

PARAJANOV'S METAMORPHOSES: FROM VERSIFIED FILM TO CINEMA OF POETRY

This article examines the attempts to explain the anomaly of Sergey Parajanov's work from the point of view of the auteur theory of cinema. This anomaly is related to the division of the filmmaker's oeuvre into two almost symmetrical but very different parts: the early films, which most critics consider mediocre failures, and the mature films, which are each recognized as breakthroughs in cinematic language. While the moment of the filmmaker's transformation remains enigmatic, this article argues that the search for a poetic vision was (consciously or not) conducted during the whole early period of Parajanov's work, and that this helps to account for the at times incoherent quality of the early films as narrative cinema.

Keywords: Sergey Parajanov, image, narrative, poetic textual regime, prosaic textual regime.

Sergey's Parajanov's work is an anomaly from the point of view of the auteur theory of cinema. Robert Payne pointed out that the main obstacle to applying of authorial approach to the work of this filmmaker is the inaccessibility (in the early 1990s) of his early films. It seems, though, that their accessibility only exacerbates the problem. Parajanov's oeuvre is split into two very different periods – early and mature. His four early feature films, *Andriesh*, *The Top Guy*, *Ukrainian Rhapsody*, and *The Flower of the Stone*, shot at the Dovzhenko Film Studios between 1954 and 1962 in the framework of the socialist realist canon, are very different from his four mature films which, beginning from *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* (Dovzhenko Film Studios, 1964) demonstrate a total break with it. It is often believed that the real Parajanov started from *Shadows* and that which came before is considered a regrettable misunderstanding. Variations of the phrase “nothing predicted this film” appear among many authors who depict Parajanov's creative trajectory. If, as Jean Renior put it, an author continues to make the same film his all life [16, p. 541] than Parajanov hardly fits such a definition. How then one can unify the early Parajanov, who had a reputation as “the worst filmmaker” at the studio [15, p. 55] and whose films traditionally provoked fire from both film critics and authorities if they did not go unnoticed, with the mature Parajanov as genius? How can this metamorphosis, this mysterious transformation, be comprehended? As a result of this puzzling incommensurability of two Parajanovs there is a tendency to forget about the existence of his early period, consciously or not to repress these films from the memory, or to find the only justification for their existence that “these

films gave him and his family possibility to escape death by starvation” [5, p. 398]. Such a strategy of normalization of this author's anomaly creates as a side product that Vadym Skurativsky referred to as the “enigmatic primary void” of Parajanov's film career [14, p. 42].

There is, however, another, more consequent strategy, which refuses to ignore Parajanov's early works and doesn't take them as unworthy of attention; it aims at searching for the flashes of Parajanov's emerging mature genius in his early films. This strategy was initiated by Parajanov himself, who, in the wake of *Shadows*' triumph in the mid 1960s, cast his disparaging look over his early films in his manifesto “Perpetual Motion” [11]. Despite his adverse tone, it is possible to discern behind the façade of what seems to appear as a desire to distance himself from his early work, an implicated endeavor of understanding his own creative path which led him to a breakthrough. Ultimately, Parajanov's take on his early films in that article is to formulate those questions the answers for which took so long to emerge, to find those seeds of a new and original vision of his own that required such a protracted germination. Myron Chernenko, painting Parajanov's creative portrait on the second wave of fame which elevated him during the Perestroika period, examines in fairly close detail filmmaker's work of the early period, “a time to cast away stones” as he referred to it [2, p. 4]. While the critic's tone remains severe, which can partly be explained by the rejection of everything “ideological” (as they used to say during Perestroika time, naively assuming that ideology could be restricted to the product of respective departments of the Communist party and was supposed to fade into history together

with its rule) Chernenko suggests two intertwined interpretations of the anomaly of early Parajanov, a conformist and a rebel: 1) Parajanov was not conscious of his abilities on this stage and was working according to the existing canons and conventions under which he had been commissioned; 2) however, the equally unconscious rush to destroy, or at least to scoff at those canons and conventions was forcing its way through this apparent docility. Chernenko makes a very interesting comparison of Parajanov's early work with collages, consisting of citations and amalgamations of the classical examples of respective Soviet genres. However he refuses to endow these collages with their own value and refers to early Parajanov as someone who is "just completing an intensive course on practical filmmaking in all the popular genres of the time – in order to understand how alien and antipathetic such filmmaking was for him, how much he needed other cinema, his own" [2, p. 6–7]. There is thus in the case of Parajanov something like a Bildungsroman, a protracted path to the acquisition of consciousness, instead of modulations of the same as emphasized by the auteur approach to cinema. Such a prolonged period of apprenticeship is rarely found among the other authors on the same plane as the mature Parajanov. They could have changed a style or a "handwriting," or, to be more precise, a language, to switch from one system of representation to the other (for example, German and American periods in Fritz Lang). But their talent manifested from the very beginning, so that their authorial voice was obvious from the first to the last film.

