

**КУЛЬТУРОЛОГІЧНІ ВИМІРИ МИСТЕЦТВА**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.28925/2519-4135.2024.415>

УДК 791.63. (477):791.037.7(450.)

**Galyna P. POGREBNIAK**

DSc in Arts, Associate Professor,  
National Academy of Management of Culture and Arts,  
Kyiv, Ukraine,  
ORCID 0000-0002-8846-4939,  
e-mail: galina.pogrebniak@gmail.com

**VISUAL CULTURE OF DIRECTING AN  
AUTHOR'S FILM**

**Abstract.** The purpose of the article is to define the director's toolkit of frame design in the visual culture of the author's film. A comprehensive approach was used in the development of the topic, methods of systematization, comparison, verification, comparative and textual analysis were used. The analytical method and the method of figurative and stylistic analysis in their unity were directed to the consideration of the art history aspect of the problem. The articles and monographs of scientists who studied the peculiarities of the visual culture of screen arts were analyzed. The articles and monographs of scientists who studied the peculiarities of the visual culture of screen arts were analyzed. It has been found that the researchers are inclined to the opinion that the directors of author's films carry out experiments in the field of pictorial form. The relationship and mutual influence of photographic and audiovisual art is considered. It was found that images in screen arts are the result of collective work and have collective authorship. The features of the visual culture of the author's film are traced on the example of the films of Yuriy Ilenko. It has been proven that the visual culture of an author's film directly

depends on the worldview of the director. The characteristic features of an author's film are identified, the dominance of the attention of the directors-authors to the artists' specific view of the world, the creation of their own subjective picture of the world, the search for their own visual language, and the presentation of the author's screen form is substantiated. The visual culture of the author's film is analyzed and it is shown that the image, frame design is the main carrier of cinematic expressiveness. It is clarified that the system of expressive means and methods of visual culture of the author's film consists of: compositional construction of the shot; dynamics of motion of the film camera; filming angles; assembly steps; sound, light, color solutions; subject-material environment of the frame; mise-en-scene; frame design. The scientific novelty of the research lies in the fact that the director's creativity is investigated in the context of the visual culture of frame design and became the subject of a special study for the first time; the appropriateness of using the system method in studying the features of the author's plastic film language has been proven; a comprehensive analysis was carried out and the features of frame design in the author's film work were revealed.

**Key words:** visual culture, screen arts, director, visual arts, design, author, designing, frame

**Introduction.** The first steps of cinematography were connected with “attempts to record works of theatrical art” [11, p. 154]. Cinema emerged at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century from photography, which then became its subjective, essentially “substantial basis” [24, p. 80]. Today, according to D. Balakina's conviction, photography “finally defined itself as a separate and independent direction of modern art and art that internally develops, complicates, transforms and absorbs both the achievements of modern society and its needs, reacts to them” [1, p 18].

In the second half of the 19th century, photography tried to approach painting. And that is why, as noted by V. Kukorenchuk and O. Pryadko, a trend – pictorial realism – emerged in it, the supporters of which strove for a pictorial – photographic image similar to painting [15, p. 121]. N. Zhukova enters into a polemic with the above-mentioned researchers, who notes that due to the appearance of photography in the early 20th century, the question of the boundaries between painting and photography became especially relevant and even dramatic, because artists believed that the artist should no longer overburden itself by transferring small details, because for this there is a photo, with the help of which a similar effect can be achieved faster and better [29, p. 146].

Cinematographers adopted the possibilities of “photographic interpretation of the world” [22, p. 23], and cinema quickly overcame the “low” status of attraction and entertainment. In a fairly short time, cinematography has formed its own language, its own visual and expressive means. It turned into an independent and quite ambitious art form, which began to claim a special role in human life.

**Problem statement.** In the early period of its existence, cinema borrowed from photographic experience, in which “the distance between the original and its interpretation is no less than in all visual arts” [22, p. 24]. For about three decades, cinema accumulates a variety of visual and expressive means, techniques, forms its visual culture through frame design, changes the “general principle of the relationship between the truth of art and life” [3, p. 132] and acquires the full status of an art form only in the mid-1920s x years It was quite difficult for cinematography to develop the possibilities to become an art. Cinema was originally born as “moving photography”, a technical trick with little variation; then as a circus-type attraction, spectacle and entertainment for the public.

The visual culture of auteur cinema is of interest to many researchers today. Let us remind you that the author's cinematic worldview model is a means, a form of knowledge of the world by the director, his reproduction of the picture of the world with the help of film language, the main structural element of which is the frame. The image, frame design is the most important and, undoubtedly, one of the most difficult spheres of cinematic expressiveness, and the creation by an individual author of an artistic image (and its cinematic variety) necessarily contains an imprint of the personal nature of perception and feeling of the picture of the world.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Such scientists as Z. Alferova, O. Astryuk, D. Balakina, R. Barth, L. Briukhovetska, J. Butler, L. Bryukhovetska, G. Cherkov, G. Chmyl, O. Dobroskok, K. Holden, V. Horpenko, Ya. Gazda, Zh. Epstein, S. Kholodynska, V. Kondrashov, Z. Krakauer, V. Krylova, O. Lebedev, U. Lidwell, H. Lutzeler, I. Manokha, M. Murashko, O. Priadko, V. Skurativskyi, K. Stanislavska, K. K. Fetisova, I. Zubavina and others.

