary-style

⁵⁴⁰ 'Maybe you, father, throughout these days and nights of solitude and illness, are thinking over all of your life. I am also remembering everything on this journey. Remembering everything. Everything...'

⁵⁴¹ In this respect, the film is an important precursor to Andrei Tarkovskii's *Zerkalo* (Mirror, 1974), which also features a body-less narrator as it guides the viewer through a series of memory episodes in which there is also a shifting point of view.

filming for the latter, makes its use during these memory sequences all the more startling. It is an example of how the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is used in the film to impart a sense of the experience of the filmmaking process on the film. In so doing, it asserts that these individuals belong to the present too, and that this is their story. Here we get a sense of the temporality of the recording, so that, although this is a scene located in the narrative past, we are made aware that these are people living in the filmmaking present, performing that past. By not ascribing these memory scenes to one of the main protagonists, they are perceived as belonging to these people in the filmmaking present. Moreover, these people are in fact the same generation as that to which the father belongs. These scenes and this treatment seem to affirm that, whilst the father is dying in hospital, the generation to which he belongs is still present. The older cast seems to function as a bridge between the past and the present, reasserting a link between generations.

In reasserting this link, the film attempts to repair an intergenerational memorial structure that had been disrupted by the traumatic experiences of collectivization and dekulakization. These processes completely transformed the traditional way of life in the countryside; indeed, Orlando Figes has characterized this period of upheaval as ‘the greatest turning-point in Soviet history’.⁵⁴² Within the film itself, the disruption is manifested structurally as the gap, or silence, between the two narrative strands. The inclusion of a small number of time-spaces from within that gap – whilst they cannot be located specifically – suggests that the distance is not unbreachable; at the same time, their small number and elusiveness acknowledge that

⁵⁴² Orlando Figes, *The Whisperers: Private Life in Stalin's Russia* (London: Allen Lane, 2007), p. 81.

the past can never be fully known. Within this gap lies the famine of 1932 and 1933, the major event towards which the narrative strand set in the past is leading, but which occurs off-screen between the two narrative strands. The State procurement of grain, with increasingly unachievable quotas, the losses of livestock, and restrictions imposed on movement from villages to towns led to the famine of 1932 to 1933 in Ukraine, now known as the Holodomor (the Don region, Kazakhstan and the north Caucasus were also particularly affected). Estimates of the loss of life as a result of the Holodomor vary: Conquest estimated five million deaths in Ukraine; Vallin et al. have given a figure of 2.6 million; and Maksudov has concluded that the loss of Ukrainians reached as high as 4.1 million.⁵⁴³ The exact figure may never be known, but the scale of the tragedy is clear. In *Bili khmary*, the disappearance from view of the Holodomor reflects its position within the official narrative of the time: it was not until 1987 that the Soviet authorities acknowledged the famine – a silencing which, as Marples points out, only exacerbated the suffering.⁵⁴⁴ Nonetheless, the trauma of 1932 to 1933 makes its presence felt in the film in other ways.

When the village women gather to protest about the grain requisitioning, for example, their voices are heard clamouring: ‘A ditei chym hotuvaty?’ (What will we feed the children?); ‘My bez khliba’ (We are without bread ourselves); ‘Nichoho nema u nas’ (We have nothing). Gradually, their voices fall silent as the camera rests

⁵⁴³ See R. Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (London: Hutchinson, 1986); Jacques Vallin, France Meslé, Serguei Adamets, and Serhiy Pyrozhkov, ‘The Great Famine: Population Losses in Ukraine’, in *Holodomor: Reflections on the Great Famine of 1932–1933 in Soviet Ukraine*, ed. by Lubomyr Luciuk (Kingston, ON: Kashtan Press, 2008), pp. 33–48; Sergei Maksudov, ‘Victory over the Peasantry’, in *Hunger by Design: The Great Ukrainian Famine and its Soviet Context*, ed. by Halyna Hryn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2009), pp. 53–101.

⁵⁴⁴ David R. Marples, *Russia in the Twentieth Century: The Quest for Stability* (New York: Longman, 2011), p. 99.

on the pained expressions of their faces and we understand that their voices were not heard. The acoustic potential of cinema to deal with the issue of silence is skilfully demonstrated in this scene, which is less effectively rendered in the novella as: ‘Hovoryv Andrieiev, a vony movchaly, i krai’ (Andrieiev spoke and they were silent).⁵⁴⁵ In one memory sequence, a woman called Ustia visits Sashko’s *khata* to read the Bible. She begins to read from James 4. 1–17 (the fact that the narrator remembers this particular reading suggests his standpoint on the dekulakization of Lutsenko), but breaks off at a certain point, unable to speak the words. Shortly afterwards, she silently watches the grain being carried into a requisitioned church, and the implications are understood without words. Later, when Andrieiev is speaking words of encouragement to the villagers about their sacrifice for the State, the camera cuts to a local woman’s aged face. She stares directly at the camera as Andrieiev’s words ring out: ‘vy Bashtantsi viddaly svii khlib’ (you people of Bashtanka have given your bread). The woman does not speak, but her face acts as testimony. The camera then mimics Ustia’s earlier silent observation as it views from on high the procession of the grain as it is transported from the village.

As these examples show, *Bili khmary* makes use of cinema’s potential to deal with silence as a means of speaking through it. Silence is dealt with thematically in the film through the father’s instructions to his young son not to cry, following the scene in which the ObKom has presented their new plan to the collective farm. The narrator’s voice then says: ‘Na vse zhyttia zapamiatav ia tu nashu rozmovu i [...]

⁵⁴⁵ Syzonenko, ‘Bili khmary’, p. 101.

koly vtrymatys' ne mozžno bulo, ia pryhaduvav vashi slova i nikoly ne plakav.'⁵⁴⁶

These words might well describe the silent response, at least at the official level, to the trauma of 1932 to 1933. Yet in speaking of this silence, the narrator also speaks through it. Within the diegesis, the family experience a personal trauma in the form of Andriev's death. Silence features here, too – literally so, as a performance: the father consoles his children in silence. This is followed by a further nineteen seconds of silence during a journey sequence in which the camera uncharacteristically remains static and in a fixed position. The scene which breaks this lengthy silence is the only journey scene in which the narrator's voice interacts with another. The narrator has apparently given a lift to an old woman, who recognizes him from his childhood. The viewer does not see the narrator, but sees only the woman's face as she talks to the camera, and the landscape passing by. She mentions four people by name, contemporaries of the narrator, and she recalls helping them as children, when they were 'hungry, blue and thin', by stuffing grain into their pockets. (In the 1983 edition of the novella, the woman specifies that she remembers the children as they were in 1933, when they were around ten years old.)⁵⁴⁷ She asks where they are now, and is told that they are all dead. This is a reference to the casualties of the Second World War – the other traumatic event which has occurred in the gap between the two narrative strands – yet perhaps it substitutes for another trauma which cannot be so openly named.

Although *Bili khmary* does not speak directly of the Holodomor, it nonetheless speaks indirectly about it. (The title *Bili khmary* is interesting in this

⁵⁴⁶ 'I remembered that conversation of ours all my life. And [...] when I couldn't hold myself together, I remembered your words, and I never cried.'

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

respect, with its auditory resemblance to the Ukrainian phrase for ‘blind spots’ (bily pliamy).)⁵⁴⁸ Exploiting the sonic potential of cinema, the film speaks through (by which is meant both across and via) the silence surrounding this tragedy. In so doing, it attempts to open up a dialogue between past and present, and to re-build the intergenerational structure that has been inflected by trauma.

Conclusion

In the wake of *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, a body of work was produced at the Dovzhenko Studio which took direct inspiration from its aesthetic approach. *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh* and *Kaminnyi khrest* most closely align with the style of filmmaking that characterizes *Tini zabutykh predkiv*, and which we have termed the Experiential Ethnographic Mode. As this chapter has shown, a similar methodology to that adopted by Paradzhanov and his film-crew lay behind the making of these two films; this involved time spent on location, and responding to and collaborating with the local residents who took part in the filmmaking process. This is reflected in the films themselves, where a similar concern can be detected with establishing a relationship between the story that is performed, the place of its performance and the people who perform it. To varying extents, this style of filmmaking can be discerned across the whole of the poetic school, yet it is these three films which constitute the inner core of the school and where this is most clearly manifested.