The tendency to consider Parajanov's "the first steps" as apprenticeship was furthered in the late 1990s by Volodymyr Horpenko in a brief monograph of the same name [7] in which the focus is put on mistakes and faults of a novice to the filmmaking profession: they are found in the logical development of narration and continuity of editing, in the plastic expressions of psychological motivation of characters, and the dramatic theme. Such an approach – judging Parajanov's early films from the criteria of the conventions of continuity and consistency which he would later completely reject – appears to be counterintuitive; these deviations from the normative language could better be seen not as mishaps, but as flashes of a forthcoming authorial style which rejects established cinematic "literacy." It is this literacy that, according to Parajanov, was responsible for the shortcoming of another Carpathian film, *Oleksa Dovbush* (Dovzhenko Film Studios, 1959), by Victor Ivanov,

who "came to Carpathians cinematically educated" [11, p. 62] and thus failed to capture local way of life. On the other hand, such a stocktaking of failures if it is enhanced with reflexivity can open an intriguing sphere of cinematic hybrids that emerge from the crossbreeding of the classical narrative film with the modernist tendencies, even if they are not fully realized. Besides, Horpenko's work, which distinguishes for the first time Parajanov's early films as a specific object of study, provides an interesting, sometimes close, shot-by-shot analysis of their "architectonics" and valuable observations on germination of authorial vision from socialist realist system of representation.

There is a tendency, thus, if not to rehabilitate the early films by Parajanov, then at least to develop a more sympathetic attitude toward them. The disparaging tone of the mid 1960s has given way since the late 1980s to the intention to look closer at these films in order to find flashes of looming genius in them. This mollifying tendency can probably be attributed to the distance of time that increases aura of things not devoured by it. The rehabilitation of early Parajanov was furthest advanced in the article by Vadym Skurativsky "Shadows of Forgotten Films" (2001) in which the author didn't limit himself to restating Myron Chernenko's call to take a closer look at these films and the legitimization of them as a worthy object of study suggested by Volodymyr Horpenko. With a somewhat provocative gesture Skurativsky proposed to merge together Parajanov's first four "non-masterpieces" with his first masterpiece into his "Ukrainian pentalogy" [14, p. 45–46]. This is supposed to be done on the basis of the antirealist tendency inherent in all the films, which ripened in spite of the dominant neorealist trend of the Thaw.

According to Skurativsky this antirealist countertendency hadn't find its proper cultural material in Parajanov's early films. As long as it had been Soviet contemporary life that served as the material for the films, neatly covering class structure of Soviet society (workers, collective farmers, "layer of intellectuals," and a fairytale shepherd-leader above them) Parajanov's formal, antirealist inclination was perceived as an integral part of Stalinism, or to put it in Skurativsky's words, "totally archaic intention of previous Soviet cinematic mythology" [14, p. 42–43]. It is only beginning with *Shadows*, based on the material of traditional Hutsul culture, the natural environment of ceremonies and rituals, which form, according to Skurativsky, a matrix of Parajanov's cinema, that this tendency could find its full realization in all its unique authority. Yet, it remains an open

question whether the rituals which Skurativsky looks for in Parajanov's early films do contain the seeds of his forthcoming mature signature. It is true that rituals do permeate his early films; there is a wedding ritual in *The Top Guy* (Dovzhenko Studios, 1958), a singing competition transformed into a strange initiation ritual due to a fetishistic separation of a stage and an audience in *Ukrainian Rhapsody* (Dovzhenko Studios, 1961), religious rituals of Pentecostal sect in *The Flower on the Stone* (Dovzhenko Studios, 1962), as Skurativsky justly points out. Yet, the construction of rituals and ceremonies was not as such alien to Soviet society with its inherent archaic and formulaic thinking that tended to create its own mythology as was demonstrated through the material of socialist realist novel by Katerina Clark [3].

From the first sight, the key to the difference between the early and the mature Parajanov lies in the cultural matter of the rituals and ceremonies, whether it belongs to a Soviet contemporaneity or pre-Soviet past. This explains why the Parajanov's debut folkloric film *Andriesh* (Dovzhenko Studios, 1954), made together with Yakov Bazelian based on their VGIK diploma, enjoys the most attention out of his early films. *Andriesh* is a pseudofolk Moldavian fairytale about a little courageous shepherd whose herd of sheep was taken away by dark forces and who sets off to get it back and to vanquish the evil. This film contains both folk-mythological substratum and allegoric form of narrative with rejection of psychological motivations as far as to make the characters speak not with the ordinary colloquial, but versified yet rather very prosaic speech.

This emphasis on his debut fairytale makes the time period of Parajanov's status as "the worst filmmaker of the Studio" – the decade between 1954, when *Andriesh* was released, and 1964, the year of the breakthrough of *Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors* as a kind of sidestepping from the initial path of folkloric and mythological material, as if his films on Soviet collective farmers (*The Top Guy*), intellectuals (*Ukrainian Rhapsody*), and coal miners (*The Flower on the Stone*) were leading Parajanov in a route opposite of his innermost aspirations until he found himself at home again within the folkloric material of Hutsulshchyna.

Thus Parajanov's early career resembles a story of the prodigal son's return according to this dominant scheme. This version of Parajanov's anomaly places material in the heart of the authorial voice; the substance of his films becomes a decisive in his self-fulfilment. Yet, despite the superficial similarity of his debut Moldavian fairytale

Andriesh with *Shadows*, those two films can be seen as a true antipodes, particularly in the light of an important distinction between the folkloric and ethnographic modes of representation introduced by Joshua First [5, p. 27–44], the former being naively staged and spurious construction of the ethnic difference, while the latter recreates it as a full-blown, lively experience. In this respect *Andriesh* and *Shadows* are opposites. Thanks to its modernist form, the latter film performs an operation of defamiliarization of folkloric material, turning "the knowable curiosities back into strange beings" [5, p. 100]. This modernist intention is manifested not only on the level of the material substance of the image, but also on the level of the narrative treatment of the key theme of both films, that of a loss. *Andriesh*, being a part of a heroic discourse, presents the loss as a pretext for a feat, while in *Shadows* it appears as an irreparable break of life which bleeds. The difference between these two films is discernible even more clearly when focus is shifted from content to form. It becomes obvious that the two films belong to two diametrically opposed formal poles: realistic-prosaic (albeit versified) and poetic-metaphoric, particularly in their handling of a phantastic. The phantastic is rendered realistically in *Andriesh*, where it is normalized within the structure of classical narrative film. On the contrary, Parajanov effaced almost all phantastic creatures of Hutsul demonology from *Shadows* despite their presence in Kotsiubynsky's novel, and rendered a remaining few as mundane. Yet, at the same time, the very real, sensible world in *Shadows* was turned into a mirage, a dream. While in *Andriesh* the phantastic is located on the level of signified, in *Shadows* it belongs to the level of signifier. The former is a realistic description of fictitious, while the latter is a poetic description of the real.

To understand the path between these two poles, represented by *Andriesh* on the one side and *Shadows* on the other, one needs to look closer to the films on contemporary Soviet reality which Parajanov made between them and which were despised by both critics and filmmaker himself. This different vision of reality, which fully manifested itself in *Shadows*, the vision, which was keen to look for the elements of poetic in the everyday, to notice the magic metamorphoses of the very mundane matter and endow them with the meaning, was becoming ripe in those films amidst and despite their prosaic material. The discoveries made by Parajanov along this way of acquiring a new vision varied from film to film, finally perfected into poetic crystal since *Shadows*.