The Experiential Ethnographic Mode characterizes the poetic school, although it is not limited to these works. Its identification enables a new interpretation of the school by highlighting how the films deal with the traumatic events of the recent past

⁵⁴⁸ My thanks go to Ol'ha Briukhovets'ka for this observation.

and the ways in which those events continue to resonate for those who came afterwards – the second and 1.5 generations to which the filmmakers belong. In the case of *Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh*, we have seen how this relates to the impact of the Second World War and urbanization on the rural population; in *Kaminnyi khrest* it concerns the rupture brought about by the various waves of emigration from western Ukraine; and in *Tini zabutykh predkiv* it involves the competing territorial claims and associated cultural policies that had befallen the Carpathian region. As these films demonstrate, the poetic school is concerned with the specificities of a particular place; their gaze is local, rather than necessarily national. Although the focus of their gaze is different, however, the films are united by a central theme: the relationship between people and the land on which they live. Of all the films, this theme is most clearly expressed in *Bili khmary*.

If the Experiential Ethnographic Mode is deployed in the films of the poetic school to deal with the postmemory of traumatic events of the recent past, *Bili khmary* demonstrates how and why the cinematic medium is particularly suited to this task. The audio-visual properties of cinema are used in order to speak through silence. As we noted in the Introduction, silence is deeply associated with the experience of the second generation; and, in the Soviet context in which the poetic school emerged, as Merridale has noted, silence carries an extra resonance, which relates to the lack of space within which to talk about the past.⁵⁴⁹ The films of the poetic school attempt to speak through the silence, to re-connect with the past, and to reactivate an intergenerational memorial structure that has been disrupted. The familial relationships, which are central to these films, provide that space of identification,

⁵⁴⁹ Merridale, *Night of Stone*.

noted by Hirsch, for those not personally connected to the events.⁵⁵⁰ In light of this, the films can be seen to engage in postmemorial work, and to widen the postmemorial circle to potentially encompass the viewer.

⁵⁵⁰ Hirsch, 'Past Lives', p. 668.

CONCLUSION

In Illienko's *Bilyi ptakh z chornoiu oznakoiu*, the fifty-year-old Les' Zvonar' says to the young Soviets who have come to 'liberate' northern Bukovyna from Romania:

A iak my vsi zhyly? A iak ia sam zhyv? Pershi desiat' rokiv bez shtaniv – tse puste. P'iat' strashnykh rokiv viiny mozna vidshpurnuty. Maiemo piatnadsat' vzhe. Dvadsiat' s'omyi, trydtsiatyi, trydtsiat' tretii... try roky holodu. Rik kholery. Rik rumuns'koho kryminalu za te, shcho bihav po ts'oho stovpa za khlibom z Ukrainy na Ukrainu. Maiemo dvadsat' rokiv. A za ostanni trydtsiat' rokiv, zhyv azh shistdesiat' dniv: den' na velykden' [...] i den' na Rizdvo, koly v dushi veselo.⁵⁵¹

And this list of sufferings does not yet include the Second World War, which will shortly tear his family apart. Zvonar' is speaking of his personal experiences, but we do not see him as he says these words. Instead, the camera slowly pans across the different faces of the people who are standing nearby. These are the faces of local non-professional actors, from the villages of Roztoky and Vyzhnytzia in Bukovyna,

⁵⁵¹ 'But how have we all lived? How have I lived myself? The first ten years were without trousers – that's immaterial. Five terrible years of war you can throw to the side. That's fifteen already. '27, '30, '33... three years of famine. A year of cholera. A year of a Romanian prison because I used to run past that boundary post for bread, from Ukraine to Ukraine. That's twenty years. And for the remaining thirty years, I have lived only sixty days: one day at Easter [...] and one day at Christmas, when there is happiness in one's soul.' The five years of war presumably refers to the First World War, during which Bukovyna was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and following which Bukovyna fell under Romanian rule and experienced a further year of violence during the (ultimately unsuccessful) struggle for a West Ukrainian People's Republic (Zakhidno-Ukrains'ka Narodna Respublika (ZUNR)), composed of lands in Galicia, Bukovyna and Transcarpathia. See Yekelchik, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, pp. 76–78; and Wilson, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, pp. 127–28. The slight pause after Zvonar' refers to 1933 draws attention to this year and the tragedy with which it is associated, although the Holodomor of 1932 and 1933 is associated with Soviet Ukraine (of which Bukovyna was not a part at that time). More recently, recognition is being sought of the famine of 1946–1947, experienced in Bukovyna and Bessarabia, and associated with the introduction of collectivization to the region, which is also being referred to now as a Holodomor. See V. I. Pavliuk and others., *Natsional'na knyha pamiati zhertv holodomoriv 1932–1933, 1946–1947 rokiv v Ukraini: Chernivets'ka oblast'* (Chernivtsi: Zelena Bukovyna, 2008); and Iryna Yehorova, 'The "Unknown" Holodomor of 1947', *Den'*, 38 (11 December 2007), < <http://www.day.kiev.ua/193091/> > [accessed 24 July 2012].

where the film was shot between March and October 1970.⁵⁵² There are many people gathered there, but the camera focuses on the older generation. As we look at their faces, worn with age and suffering, we understand that the words Zvonar' is speaking apply to these people in the filmmaking present.

Like the other films of the poetic school, *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoii* looks back to the traumas of the past. Yet this thesis has sought to demonstrate how these films, in looking to the past, speak really of the (filmmaking) present. Through their use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, the films evoke a sense of the filmmaking process. In this way, it is shown how the traumas of the past continue to resonate within the present. Moreover, old traditions and a past way of life, supposedly forgotten, are perceived as being remembered in the filmmaking present. The films attempt to bridge the divide between the past and the present, and to suggest continuity. This, it has been argued, speaks of a striving on the part of this generation of filmmakers 'to re-member, to re-build, to re-incarnate, to replace and to repair'.⁵⁵³ Whilst the films are undeniably about loss, the loss of a past that can never be retrieved, this attempt also enables us to see them as expressions of hope, the hope that this divide can nonetheless be overcome. In many ways, this interpretation accords with the atmosphere of excitement and joy in which the films were seemingly made (or at least, how that is remembered). During my trip to Verkhovyna, I was struck by how happy the memories of this period were, something which also comes across in the memoirs that have been written by those who were involved. Above and beyond the simple pleasure of recalling one's youth, there was a feeling of pride

⁵⁵² RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 1692, l. 27.

⁵⁵³ Hirsch, 'Past Lives', p. 661.

amongst the individuals with whom I spoke at having taken part in something unusual and important. Whilst they were certainly intrigued by my interest in their experiences, at the same time there was a recognition that the film – and, moreover, the people about whom it tells – warranted such interest.

It has not been possible within the scope of this thesis to investigate *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*, one of the later films of the school, and also one of the most successful.⁵⁵⁴ Yet the film illustrates a number of points to which we might turn in drawing together our conclusions. The screenplay was written by Illienko and Mykolaichuk, and tells of the Zvonar' family, a group of musicians living in Bukovyna during the late 1930s and 1940s. By following the different paths of Les' and Katrina's sons (Petro, Orest, Bohdan and Heorhii), the film discusses the difficult experiences of the Bukovynans during this tumultuous period, when various forces (Romanian, Soviet, and Ukrainian nationalist) were fighting for control of the region. Upon the outbreak of war, Petro Zvonar' enthusiastically enlists into the Red Army. He will later be joined there by his brother, Bohdan, who first spends several years in hiding to avoid being drafted into the Romanian forces, and his father, who will not come back alive. Meanwhile, Orest Zvonar' elopes to the forest with Dana, the priest's daughter with whom Petro is also in love. Dana and Orest are soon discovered in their hideout by Roman, leader of a guerrilla group fighting for Ukrainian independence. Initially coerced into joining their number, Orest soon adapts to his new life.

In this way, Petro and Orest are established as rivals in love and in war. One of the emotional peaks of the film occurs when, after years of fighting, the brothers

⁵⁵⁴ The film won the Gold Medal at the 1971 Moscow International Film Festival.

come face to face with one another across the kitchen table in the family home. Following this, Petro is killed trying to rescue Ostap, a comrade who has been tied to a tractor that has been set on fire by Roman's men. Orest has his brother's blood on his hands; and yet the treatment of this character is not unsympathetic. The role was written, according to Briukhovets'ka, with Mykolaichuk in mind.⁵⁵⁵ Indeed, in the original plans for the film, the actor was scheduled to play Orest.⁵⁵⁶ However, it was feared that an actor such as Mykolaichuk would make the character too appealing for the audience.⁵⁵⁷ In the end, Bohdan Stupka, a theatre actor from L'viv who was originally intended to play Roman, was awarded the role for his debut film appearance.⁵⁵⁸ Stupka gives an exceptional performance, and it is hard to see how the audience could have avoided responding positively to his character. Crucial to this are the two dance sequences within which the relationship between Orest and Dana is framed. The first dance sequence occurs during Dana's wedding to Ostap, a soldier from the recently arrived Red Army, at which the Zvonar' family provide the musical entertainment. At this point, the audience, along with Dana, does not know which of the three brothers – Petro, Orest, or Bohdan – will be the main contender for her heart, although Petro has thus far featured more prominently in the film. It comes as something of a surprise, therefore, when Orest unexpectedly jumps down from the stage on which the family are playing and interrupts the bride and groom's dance so that he can dance with Dana. Orest knows exactly how to perform the traditional dance, unlike Ostap who, as an outsider to the region, is unfamiliar with the steps.