One of these evolving discoveries can be found in the comedy *The Top Guy*, about the victorious introduction of sports into collective farm life. In the most frivolous episode of the film, the flirtatious textile salesman throws over his sweetheart different colorful fabrics until a white semitransparent veil covers her head, creating a moment of peculiar, semitransparent vision which embodies dreamy captivated desire. The shot/reverse shot figure transmits through the semitransparent veil-screen the erotic gaze blurred by the affect that the couple exchanges. A similar moment of erotized misty gaze through a semitransparent veil appears in the film *The Flower of the Stone* about Donbas coal miners. The exchange of this gaze also happens in a department store, although the narrative motivation is much less defined (we do not know how the veil happened to cover the female protagonist), only the logic and aesthetic of the affect which constitutes semitransparency as a characteristic of the enamored gaze is important. The plastic equivalent of affect in these two films still exists in a framework of aestheticization of eroticism similar to the famous laces in Josef von Sternberg's films. Marshall McLuhan elevates this erotized semitransparency into an informational media theory opposing solid and netted stockings as hot and cool media. According to the media theorist, an eye confronted with netted surface acts similarly to a hand filling in missing parts in an image; this endows a gaze with tactile properties, brings it closer to touch [10, p. 29]. This plastic realization of a logic of affect achieves a crystal state in Parajanov's mature work: in *The Color of Pomegranates* (Armenfilm, 1969), the poet's beloved peers into the camera through a horizontal strip of lace, which she slowly moves up and down in front of her face. The haptic gaze here is liberated from a narrative motivation to become a pure crystal of aesthetic.

Haptic eroticism permeates *Shadows*; here it is achieved not via veiling, but thanks to an impressionistic usage of light and soft focus, as well as shooting through a net of floral ornament. This ornament covers an image with a layer of lace which transforms the very concept of space. The latter is no longer a homogenous volume but a juxtaposition of different layers. The metamorphosis of space through floral ornaments, which function as an additional screen, began in Parajanov's early films, albeit formalized in *Shadows*, where it revealed itself in all its purity of aesthetic surface. The short sparks of such multilayered space created by floral patterns are

already found in *Ukrainian Rhapsody* and in *The Flower on the Stone*. As we already noted, the hint of multilayered space makes its first appearance in the film *The Top Guy*, where it does not enjoy sufficient autonomy and needs a narrative excuse for its existence. It is important to understand the general tendency of Parajanov's development: the further he carries his explorations, the less fictitious and phantastic is his poetry, the more the reality itself is subjected to the magic metamorphosis under his gaze, which performs an aesthetic estrangement. This daydream episode with flirtatious textile salesman deserves a closer examination. Vadym Skurativsky pointed out a charming reversal from the material of ritual to the ritual of the material, which is performed in it. Covering the object of his love with the layers of colorful textiles the salesman creates a ritual of flirtatious caresses. This metamorphosis of material-matter contains the sparks of Parajanov's original style, "a harbinger of the textural demonstrations of his mature works" [14, p. 44]. Mature Parajanov would develop the multilayeredness as a principle of vision in different ways, particularly in the organization of visual and narrative space which is gradually freed from the characteristics of uninterrupted continuum to reveal the layering of flat surfaces, or paratactic beading of images. Distinguishing this more general tendency allows the system to be revealed in such diverse phenomena as foregrounded texture, fascination with which Parajanov persistently demonstrated during all his (not only cinematic) life; an increasing tendency toward the flattening of space that developed a wide stock of techniques to overcome the perspective built into the cinematic apparatus; a paratactic sequencing of images instead of their syntactic coordination; a dismissal of logocentrism and the creation of multilayered heterogenous acoustic space, which is not subordinated to word as a nucleus of the generation of meaning (Jj Gurga had aptly analyzed this acoustic multilayeredness in *Shadows* [6, p. 204–249]).

According to Horpenko, there is a certain "pulsation," "radiation," "energy," which creates "sensation of springiness" in Parajanov's early films, yet these properties exist only on the micro level of shot, weaken on the level of scene and practically disappear on the level of the whole film [7, p. 27, 43–44]. This observation opens the possibility of interpreting different levels of film and the potentiality of their heterogeneity in the overall relation of image and narrative in film. Parajanov's early films remained within the limits