⁵⁵⁵ Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 109.

⁵⁵⁶ RGALI, f. 2944, op. 4, d. 1692, l. 31.

⁵⁵⁷ Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 109; Kadochnikova, *Belaia ptitsa*, p. 196.

⁵⁵⁸ *Ibid.*.

The camera circles the dancing pair, mirroring their movement so that it seems to become part of the dance itself. As it does so, we see that the crowd of onlookers have disappeared, and we understand that we are entering into the private world of Dana and Orest. This feeling of intimacy is abruptly shattered by the outbreak of war, but a connection has been established between Dana and Orest such that it does not strike us as strange that they then decide to elope into the mountains.

The second dance sequence comes towards the end of the film, after the Second World War is over. The demands of the war have separated Dana and Orest (after three years of living in the forest Dana returned to the village, leaving Orest with the guerrilla fighters), although we understand that their love endures. Knowing that it will mean his death, Orest returns to the village in search of Dana. It is harvest time, and the villagers are gathered together along with a group of musicians, whom Orest pays to play a 'Sabash'. Dana rushes over to Orest, and they repeat their earlier dance. The camera circles the pair again, and a series of fairly rapid cuts serves to express their heightened emotional state – this is their farewell dance. This time, however, the group of onlookers are present throughout. Their presence seems to suggest that they are acting as witnesses to Dana and Orest's personal tragedy. The Bukovynan music – performed by a group from the village of Hlynysia – and the traditional dance have established a link between the filmic subjects and the location in which the narrative takes place; by surrounding Dana and Orest with the local non-professional actors, it is suggested that the story belongs to them. Whilst Orest is an outcast (some of the villagers are heard to shout 'katiuha' (executioner/hangman), an addition that was made in March 1971 after the film had been criticized by members

of the TsKKPU),⁵⁵⁹ at the same time he is seen to belong to this region, its people and their past.

The representation of Orest – and the Ukrainian nationalists who fought for independence during the war – is fundamental to understanding the significance of *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*. According to Briukhovets'ka, several other directors to whom Mykolaichuk proposed his idea for the film before turning to Illienko had been unwilling to take on the project precisely because it tackled the taboo subject of the 'Banderivtsi' (followers of [Stepan] Bandera) – the term used at the time to describe those who fought for Ukrainian independence during the Second World War and for several years after.⁵⁶⁰ Whilst this aspect of the film is undeniably important, we should not overlook another facet which, although perhaps less dramatic, is no less significant. Here I have in mind the fourth Zvonar' brother, Heorhii. *Bilyi ptakh z*

⁵⁵⁹ The XIV meeting of the TsKKPU took place from 17 to 20 March 1971, during which *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu* was shown to the delegates. The film provoked an unexpected reaction from the secretaries of the ObKom of the western *oblasti*, who thought it should be banned for being anti-Soviet in its portrayal of a 'bourgeois nationalist'. A meeting then took place at the Dovzhenko Studio on 22 March with representatives from Kyiv and Moscow in order to show support for the film. See 'Protokol vid 22 bereznia 1971 roku', in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 291–95. Following this, a number of amendments were made to the film, including the addition of the phrase 'katiuha' referred to above. TsDAMLNU, f. 670, op. 1, d. 2262, ll. 12–13. Ultimately, Shelest, the First Secretary of the TsKKPU, intervened to ensure that the film was shown at the Moscow Film Festival, where it went on to win the Gold Medal. Kadochnikova, *Belaia ptitsa*, p. 199.

⁵⁶⁰ Briukhovets'ka, *Kinosvit*, p. 106. Bandera was the leader of one faction of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (Orhanizatsiia Ukrain's'kykh Natsionalistiv (OUN)), 'a highly disciplined underground revolutionary movement dedicated to the overthrow of Polish, Romanian, and, eventually, Soviet rule in Ukrainian territories' (Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine*, p. 640). Founded in Vienna in 1929, the OUN split into two factions following the assassination of its leader Ievhen Konovalets' in 1938: the OUN-B, led by Bandera, and the less radical OUN-M, led by Andrii Mel'nyk. Meanwhile, in 1941 a small anti-Soviet partisan force emerged in the forests of Volhynia and Polissia under the leadership of Taras Bulba-Borovets'. This group began to call itself the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Ukrains'ka Povstans'ka Armiia (UPA)) in the spring of 1942 when it started attacking Nazi forces. The Nazi occupation led to both factions of the OUN establishing guerrilla units as well, and, in 1943, these nationalist partisans were all forcibly united under Bandera as the UPA. See Yekelchuk, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation*, p. 144.

chornoïu oznakoïu both begins and ends with Heorhii, who in many ways can be seen as the main character of the film. Interestingly, like the authors of the screenplay Illienko and Mykolaichuk, Heorhii experiences the Second World War as a child and might thus be considered to be a member of the 1.5 generation with regard to this traumatic event.⁵⁶¹ There are a number of gaps, or silences, in the storyline relating to Heorhii, which are evocative of the breakages that occur as a result of traumatic experience in the structure of memorial transfer. After the woman he loves is killed, Heorhii disappears from view (Les' tells Petro that Heorhii has run away to look for him) until the final scenes of the film, when we see him return to the village, three years after Orest's death. There follows a particularly striking sequence, which stands out from the rest of the film by virtue of its documentary-style filming which includes the use of jump cuts. This sequence has no dialogue and is composed of three strands: Heorhii winding a winch, a group of men pushing a tractor, and a series of shots of different local people presumably watching these events. The sequence ends with an aerial shot of the tractor, now painted red, standing on the edge of a cliff. We perceive this to be a monument to Petro and Ostap (and, more broadly, the suffering endured in the region), and the preceding shots are understood retrospectively as portraying the villagers engaged in a process of memorialization, which is somehow driven by Heorhii. In understanding this retrospectively, the film provokes in the viewer her own sensation of remembering, thus widening the postmemorial circle. Immediately

⁵⁶¹ Illienko was born in 1936 and Mykolaichuk in 1941. Determining Heorhii's age is not straightforward: when war breaks out, he is a young boy of around eleven or twelve years old; the film jumps forward in time to 1944 and Heorhii is then played by a different actor (Mykhailo Illienko, Iurii's brother, who was twenty-three years old at the time). Heorhii is too young to be drafted into the army during the war, but old enough to 'marry' Vivdia in 1944 (they perform their own wedding service, although one should point out that Vivdia does not actually speak for herself).

after this sequence, we see Dana's father, the priest, in a white room seemingly threatening Heorhii with a pistol. It emerges that Heorhii is now a doctor, and that the priest, who is suffering from mental illness presumably as a result of the horrors which he has endured, is his patient.⁵⁶² In the interaction between Heorhii and the priest (who had earlier taken young Heorhii into his home and acted as something of a father figure to the boy) we see how the trauma has affected the transmission of memory between generations: the two are simply unable to communicate meaningfully with one another. Yet the film does not end on this note of despair. Instead, Heorhii opens the window and looks out onto a group of young musicians playing in the street below. This is the new generation, who are continuing the traditions of the Zvonar' family by playing their melodies.⁵⁶³ In a series of flashbacks, we see how the past continues to haunt Heorhii, who is reminded of his father and brothers, now all deceased, as he looks at the musicians. The connection between the past and the present has undeniably been disturbed, yet at the same time the film suggests that it persists, both in Heorhii's memory, and in the new generation who continue the traditions of their forefathers.

⁵⁶² It is tempting to suggest, *pace* Merridale, that the priest is suffering from some degree of post-traumatic stress. Interestingly, the priest is not the only character in the film who suffers from mental illness. When Bohdan returns from the war, he is no longer able to speak, which is suggestive of a psychological trauma. Furthermore, after Vivdia's murder, Heorhii is told what happened by 'Kukushka' (Cuckoo), the local 'madman' (played by Kostiantyn Stepankov). Similarly, in *Sovist'*, two mentally disturbed individuals witness the shootings of villagers by the Nazis. On the one hand, the presence of these characters at these events may simply refer to the fact that those with mental illness were targeted by the Nazi regime (i.e. that is why they were there at the time); on the other hand, it may possibly allude to the mental effects of witnessing such atrocities.

⁵⁶³ Perhaps these musicians are the real ensemble from Hlynysia, whose music we have heard throughout.

For this reason, Heorhii has a significant role in helping us understand this film and the poetic school more broadly. He is, after all, the white bird of the film's title. This is established in the opening shot of the film, in which we see young Heorhii standing behind a stork. Heorhii's white clothing matches the bird's white plumage; and his black belt mirrors the bird's black underwing. A connection is thus established between Heorhii and the stork, a connection which is later consolidated when the young boy prompts his mother to tell the fable of the white bird with the black spot. She finds Heorhii trying to remove a stork's nest from the roof of their house (the family already has too many children, he explains). She tells him that many years ago, the stork was a man. He was given a sack by God which he was instructed to throw into an abyss without looking inside it. The man was unable to resist the temptation to look inside the sack, and there he saw all kinds of vermin. He threw the sack into the abyss but the sin had been committed. God turned the man into a white bird with a black spot and commanded him to gather all the evil and vermin from the world, only after which would he be returned to human form. Heorhii is therefore aligned with the white bird of the film's title. His decision to become a doctor is understood in this context, as an attempt to cleanse the world of evil and disease. There is, however, one other episode in the film where we see a white bird with a black spot. This episode is easily overlooked, and yet I believe it adds an important layer of meaning to the film's title. It occurs towards the beginning of the film, when Les' takes his sons to the market to drum up trade for the family business, or find them alternative work. Towards the end of the day, when Les' is

sitting on the cart with his two remaining sons, a cut is made to an old woman who is standing next to a stork. She says:

Viz'mit' leleku. Ne prodaiu. Dobrym liudiam viddaiu. Bo moi khaty voda zabrala a ia vzhe stara. Meni pomyraty chas. Viz'mit' leleku.⁵⁶⁴

The stork is being passed down from the older generation to the next and, in this way, comes to symbolize cultural heritage and memory, which is similarly passed down. Immediately after the woman utters these words, there is a cut to the next scene so that we do not know to whom she was speaking, nor indeed if anyone was listening; but when she was speaking, she had directly addressed the camera, as if instructing the audience to accept her gift. This illustrates how *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu* operates in two ways: firstly, as an expression of the filmmaking present, a period in which structures of remembering have been disturbed by the traumas of the past; and secondly as an attempt to repair those structures and to transmit knowledge and memory of the past to the viewer and to the next generation.

Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu – and the poetic school more broadly – attempt to facilitate the act of transfer symbolized by the offer of this elderly woman and her white bird. Therein lies the nature of the films' postmemorial work. This thesis has sought to demonstrate how this postmemorial work is enabled by the use of the Experiential Ethnographic Mode, which is offered as a new way of approaching fiction film in which the filmic product is informed by a particular approach to the filmmaking process, and which is a defining characteristic of the poetic school. The proposal of this concept has generated a new interpretation of these films, in which

⁵⁶⁴ 'Take the stork. I'm not selling it. I am giving it away to good people. Because my *khata* has been taken away by the water and I am old already. It is time for me to die. Take the stork.'

attention is brought to the filmmaking process and the ways in which this is manifested in the films. Ultimately, it has been argued that, far from being focused on the past, the films are steeped in the filmmaking present. As such, they provide insights into this group of filmmakers and the generation to which they belong. The films suggest that, growing up in the aftermath of trauma, this generation, like Heorhii, were haunted by echoes of the past. In this respect, we might posit that the films continue to have relevance for today's audience in post-Soviet Ukraine, similarly faced with the difficulties of dealing with the traumas of the past. Remembrance of the events with which the films of the poetic school are concerned is still contested today. In 2010, for example, the then President Viktor Iushchenko awarded Stepan Bandera the title of 'Heroi Ukrainy' (Hero of Ukraine); the following year, his successor President Viktor Ianukovych announced that the award had been annulled. In 2006, the Verkhovna Rada passed a law declaring that the Holodomor of 1932 and 1933 was an act of genocide against the Ukrainian people.⁵⁶⁵ Four years later, Ianukovych declared to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe that the Holodomor cannot be considered an act of genocide. As these examples show, the complexities presented by remembrance of the past have not gone away; the echoes continue to be heard. And filmmakers continue to respond.

Whilst in the poetic school, the 'Banderivtsi' are remembered in *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*, and the Holodomor is remembered in *Bili khmary*, these events have been returned to more recently in the works of Ukrainian director Oles' Ianchuk: *Holod-33* (Hunger-33, 1991), based on the novella *Zhovtyi kniaz'* (The Yellow

⁵⁶⁵ As yet, there is no international consensus on whether the Holodomor constituted an act of genocide.

Prince, written by Ukrainian writer Vasyl' Barka (1908–2003) between 1958 and 1961, after his emigration to the United States), recounts the experiences of the fictional Katrannyk family during the Holodomor; *Atentat – Osinnie vbyvstvo u Miunkheni* (Assassination – an Autumn Murder in Munich, 1995) concerns the assassination of Stepan Bandera in 1959; *Neskorenyi* (The Undefeated, 2000) tells of Roman Shukhevych's time as leader of the UPA; and *Zalizna Sotnia* (The Company of Heroes, 2004, based on the memoirs of OUN member and UPA fighter Iuryi Borets', *U vyri borot'by* (In the Whirlpool of Combat, 1971)) concerns the struggles of the OUN and UPA in western Ukraine and eastern Poland. Thematically, then, there are some commonalities between the poetic school and Ianchuk's works. Moreover, Nebesio has suggested a similarity between *Holod-33* and Illienko's work in terms of the use of symbolism.⁵⁶⁶ The poetic school and Ianchuk's films share a concern with memory; the way in which this is manifested, however, is different. As this thesis has argued, by using the Experiential Ethnographic Mode the poetic school portrays the past as something that is being remembered in the filmmaking present. Ianchuk's films do not make use of this mode; and neither do they evoke a sense of the filmmaking process. Consequently, although the narrative is set in the past, we do not perceive this to be something being remembered in the filmmaking present. The issue of memory is manifested in the form of flashbacks, with which Ianchuk's films are littered. These flashbacks often depict a time before the trauma with which the film is concerned occurred. This stands in contrast with the use of flashbacks in *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*, for example, referred to above, when Heorhii looks at the

⁵⁶⁶ Bohdan Y. Nebesio, 'The First Five Years with No Plan: Building National Cinema in Ukraine, 1992–1997', *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 34.3 (2007), 265–97 (p. 291).

young musicians. The images which Heorhii recalls are taken from earlier scenes in the film, which the viewer herself remembers. In Ianchuk's films, the flashbacks tend to depict a scene of which the viewer has no recollection or knowledge herself. They are often filmed in slow-motion, and have a certain aura about them; they portray the past as a kind of dream or illusion. In *Holod-33*, for example, the flashbacks are filmed in colour to contrast with the monochrome world in which the narrative takes place. At the end of the film Andrii, the sole survivor of the Katrannyk family, is hiding in a field, which prompts a memory of his family in happier times, before the famine. In this flashback, we see the family together again, filmed in colour and running through a field in slow-motion. The frame freezes on this family portrait, with which the film ends. In this way, the past is portrayed as other-worldly and distinct from the rest of the film; it is literally frozen in time, and inaccessible. We should not be surprised, however, that Ianchuk responds to these events and the challenge of representing them cinematically in a different way; whilst the echoes of the past continue to be heard, they resonate in a new, post-Soviet context.⁵⁶⁷

This thesis has examined how the filmmakers of the poetic school responded to those echoes in the 1960s (or, in the case of *Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu*, in the

⁵⁶⁷ As O. O. Papash says of the film: 'Tse ne stil'ky estetychna reprezentatsiia, skil'ky politychnyi arhument, poklykanyi konsoliduvaty ukraintsiv, zburyty ikh na borot'bu za nezalezhnist' toshcho, ale azh niiiak ne "adekvatno predstavty" podii 1930-kh rokiv' (It is not so much an aesthetic representation as it is a political argument, called for to consolidate Ukrainians, to disturb them into the fight for independence and so forth, but it by no means "adequately represents" the events of the 1930s). See O. O. Palash, 'Kolektyvna travma v ihrovomu kino: Vypadok odynychnoi reprezentatsii ("Holod-33")', *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA*, 114 (2011), 73–78 (p. 73). Papash is concerned to 'desacralize' (desakralizuvaty) the film – 'the only fiction film dedicated to the famine' (iedynyi ihrovyi fil'm, prysviachenyi holodu) – in order to better analyse its mode of representation, which she finds positions Ukrainians as victim-martyrs. *Ibid.*, p. 74. We would, of course, take issue with the description of *Holod-33* as the sole fiction film to deal with the Holodomor, having identified the ways in which, some twenty years earlier, Serhiienko's *Bili khmary* dealt with this subject.

early 1970s). It has questioned previous characterizations of the school as ‘films about failure and loss’, suggesting instead ways in which the films speak of hope.⁵⁶⁸ Perhaps, when we think about the school in terms of loss, we might more appropriately think of the loss of that sense of hope: it is difficult to envisage films of the poetic school emerging from the Dovzhenko Studio today. Yet, for a brief period at that studio, these films did emerge, and they do speak of hope.