of narrative conventions of socialist realism, yet they were perceived as failures by critics and audience who judged them according to imperatives of pedagogical entertainment that was set for Soviet filmmakers. Such pedagogical entertainment, which required narrative continuity and psychological motivation, was never in the focus of Parajanov's interest. From the very beginning he seemed to understand (maybe just intuitively) that images rather than narration are, to use Gilles Deleuze's terms, the "evident given" of cinema [4, p. 26], and Parajanov focused his interest on this primary level. A coherent story is a secondary product which exists only in the mind of a viewer and not in the film itself; it is constructed by a viewer out of narrative clues and implications. Parajanov latter formulated his disinterest in what he dubbed as a "literary" solution in cinema as opposed to "painterly" one: "I always have been sensitive to painting and long ago got used to perceiving a frame as an independent pictorial canvas. I am conscious of a tendency of my directing style to dissolve itself into painting; this is both its primary weakness and primary strength. More often I apply painterly rather than literary solutions in my practice" [11, p. 60]. This explains why the school founded by *Shadows* had initially three alternative names: poetic (this one was allotted to it), associative, and painterly [8, p. 230]. What is at stake here is the autonomy of the image, which retains its own frequency, its own "pulsation," independent of a narrative; difference between image and narrative does not need to be expressed with reference to other artistic practices like painting and literature, it enters the more global problematics of matter. This is what Giles Deleuze designated, with the reference to chemistry, as molecular and molar levels of cinema.

Deleuze emphasized this visual substance of cinema against Christian Metz's "grand syntagmatic," for Deleuze: "Narrative is never an evident [apparent] given of images, or the effect of a structure which underlines them; it is a consequence of visible [apparent] images themselves, of the perceptible images in themselves, as they are initially defined for themselves" [4, p. 27]. Deleuze considers pure cases where both a certain type of image (movement-image, time-image) and a character of combinations it enters generate a respective type of narration (classical or modern). For the purpose of this study, it is more important to discern two levels of film: that of image and that of narration, or, to use Deleuze's phrasing, molecular and molar

levels. The possibility to understand the relations between these two levels not only in terms of correspondence but also in terms of contradiction is revealed in "heretical" semiology of Pier-Paolo Pasolini, whose influence on Deleuze's approach to cinema is profound. Yet, it remains questionable whether Pasolini's distinction between "cinema of poetry" and "cinema of prose" can without an exaggerated stretch be compared with Deleuze's distinction between classical cinema (movement-image) and modern cinema (time-image). Pasolini is convinced that despite the narrative conventions were appropriated rather early on as a dominant cultural form of cinema ("cinema undergone rather unavoidable and foreseeable rape"), under the surface of narrated story each film contains an unconscious flow of images that constitute the substance of cinema as an irrational, oneiric, hypnotic "monstrum" [12, p. 172]. Here "monstrum" refers both to "specific phenomena" (as the editors of Pasolini's text cautiously comment on its etymology) and to a marvelous monstrosity of a primary world of things, a protoverbal language of matter where all meanings are lost and spring from. It is important to note that construction of a narrative out of the flow of images should not be confused with aesthetic refinement, it is rather similar to secondary elaboration or rationalization described by Sigmund Freud, a mechanism which puts the "evident given" of oneiric images and their metamorphoses into a straitjacket of common sense.

The secondary elaboration of filmic images into coherent narrative never constituted a creative task for Parajanov, even in his early films which were still slavishly subjugated to a story. Molecular and molar levels not only contradict one another in these films, but also almost openly fight with each other, striving to liquidate the adversary. This feud only grows from film to film, generating very strong sensation of discomfort, noted already by Soviet film critics. Parajanov's early films seem to devour themselves. Parajanov's interest in this micro-level of image, its pulsation and texture, revealed in his early films a contradiction between molecular and molar, between protoverbal sensual language of things, environments, and textures and a scheme of narrative. Parajanov describes this contradiction in his article "Perpetual Motion," which among other things reflects on his experience with classical narrative film in the early stage of his work: "When I began to work on the film *The Top Guy* I opened to myself for the first time Ukrainian countryside – its texture of impressive beauty, its poetry. I tried to express this fascination

on the screen. However the whole construction fell down under the blows of the story, which was, essentially, rather primitive humoresque. The landscapes, stone babas, storks, tractors, straw wreaths had nothing to do with it" [11, p. 61]. Only after departing totally from the constrains of narrative schema and liberating a flow of images was it possible to ensure their pulsation on the level of the whole film.