⁵⁶⁸ First, ‘Scenes of Belonging’, p. 320.

FILMOGRAPHY

- Ambavi Suramis tsikhisa* (The Legend of Suram Fortress, 1984, Sergei Paradzhanov)
- Andrei Rublev* (1966, Andrei Tarkovskii)
- Andriiesh* (1954, Sergei Paradzhanov and Iakov Bazelian)
- Annychka* (1968, Borys Ivchenko)
- Arabeski na temu Pirosmani* (Arabesques on the Theme of Pirosmani, 1985, Sergei Paradzhanov)
- Arena* (1967, Samson Samsonov)
- Arsenal* (1928, Oleksandr Dovzhenko)
- Ashiki Keribi* (Ashik Kerib, 1988, Sergei Paradzhanov)
- Atentat – Osinnie vbyvstvo u Miunkheni* (Assassination – an Autumn Murder in Munich, 1995, Oles' Ianchuk)
- L'Avventura* (The Adventure, 1960, Michelangelo Antonioni)
- Bili khmary* (White Clouds, 1968, Rolan Serhiienko)
- Bilyi ptakh z chornoii oznakoiu* (The White Bird with the Black Spot, 1971, Iurii Illienko)
- Blow-up* (1966, Michelangelo Antonioni)
- Bukovyna, zemlia ukrains'ka* (Bukovyna, Ukrainian Land, 1940, Iuliia Solntseva)
- Chronique d'un été* (Chronicle of a Summer, 1960, Jean Rouch)
- Delo Rumiantseva* (*The Rumiantsev Affair*, 1955, Iosif Kheifits)
- Des' ie syn* (My Son is Somewhere, 1962, Artur Voitets'kyi)
- Il Deserto Rosso* (Red Desert, 1964, Michelangelo Antonioni)
- Dni l'otni* (Flight Days, 1965, Mykola Litus and Leonid Rizin)

Dva Fedora (The Two Fedors, 1958, Marlen Khutsiev)

Dvoie (Two, 1964, Leonid Osyka)

L'Eclisse (Eclipse, 1962, Michelangelo Antonioni)

Garmon' (The Accordion, 1934, Ihor Savchenko)

Hakob Hovnatanyan (1967, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Holod-33 (Hunger-33, 1991, Oles' Ianchuk)

Idu do tebe (I Come to You, 1971, Mykola Mashchenko)

Istoriia Asi Kliachinoi, kotoraiia liubila, da ne vyshla zamuzh (The Story of Asia Kliachina, Who Loved But Did Not Marry, 1966, Andrei Mikhalkov-Konchalovskii)

Ivanovo detstvo (Ivan's Childhood, 1962, Andrei Tarkovskii)

Kaminnyi khrest (The Stone Cross, 1968, Leonid Osyka)

Kapela "Dumka" (The "Dumka" Choir, 1959, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Khostovanank (Confession, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Khto povernet'sia – doliubyt' (Love Awaits He, Who Returns, 1967, Leonid Osyka)

Komisary (The Commissars, 1970, Mykola Mashchenko)

Krov' liuds'ka ne vodytsia (Where Human Blood is not Found, 1960, Mykola Makarenko)

Krynytsia dlia sprahlykh (A Well for the Thirsty, 1965, Iurii Illienko)

Kvitka na kameni (The Flower on the Stone, 1962, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Kyivs'ki fresky (Kyiv Frescoes, 1966, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Lisova pisnia (Song of the Forest, 1961, Viktor Ivchenko)

Liudyna z kinoaparatom (Man with a Movie Camera, 1929, Dziga Vertov)

Man of Aran (1934, Robert Flaherty)

Moi, un Noir (Me, a Black Man, 1958, Jean Rouch)

Mol'ba (The Plea, 1968, Tengiz Abuladze)

Moldavskaia skazka (A Moldavian Fairytale, 1952, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Nanook of the North (1922, Robert Flaherty)

Nataliia Uzhvii (1960, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Neskorenyi (The Undefeated, 2000, Oles' Ianchuk)

La Notte (The Night, 1961, Michelangelo Antonioni)

Oleksa Dovbush (1959, Viktor Ivanov)

Osvidchennia v liubovi (Declarations of Love, 1966, Rolan Serhiienko)

Pavlo Korchahin (1956, Oleksandr Alov and Vladimir Naumov)

Pershyi khlopets' (The First Lad, 1958, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Pomerancheve nebo (Orange Sky, 2006, Oleksandr Kyrylenko)

Propala hramota (The Lost Letter, 1973, Borys Ivchenko)

Proshchavaite, holuby (Farewell, Doves, 1960, Iakov Segel')

Put' na arenu (Journey to the Ring, 1963, Levon Isaakian and Genrikh Malian)

Roma, città apèrta (Rome, Open City, 1944–46, Roberto Rossellini)

Roman i Francheska (Roman and Francesca, 1960, Volodymyr Denysenko)

Sayat Nova/Tsvet granata (The Colour of Pomegranates, 1968, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Shchors (1939, Oleksandr Dovzhenko)

Son (A Dream, 1964, Volodymyr Denysenko)

Sovist' (Conscience, 1968, Volodymyr Denysenko)

Ta, shcho vkhodyt' v more (She, Who Enters the Sea, 1966, Leonid Osyka)

Taka piznia, taka tepla osin' (Such a Late, Warm Autumn, 1981, Ivan Mykolaichuk)

Tam, gde poet trembita (Where the Trembita Sings, 1964, Boris Golovnia)

Taras Shevchenko (1951, Ihor Savchenko)

La terra trema (The Earth Quakes, 1948, Luchino Visconti)

Tini zabutykh predkiv (Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors, 1964, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Tretii udar (The Third Blow, 1948, Ihor Savchenko)

Tryvozhna molodist' (Restless Youth, 1954, Oleksandr Alov and Vladimir Naumov)

Ukrains'ka rapsodiia (Ukrainian Rhapsody, 1960, Sergei Paradzhanov)

V gorode S (In the Town of S., 1966, Iosif Kheifits)

Vavylon XX (Babylon XX, 1979, Ivan Mykolaichuk)

Vechir na Ivana Kupala (On the Eve of Ivan Kupala, 1968, Iurii Illienko)

Vesna na Zarechnoi ulitse (Spring on Zarechnaia Street, 1956, Marlen Khutsiev and Feliks Mironer)

Vidkryi sebe (Open Yourself, 1973, Rolan Serhiienko)

Vsuperech us'omu (In Spite of Everything, 1972, Iurii Illienko)

Z nud'hy (From Boredom, 1968, Artur Voitets'kyi)

Zaivyi khlib (Extra Bread, 1967, Viktor Hoviada)

Zakhar Berkut (1971, Leonid Osyka)

Zalizna Sotnia (The Company of Heroes, 2004, Oles' Ianchuk)

Zastava Il'icha/Mne dvadtsat' let (Il'ich's Gate/I am Twenty, 1965, Marlen Khutsiev)

Zemlia (Earth, 1930, Oleksandr Dovzhenko)

Zlodii (The Thief, 1969, Roman Balaian)

Zoloti ruky (Golden Hands, 1960, Sergei Paradzhanov)

Zvenyhora (1927, Oleksandr Dovzhenko)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altman, Rick, McGraw Jones and Sonia Tatroe, 'Inventing the Cinema Soundtrack: Hollywood's Multiplane Sound System', in *Music and Cinema*, ed. by James Buhler, Caryl Flynn and David Neumeier (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 2000), pp. 339–59

Assmann, Jan, 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique*, 65 (1995), 125–33

—, 'Communicative and Cultural Memory', in *Cultural Memories: The Geographical Point of View*, ed. by Peter Meusburger, Michael Herrernan and Edgar Wunder (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011), pp. 15–27

Babii, Viktor, 'Samobutnia muzyka', *Sil's'ki visti*, Kyiv, 9 February 1968

Banks, Marcus, 'Which Films are the Ethnographic Films?', in *Film as Ethnography*, ed. by Peter Ian Crawford and David Turton (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 116–30

Barker, Jennifer M., *The Tactile Eye: Touch and the Cinematic Experience* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009)

Bazhan, Mykola, 'Try fil'my Dovzhenkivtsiv' [1968], in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 95–102

Bezruchko, Oleksandr, 'Osoblyvosti tvorchoi i pedahohichnoi dial'nosti Leonida Mykhailovycha Osyky', *Kul'tura i Suchasnist'*, 2 (2010), <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/kis/2010_2/30.pdf> [accessed 3 June 2012]

Bleiman, Mikhail, 'Arkhaisty ili novatory?', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1970.7, 55–76

Bondanella, Peter, *Italian Cinema: From Neorealism to the Present*, 3rd edn (New York: Continuum, 2002)

de Brigard, Emilie, 'The History of Ethnographic Film', in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. by Paul Hockings, pp. 13–43

Briukhovets'ka, Larysa, *Ivan Mykolaichuk* (Kyiv: Atlant UMC, 2007)

—, *Kinosvit Iurii Illienka* (Kyiv: Zadruha, 2006)

—, *Leonid Osyka*, (Kyiv: Akademiia, 1999)

—, ed., *Poetychne kino: Zaboronena shkola* (Kyiv: ArtEk, 2001)

—, 'Proryv do vichnoho', *Kino-Teatr*, 2008.5, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=814> [accessed 13 August 2012]

—, "'Viina kul'tur" chy zahroza asimiliatsii? Ukrain's'ke poetychne kino iak faktor national'noho samostverzhennia', in *Naukovi zapysky: Tom 75: Teoriia ta istoriia kul'tury*, ed. by V. S. Briukhovets'kyi and others (Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylians'ka Akademiia, 2008), pp. 77–84

Budurowycz, Bohdan, 'Poland and the Ukrainian Problem, 1921–1939', *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 25 (1983), 473–500

Burch, Noël, *Life to those Shadows*, trans. and ed. by Ben Brewster (London: BFI Publishing, 1990)

Calvo-Merino, B., D. Glaser, J. Grèzes, R. Passingham, and P. Haggard, 'Action Observation and Acquired Motor Skills: An fMRI Study with Expert Dancers', *Cerebral Cortex*, 15.8 (2005), 1243–49

Chabanenko, I., 'Puti ukrainskogo kinoiskusstva', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1958.10, 111–14

Charnets'kyi, Adam, ed., *Ukrains'ki narodni pisni v zapysakh Zoriana Dolenhy-Khodakovs'koho: z Halychyny, Volyni, Podillia, Prydniprianshchyny i Polissia* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1974)

Chernetsky, Vitaly, 'Visual language and identity performance in Leonid Osyka's *A Stone Cross*: The roots and the uprooting', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 2 (2008), 269–80

Chion, Michel, *Film, A Sound Art*, trans. by Claudia Gorbman (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009)

—, *The Voice in Cinema*, ed. and trans. by Claudia Gorbman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999)

Connerton, Paul, *Bodily Practices. How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)

Conquest, R., *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (London: Hutchinson, 1986)

Crawford, Peter Ian and David Turton, eds, *Film as Ethnography*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)

Dashkevych, Iaroslav, *Volodymyr Hnatiuk: Dokumenty i materialy (1871–1989)* (Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1998)

Deleuze, Gilles, *Cinema 2: The Time Image*, trans. by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (London: Continuum, 2005)

Denzin, Norman K., *Performance Ethnography: Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003)

Dmytriieva, H., 'Sil's'ka kinoaktrisa', *Molod' Ukrainy*, 28 June 1970

Doane, Mary Ann, *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002)

—, 'Ideology and the Practice of Sound Editing and Mixing', in *Film Sound: Theory and Practice*, ed. by Elisabeth Weis and John Belton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), pp. 54–62

—, 'The Voice in the Cinema: The Articulation of Body and Space', *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 33–50

Dziuba, Ivan, 'Den' poiska', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1965.5, 73–82

—, 'Vidkryttia chy zakryttia "shkoly"?' [1989], in *Poetchne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 209–28

Eaton, Mick, *Anthropology, Reality, Cinema: The Films of Jean Rouch* (London: BFI, 1979)

Ellis, Carolyn, and Arthur P. Bochner, 'Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity', in *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, ed. by Norman K. Denzin, 2nd edn (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000), pp. 733–68

Fabian, Johannes, *Of Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object* (New York: Colombia University Press, 1983)

Fediv, Irina, 'Odiah, tkany i vyshyvka', <<http://hutsul.museum/collection/overview/fabrics/>> [accessed 27 June 2011]

Feld, Steve, 'Doing Anthropology in Sound', *American Ethnologist*, 31 (2004), 461–74

Figs, Orlando, *The Whisperers: Private Life in Stalin's Russia* (London: Allen Lane, 2007)

Fil'kevych, M. O., *Dovzhenkivtsi: Storinky nashoi istorii*, 2nd edn (Kyiv: PP Kl'ots A. O., 2006)

Fine, Ellen, 'The Absent Memory: The Act of Writing in Post-Holocaust French Literature' in *Writing and the Holocaust*, ed. by Berel Lang (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1988), pp. 41–57

Finnin, Rory, 'Silence and Extinction in *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*: Paradzhanov at BAM, November 2007', *Slavic and East European Performance*, 28.1 (2008)

First, Joshua, 'Scenes of Belonging: Cinema and the Nationality Question in Soviet Ukraine During the Long 1960s' (doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 2008), <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/61707/1/jfirst_1.pdf> [accessed 25 January 2012]

—, 'Ukrainian National Cinema and the Concept of the "Poetic"', *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 9 (2009), <<http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/first.shtml>> [accessed 15 July 2012]

Forgacs, David, *Rome Open City (Roma Città Aperta)* (London: BFI, 2000)

Foster, Susan, 'Dancing with the "Mind's Muscles": A Brief History of Kinesthesia and Empathy', keynote address, presented at the conference *Kinesthetic Empathy: Concepts and Contexts*, University of Manchester, April 2010, <<http://www.watchingdance.ning.com>> [accessed 14 May 2011]

Fresco, Nadine, 'Remembering the Unknown', *International Review of Psycho-Analysis*, 11 (1984), 417–27

Gazda, Janusz, 'Ukrains'ka shkola poetychnoho kino' [1970], in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 184–86

Ginsburg, Faye, 'The Parallax Effect: The Impact of Aboriginal Media on Ethnographic Film', *Visual Anthropology Review*, 11.2 (1995), 64–76

Golovatskii, Ia. F., 'Narodnyia piesni Galitskoi i Ugorskoi Rusi', in *Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, 3 (Jul–Sep 1864), pp. 177–320

Gurga, JJ, 'Remembering (in) Ukrainian Cinema of the 1960s: Rolan Serhiienko's *White Clouds*', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 5 (2011), 353–70

Hammersley, Martyn and Paul Atkinson, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, 3rd edn (London: Routledge, 2000)

Hass, Aaron, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Second Generation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Havryl'iuk, Natalia, 'The Structure and Function of Funeral Rituals and Customs in Ukraine', *Folklorica: Journal of the Slavic and East European Folklore Association*, 8.2 (2003), 7–23

Heider, Karl, *Ethnographic Film*, rev. edn (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2006)

Hirsch, Marianne, *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative, and Postmemory* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997)

—, 'The Generation of Postmemory', *Poetics Today*, 29 (2008), 103–28

—, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012)

—, 'Past Lives: Postmemories in Exile', *Poetics Today*, 17 (1996), 659–86

—, 'Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory', *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, 14 (2001), 5–37

Hnatiuk, V. 'Sympatychna Postat' in *Spohady pro Mykhaila Kotsiubyns'koho*, ed. by Mykhailo Potupeiko, 2nd edn (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989), pp. 175–79

Hockings, Paul, ed., *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, 3rd edn (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003)

Hoffman, Eva, *After Such Knowledge: Memory, History, and the Legacy of the Holocaust* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004)

Hrabovs'kyi, Viktor, 'Nepokora – 1963: Zabuttiu pidliahaie?', *Telekritika*, 15 February 2008, <<http://telekritika.ua/view/2008-02-15/36523>> [accessed 25 January 2012]

Iakutovych, Serhii, 'Koly zhaduiesh Velykoho Maistra', *Kino-Teatr*, 2010.6, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=1087> [accessed 6 April 2012]

Iashchenko, Leopold, *Ukrains'ke narodne bahatoholossia* (Kyiv: Akademii nauk Ukrain'skoi RSR, 1962)

Il'enko, Iurii, 'Duel' in Sergei Paradzhanov, *Kollazh na fone avtoportreta: Zhizn' – igra* (Nizhnii Novgorod: Dekom, 2005), pp. 130–33