One of the best example of a metamorphosis of matter-image in early Parajanov's cinema is a fragment (neither scene, nor episode) from the film *Ukrainian Rhapsody*, which depicts the end of the war, or its female variant, to be more precise. This film, the complicated narrative structure of which resembles kaleidoscope, consists not only of fragments of memories, but of two separate halves of the story, male and female, and their respective visions. Thus two versions, male and female, of the Second World War and its end are presented in the film. The male version, the grand narrative of Victory, is accomplished with the help of the monumental orchestration of masses; the extreme long shot of soldiers inscribed into a half-destroyed construction similar to the Coliseum transform people into ornamental sculptures as a part of the architectural exterior. The female version of war's end is rendered in the opposite way: as an intimate, everyday, moving experience of the return to life through a series of close-ups of village women's work and environment. This is the fragment in which matter undergoes metamorphosis via a paratactic series of images that defy narrative logic. A soldier's helmet, a material remnant of the war, is transformed under the pressures of postwar life, which utilizes it for its own peaceful purposes and demands. It is very likely that this fragment was the most important for Parajanov out of the whole film, since he refers to it in his article while rejecting the rest of the film as a failure: "The war helmet acquired meaning for me when I saw how it is used to whitewash a house, to give a drink to calves, to grow flowers or to place under a kid instead of pot" [11, p. 62]. Out of the sequence of these paratactic images that depict metamorphoses of a soldier's helmet, the concept of peaceful life growing through deadly war appears. Yet, the key and unexpected word in this passage is "meaning" which is attached to a cinematic concreteness and refers to a protoverbal language of things, the "written language of reality," as Pasolini put it. It is not a metaphor, but metamorphoses of a thing, not a transfer of meaning from one thing to another, but a transformation of matter submerged in a flow of time. This is visual thinking at work, a living

concept emerging from a set of images: life wins over death.

This protoverbal meaning, pulsing language of things is barely discernible in *Ukrainian Rhapsody*, sprouting between pompous theatricality and mundane conversations that constitute the narration in this film. Parajanov joked that there are two films in it: half of the film belongs to the scriptwriter Oleksandr Levada, a prominent figure of Ukrainian socialist realism, the other to Parajanov properly [15, p. 46]. This type of schizophrenic splitting is inherent in all his early films, which are comprised of heterogeneous textual regimes that to the most part are mutually exclusive. One possible way of naming these mutually exclusive textual regimes is Pasolini's distinction between "cinema of prose" and "cinema of poetry" [12]. The relation between these regimes cannot be harmonious by definition; there is a deadly struggle between them, it is a violent relationship, a "rape," to use Pasolini's brutal comparison, and a revenge for rape. The pulsating flows of images burst into a story, tear apart its continuous surface, and explode with attraction, burlesque, singing, dancing, pantomime, dream or phantasy. This wild, roaring, exuberant, primary, irrational, oneiric flow of images, which is so familiar from the mature films by Parajanov, is already discernible in his early work. Moreover, increasingly so from film to film: this poetic matter makes its appearance already in his debut work *Andriesh*, which is firmly coated in prose, albeit a versified one and based on folkloric material, and continues to conquer more and more of screen territory.

In this respect Parajanov's last early film *The Flower on the Stone* which enjoys the unsurpassable antipathy of most critics ("Never had Parajanov been so far from himself" [2, p. 9]; "film-cripple" [7, p. 65]) proves to be closest to "cinema of poetry," although it is rather a prosaic-poetic hybrid [1]. The monstrous heterogeneity of this film, in which the balance between these two opposed textual regimes reaches threatening equipollence, opens not only a possibility, but rather the necessity of transition from quantity to quality. It is said that during the shooting of this film Parajanov joked that this would be "the last bad film of the Kyiv Film Studio" [6, p. 85]. There could be only qualitative transformation after this film, a metamorphosis, "miraculous" from the first view, but actually prepared by the enduring work of destruction, transition from "cinema of prose" to "cinema of poetry."

Thus an established notion of Parajanov's early trajectory as a detour, a sidestepping from the initial path [2, p. 5, 7, 9; 14, p. 40–42] needs

serious reconsideration. However devious this path may seem to be, Parajanov moved forward toward a poetic vision. The early period of Parajanov's work is a story of an ugly duckling rather than the prodigal son's return; what was considered a weakness, a failure, an inability to film the same way as the others, turned out to be strength to film differently, to create one's own vision. Evaluations of "bad" and "good" become mutually inverse: thanks to the fact that Parajanov was "the worst" filmmaker from the point of view of studio system, that he didn't conform to the

established rules, he was able to transcend them and expand the understanding of film language. The search for a poetic vision led Parajanov from a grand syntagmatic of a story to a protoverbal language of objects, the perpetual motion of their metamorphoses. From a phantastic and fictitious toward a real, immediate experience of contemplation of the world, toward the crystallization of its poetic core.