Iur'iev, Borys, 'Dovzhenko znimaie "Shchorsa"', *Kino-Teatr*, 2003.1, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=66> [accessed 4 April 2012]

Ivanov, Sviatoslav 'Ukrains'kyi khudozhnii fil'm 60-kh rokiv', in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 229–43

Johnson, William, 'The Liberation of the Echo: A New Hearing for Film Sound', *Film Quarterly*, 38.4 (1985), 2–12

Jones, Polly, "'A Symptom of the Times": Assigning Responsibility for the Stalin Cult in the Soviet Literary Community, 1953–64', *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 42 (2006), 151–67

Jucovy, Milton E., 'Psychoanalytic Contributions to Holocaust Studies', *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 73 (1992), 267–82 (pp. 268–69)

Kadochnikova, Larisa, *Belaia ptitsa: Polety naiavu i vo sne* (Vinnytsia: Globus-Press, 2008)

—, ‘Vin buv zemnoiu i vodnoch as hezemnoiu liudynoiu’, *Kino-Teatr*, 2011.3
<http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=1143> [accessed 8 July 2011]

Kaindl, Raimund, *Hutsuly: Ikh zhyttia, zvychai ta narodni perekazy* (Chernivtsi: Molodyi Bukovynets, 2000)

Kassabian, Anahid, ‘Inattentive Engagements: The New Problematics of Sound and Music’, *Cinema Journal*, 48.1 (2008), 118–23

Katanian, Vasilii, *Paradzhanov: Tsena vechnogo prazdnika* (Moscow: Chetyre iskusstva, 1994)

Kepley Jr, Vance, ‘Federal Cinema: The Soviet Film Industry, 1924–32’, *Film History*, 8 (1996), 344–56

Kerins, Mark, ‘A Statement on Sound Studies: (with apologies to Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, and Grigori Alexandrov)’, *Music, Sound, and the Moving Image*, 2.2 (2008), 115–19

Keryk, Oksana, ‘Serhii Iakutovych – syn “Tinei zabutykh predkiv”’, *Vyskokyi zamok*, 31 July 2004, <<http://www.wz.lviv.ua/articles/32136>> [accessed 5 April 2012]

Koenig, Samuel, ‘Mortuary Beliefs and Practices Among the Galician Ukrainians’, *Folklore*, 57.2 (1946), 83–92

Kolesnikova, N., ‘Po doroge na ekran’, *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 12 December 1961, p. 4.

Kononenko, Natalie, *Ukrainian Minstrels: And the Blind Shall Sing* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1998)

Koolstra, Cees M., Allerd L. Peeters and Herman Spinhof, 'The Pros and Cons of Dubbing and Subtitling', *European Journal of Communication*, 17 (2002), 325–54

Kostenko, Lina, 'Narodzhenyi pid znakom Stril'tsia', *Kino-Teatr*, 2002.2,
<<http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/2002/2/index.htm>> [accessed 12 February 2012]

Kotsiubynsky, M., *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, trans. by Marco Carynnyk, with notes and an essay by Bohdan Rubchak (Littleton, CO: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1981)

Kotsiubyns'kyi, Mykhailo, 'Tini zabutykh predkiv', in Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Tvory v chotyrokh tomakh*, ed. by M. S. Hrytsiuta (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1985), III (*Povisti ta opovidannia 1910–1912*), 154–211

—, *Tvory v chotyrokh tomakh*, ed. by M. S. Hrytsiuta (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1985)

—, *Tvory v semy tomakh*, ed. by O. Ie. Zasenka and others, 7 vols (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1973–1975)

Kozyrieva, Tetiana, 'Pochuty pochuttia. Kompozytor Myroslav Skoryk. "Paradzhhanov prosyv stvoryty dlia "Tinei..." til'ky henial'nu muzyky"', *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, 34 (13 September 2008), <http://dt.ua/CULTURE/pochuti_pochuttia_kompozitor_miroslav_skorik_paradzhhanov_prosiv_stvoriti_dlya_tiney_tilki_genialnu_-54788.html> [accessed 25 November 2011]

Kufryk, Bohdan, 'Iuvilei henial'noho fil'mu', *Ekspres*, 28–29 September 2004, p. 19

Lakatos, Robert, 'Tradytisia i novatorstvo v strukturuvanni zobrazhennia u fil'makh Serhiiia Paradzhanova' [1999], in *Poetychne kino*, ed. by Briukhovets'ka, pp. 33–43

Lant, Antonia, 'Haptical Cinema', *October*, 74 (Autumn 1995), 45–73

Luhovs'kyi, Volodymyr, *S. Paradzhanov: Tini zabutykh predkiv rozkadrovky: Nevidomyi maestro* (Kyiv: Akademiia, 1998)

MacDougall, David, *The Corporeal Image: Film, Ethnography, and the Senses* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006)

Magocsi, Paul Robert, *A History of Ukraine: The Land and its Peoples*, 2nd rev. and expanded edn. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010)

Magocsi, Paul R. and Ivan Ivanovich Pop, *Encyclopedia of Rusyn History and Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002)

Maiboroda, O. M. and others, eds, *Movna sytuatsiia v Ukraini: Mizh konfliktom i konsensusom* (Kyiv: Instytut Politychnykh i Etnonatsional'nykh doslidzhen' im. I. F. Kurasa, Natsional'na Akademiia Nauk Ukrainy, 2008)

Makarenko, Nikolai, 'Gliadia v koren"', *Sovetskaia Ukraina*, 1961.1, 109–35

Maksudov, Sergei, 'Victory over the Peasantry', in *Hunger by Design: The Great Ukrainian Famine and its Soviet Context*, ed. by Halyna Hryn (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2009), pp. 53–101

Malinowski, Bronislaw, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1984)

Marcus, Millicent, *Italian Film in the Light of Neorealism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986)

Marks, Laura U., *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000)

—, 'Video and Haptic Erotics', *Screen*, 39 (1998), 331–48

Marples, David R., *Russia in the Twentieth Century: The Quest for Stability* (New York: Longman, 2011)

Martin, John, *America Dancing: The Background and Personalities of the Modern Dance* (New York: Dance Horizons, 1968)

Maznyi, Volodymyr, ed., *Lysty do Mykhaila Kotsiubyns'koho*, 4 vols (Kyiv: Ukrain's'ki Propilei, 2002)

Mel'nyk, Ol'ha, 'Iurii Illienko: Ia opanuvav Ukrain's'ku metodolohiiu vzhivannia cherez «ne mozhu» i «tak ne buvaie»', *Personal Plus*, 19 (170), 10–16 May 2006, <<http://www.personal-plus.net/170/670.html>> [accessed 16 February 2012]

Merridale, Catherine, 'Death and Memory in Modern Russia', *History Workshop Journal*, 42 (1996), 1–18

—, *Night of Stone: Death and Memory in Russia* (London: Granta Books, 2000)

Metz, Christian, 'Aural Objects', trans. by Georgia Gurrieri, *Yale French Studies*, 60 (1980), 24–32

Mikhalkov-Konchalovskii, Andrei, *Vozvyshaiushchii obman* (Moscow: Kolleksiia 'Sovershenno sekretno', 1999)

Mochul's'kyi, M., 'Chudovyi khudozhnyk slova' in *Spohady*, ed. by Potupeiko, pp. 127–29

Myshanych, S. C., ed., *Pisni Podillia: Zapysy Nasti Prysiazhniuk v seli Pohrebyshche, 1920–1970 gg* (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1976)

Nebesio, Bohdan Y., ‘Competition from Ukraine: VUFKU and the Soviet Film Industry in the 1920s’, *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, 29.2 (2009), 159–80

—, ‘The First Five Years with No Plan: Building National Cinema in Ukraine, 1992–1997’, *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, 34.3 (2007), 265–97

—, ‘Questionable Foundations for a National Cinema: Ukrainian Poetic Cinema of the 1960s’, *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 42 (2000), 35–46

—, ‘Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors: Storytelling in the Novel and the Film’, *Literature/Film Quarterly*, 22 (1994), 42–49

Nykorak, Olena P., ed., *Hutsul's'ka vyshyvka z koleksii Natsional'noho muzeiu narodnoho mystetstva Hutsul'shchyny ta Pokuttia im. I. Kobryns'koho* (Kyiv: Rodovid, 2010)

O'Reilly, Karen, *Ethnographic Methods* (London: Routledge, 2005)

Oleksyk-Bleiker, Miroslava, ‘Serhii Paradzhanov: “*Khai zhyve ukrains'kyi natsionalizm!*”’, *Kino-Teatr*, 2008.4, <http://www.ktm.ukma.kiev.ua/show_content.php?id=797> [accessed 21 February 2012]