I am grateful to James Steffen from Emory University (USA) for his helpful comments on the text.

References

1. Briukhovetska O. Kinematografichniy Donbas periodu vidlyhy: "Chornyi" film Parajanova, abo Moloko dlia heroia / O. Briukhovetska // Kinematografichni Revisii Donbasu. – Kyiv : Art-Knyha, 2015. – P. 99–120.
2. Chernenko M. Sergey Parajanov: Tvorcheskiy Portret / M. Chernenko. – Moscow : V/O Sojuzinformkino, 1989. – 31 p.
3. Clark K. The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual / K. Clark. – Chicago : The University of Chicago Press, 1981. – 293 p.
4. Deleuze J. Cinema-2: The Time-Image / J. Deleuze. – London : The Athlone Press, 1989. – 344 p.
5. First J. Ukrainian Cinema: Belonging and Identity during the Soviet Thaw / J. First. – London, New York : I. B. Tauris, 2015. – 251 p.
6. Gurga J. J. Echoes of the Past: Ukrainian Poetic Cinema and the Experiential Ethnographic Mode / J. J. Gurga. – University College London (UCL), September 2012. – 342 p. (Manuscript).
7. Horpenko V. S. Parajanov: Pershi Kroky / V. S. Horpenko. – Kyiv : DITM, 1999. – 66 p.
8. Ivanov S. Ukrainskiy khudozhniy film 60-kh rokiv / S. Ivanov // Poetychne Kino: Zaboronena Shkola / upor. L. Briukhovetska. – Kyiv : ArtEk, 2001. – P. 229–243.
9. Katanian V. Prikosnovenie k idolam / V. Katanian. – Moscow : Zakharov-Vagrius, 1997. – 448 p.
10. McLuhan M. Understanding Media. Extensions of Man / M. McLuhan. – Cambridge and London : The MIT Press, 1994. – 365 p.
11. Parajanov S. Vechnoye dvizhenie / S. Parajanov // Iskusstvo Kino. – 1966. – No. 1. – P. 60–66.
12. Pasolini P.-P. The "Cinema of Poetry" / P.-P. Pasolini // Heretical empirism. – New Academia Publishing, LLC, 2005. – P. 167–186.
13. Payne R. The Storm of the Eye: Culture, Spectacle, Parajanov / R. Payne // Spectator. – 1990. – Iss. 10, No. 1. – P. 32–45.
14. Skuratovskiy V. Teni zabytykh filmov / V. Skuratovskiy // Ekranni mir Sergeia Parajanova / sost. Yu. Morozov. – Kyiv : Dukh i Litera, 2013. – P. 36–47.
15. Steffen J. The Cinema of Sergei Parajanov / J. Steffen. – Wisconsin UP, 2013. – 306 p.
16. Wollen P. The Auteur Theory / P. Wollen // Movies and Methods. An Anthology / ed. by Bill Nichols. – Berkley, Los Angeles, London : University of California Press, 1976. – P. 529–542.

Брюховецька О. В.

МЕТАМОРФОЗИ ПАРАДЖАНОВА: ВІД ФІЛЬМУ У ВІРШАХ ДО КІНО ПОЕЗІЇ

У статті досліджено спроби пояснити аномалію творчості Сергія Параджанова з позицій авторської теорії кіно. Ця аномалія пов'язана з поділом оєuvre режисера на дві майже симетричні, але дуже різні частини: ранні фільми, які більшість критиків вважають бездарними провалами, і зрілі фільми, кожен з яких визнаний як прорив у кінематографічній мові. Хоча момент трансформації режисера залишається загадковим, авторка статті демонструє, що пошук поетичного бачення (свідомо чи ні) здійснювався протягом усього раннього періоду творчості Параджанова, що дає змогу зрозуміти суперечливі властивості ранніх наративних фільмів режисера.

Ключові слова: Сергій Параджанов, образ, наратив, прозаїчний текстуальний режим, поетичний текстуальний режим.

Матеріал надійшов 10.03.2016