Os'machka, Todos', *Starshyi boiaryn* (Neu-Ulm: Prometei, 1946)

Palash, O. O., ‘Kolektyvna travma v ihrovomu kino: Vypadok odynychnoi reprezentatsii (“Holod-33”)’, *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA*, 114 (2011), 73–78

Panopoulos, Panayotis, 'Animal Bells as Symbols: Sound and Hearing in a Greek Island Village', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9 (2003), 639–56

Paradzhanov, Sergei, "...Chtoby ne molchat', berus' za pero": Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s nedrugami i druz'iami', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1990.12, 32–41

—, *Kollazh na fone avtoportreta: Zhizn' – igra* (Nizhnii Novgorod: Dekom, 2005)

—, 'Nezvazhaiuchy na vidstani', *Literaturna Ukraina*, 34 (20 August 1987)

—, 'Vechnoe dvizhenie', *Iskusstvo kino*, 1966.1, 60–66

Pavliuk, V. I. and others, *Natsional'na knyha pamiati zhertv holodomoriv 1932–1933, 1946–1947 rokiv v Ukraini: Chernivets'ka oblast'* (Chernivtsi: Zelena Bukovyna, 2008)

Peacock, Louise, *Serious Play: Modern Clown Performance* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2009)

Piault, Marc Henri, 'Real with Fiction', *Visual Anthropology Review*, 23 (2007), 16–25

Polishchuk, N. S., and A. P. Ponomarev, eds, *Ukraintsy*, (Moscow: Nauka, 2000)

Smith, Mark Michael, *Sensing the Past: Seeing, Hearing, Smelling, Tasting, and Touching in History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007)

Potupeiko, Mykhailo, *Spohady pro Mykhaila Kotsiubyns'koho*, 2nd edn (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989)

‘Preodolet’ otstavanie dramaturgii’, *Pravda*, 7 April 1952, pp. 2–3

Raczymow, Henri, ‘Memory Shot Through with Holes’, trans. by Alan Astro, *Yale French Studies*, 85 (1994), 98–105

Repiakh, V. and others, ‘Molodye za ekranom: Komsomol'tsy otvechaiut na kritiku gazety. A chto dumaiut rukovoditeli studii imeni Dovzhenko?’, *Komsomol'skaia pravda*, 31 January 1962, p. 2.

Rouch, Jean, *Ciné-ethnography*, ed. and trans. by Stephen Feld (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003)

Rubchak, Bohdan, ‘The Music of Satan and the Bedeviled World: An Essay on Mykhailo Kotsiubynsky’ in Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors*, trans. by Marco Carynnyk (Littleton, CO: The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies by Ukrainian Academic Press, 1981), pp. 77–121

Ruberto, Laura E. and Kristi M. Wilson, eds, *Italian Neorealism and Global Cinema* (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2007)

Ruby, Jay, *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000)

Rudans'kyi, Stepan, *Tvory v tr'okh tomakh*, 3 vols (Kyiv: Naukova dumka (1873)

Rudnytzky, Leonid, ‘A Note on Volodymyr Hnatiuk (1871–1926)’ in Volodymyr Hnatiuk, *Vybrani statti pro narodnu tvorchist': Na 100-richchia narodzhennia, 1871–1981*, (New York: NTSh, 1981), pp. 25–28

Sadoul, Georges, *Dictionary of Films*, trans. by Peter Morris (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1972)

Salt, Barry, 'Statistical Style Analysis of Motion Pictures', *Film Quarterly* 28.1 (1974), 13–22

Samuels, David W., Louise Meintjes, Ana Maria Ochoa, and Thomas Porcello, 'Soundscapes: Toward a Sounded Anthropology', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39 (2010), 329–45

Shubravs'koi, M. M. , ed., *Vesillia: u dvokh knyhakh*, 2 vols (Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1970)

Shukhevych, Volodymyr, *Hutsul'shchyna*, 5 vols (Lviv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Shevchenka, 1899–1908)

Shumada, Nataliia, 'Karpats'kyi pisennyi dyvotsvit', in *Kvitky Verkhovyny: Kolomyiky*, ed. by Iurii Boichuk (Uzhhorod: Karpaty, 1985), pp. 6–9

—, 'Oi dribnen'ka kolomyika, kolomyika myla', in *Kolomyiky: Zbirnyk*, ed. by Natalia Shumada (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1977), pp. 5–12

Sidnell, Jack, *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010)

Stefanyk, Vasył', 'Kaminnyi khrest' in *Novely* (Uzhhorod: Karpaty, 1997), pp. 40–50

Steffen, James M., 'Kyiv Frescoes: Sergei Paradjanov's Unrealized Film Project', *KinoKultura*, Special Issue 9: Ukrainian Cinema (December 2009), <<http://www.kinokultura.com/specials/9/steffen.shtml>> [accessed 12 June 2012]

Stroievus, Ol'ha, 'Vasyl' Stus u shistdesiatnyts'komu rusi', *Ukraina – Ievropa – Svit: Mizhnarodnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*, 2 (2009), 223–29 <http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/soc_gum/Ues/2008_2009/Articles/2/Stroievus.pdf> [accessed 28 July 2012]

Suleiman, Susan Rubin, 'The 1.5 Generation: Thinking About Child Survivors and the Holocaust', *American Imago*, 59.3 (2002), 277–95

Syzonenko, O., 'Bili khmary' in *Vybrani tvory*, 2 vols (Kyiv: Dnprio, 1983), I (*Romany*), 21–199

Szporluk, Roman, 'Urbanisation in Ukraine since the Second World War', in his *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2000), pp. 139–60

Théberge, Paul, 'Almost Silent: The Interplay of Sound and Silence in Contemporary Cinema and Television', in *Lowering the Boom: Critical Studies in Film Sound*, ed. by Jay Beck and Tony Grajeda (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), pp. 51–67

Trymbach, Serhii, *Ivan Mykolaichuk* (Kyiv: KM Akademiia, 2002)

—, 'Vasyl' Vasyl'ovych', *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, 49 (21 December 2002), <http://dt.ua/CULTURE/vasil_vasilovich-30555.html> [accessed 12 February 2012]

Tsahaniuk, V. F. and Iu. P. Humeniuk, *Narodnoznavchi motyvy v tvorchosti M Kotsiubyns'koho* (Vinnytsia: Vinobldrukarnia, 1997)

Uzwyshyn, Raymond, 'Between Ukrainian Cinema and Modernism: Alexander Dovzhenko's Silent Trilogy' (doctoral dissertation, New York University, 2000), <<http://rayuzwyshyn.net/dovzhenko/Introduction.htm>> [accessed 2 December 2011]

Vallin, Jacques, France Meslé, Serguei Adamets, and Serhiy Pyrozhkov, 'The Great Famine: Population Losses in Ukraine', in *Holodomor: Reflections on the Great Famine of 1932–1933 in Soviet Ukraine*, ed. by Lubomyr Luciuk (Kingston, ON: Kashtan Press, 2008), pp. 33–48

Voskoboinikova, L., 'Ozhivaiut davnie teni', *Komsomol'skoe znamia*, 17 September 1964

Widdis, Emma, 'Faktura: Depth and Surface in Early Soviet Set Design', *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*, 3 (2009), 5–32

Wilson, Andrew, *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, 2nd edn (New Haven, CT: Yale Nota Bene, 2002)

Wissmath, Bartholomäus, David Weibel and Rudolf Groner, 'Dubbing or Subtitling? Effects on Spatial Presence, Transportation, Flow, and Enjoyment', *Journal of Media Psychology*, 21.3 (2009), 114–25

Woll, Josephine, *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2000)

Worth, Sol, and John Adair, *Through Navajo Eyes: An Exploration in Film Communication and Anthropology* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1972)

Yehorova, Iryna, 'The "Unknown" Holodomor of 1947', *Den'*, 38 (11 December 2007), < <http://www.day.kiev.ua/193091/>> [accessed 24 July 2012]

Yekelchuk, Serhii, *Stalin's Empire of Memory: Russian-Ukrainian Relations in the Soviet Historical Imagination* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003)

—, *Ukraine: Birth of a Modern Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Zeitlin, Froma I., 'The Vicarious Witness: Belated Memory and Authorial Presence in Recent Holocaust Literature', *History and Memory*, 10.2 (1998), 5–42

Zelenchuk, Iaroslav, 'Hutsul's'ke vesillia na Verkhovynshchyni', *Ukrainoznavstvo*, 2008.2, 268–70

Zezina, Maria, 'Crisis in the Union of Soviet Writers in the Early 1950s', *Europe-Asia Studies*, 46 (1994), 649–61