O. Krylova in the study “The Hero as the Personification of the Human Self in Film Art” points out that the specific nature of film art became the subject of discussions at the beginning of the 20th century, and its visual culture “enables a person to artistically embody the myth of himself on the screen” [14]. G. Cherkov in the article “Transformation of reality in the era of digital technologies” says that cinematography has a specific technical ability to “photographically accurately record the external image of reality, as well as freely transform the image of the created world” [3, p. 129].

Researchers I. Manokha and K. Fetisova believe that “all art forms known at that time did not reproduce objective reality, but a subjective image of the world and appeared as a reflection of reality in the mind of the creator, its copy” [17, p. 167]. V. Skurativskyi in his study “From the Cinematographer's

Notebook” indicates that film art “from his first French and German abstract films resolutely created its own, aesthetically high-quality avant-garde alternative to the real world” [25, p. 21].

The **purpose** of the article – to determine the director's tools for creating the design of a cinematographic frame in the visual culture of the author's film.

**Results.** Thanks to the special “effect of the authenticity of the screen image” [6, p. 149], cinema made it possible to visualize everything that “for a long time was only in human consciousness” [23, p. 69]. Screen means, which have established themselves as a creative experience of artistic cognition, made it possible to present the audience with the opportunity to “see the essence of another person through the screen” [23, p. 70].

Figurative screen systems have become evidence of a qualitatively new disclosure and reflection of reality as a vision and creation of a living new reality, which is “primarily a prepared model, accordingly serves as a tool for understanding the world” [5, p. 22]; made it possible through a unique method of sensual objectification of the movement of consciousness in sound-visual images to embody the concepts that define worldview ideas.

The result of the collective creative process over the dramaturgical material is synthesized in the plasticity of the screen image. Each participant in film production (director, cameraman, artist) operates with different systems of expressive means. The film is essentially a visual conglomerate. Sometimes it turns out to be so integral and indestructible that it is a difficult task to accurately determine the contribution of each participant in the creation of the screen image. The creative contribution of the operator, for example, is quite simple to analyze. The roles of the artist and director are not so clearly and expressively manifested, they dissolve in the screen space. The contribution

of the artist and the cameraman as authors of visual images should be considered from the point of view of expressing the pictorial concept of the film and the main stylistic principle of its solution through the frame design.

We believe that the system of visual means and techniques serves the author-director to embody certain life events, important themes and problems in the artistic fabric of the film. Visual means of expression play the role of a kind of bridge between the author and the viewer. In the author's cinematographic model, the director is the bearer of certain personal qualities. He not only can, but to a certain extent is obliged to strive for such unique self-expression through the unique form of the work. This would give grounds to talk about a specific, peculiar only to him display of the artistic picture of the world in each screen frame of an audiovisual product.

The director-author produces in his own work socially significant ideas, ideals and meanings in the context of the corresponding artistic worldview model. He embodies his idea in the screen images of the visual culture of the author's film. It should be noted that artistry as a sign of the quality of cinematographic works involves a harmonious combination of deep content and the corresponding perfect form. This combination is not manifested in the demonstrative “visuality” of the film and should not become an overt goal of the director, it should serve as a powerful means of achieving a certain artistic result, emotional and educational impact on the recipient.

We will remind you that screen arts synthesize and transform the artistic experience of literature, theater, music, choreography, visual arts, photography and circus art. At the same time, audiovisual art uses only its own visual means, reproduces the world in artistic and artistic-documentary images, expands “both the sphere of artistic exploration of life, its new sides and phenomena, and the sphere of aesthetic experience” [21, p. 205] . Researchers O. Lebedev O. and O.

Pryadko in the article “The plasticity of the cinematographic image and its components” note that “an expressive image on the screen is not just a “beautiful” and technically competent picture, but also harmoniously fits into the composition of the film, its style and drama” [16, p. 161].

We can assume that the cinematic image of the world is materialized in an audio-visual image. It grows out of the montage of shots, design of shots, composition of constituent parts of the image and acquires a deep dimension. In addition, the only condition for the existence of screen art is a real environment. It is interesting that audiovisual art creates an original (cinematic) reality, but does not actually reflect the world, but only materializes the illusory, imitates it. In the article “The time of the text and the space of the picture in cinematography: on the construction of the discussion of cinematic reality” A. Puchkov and O. Chervinsky point out that “cinematic reality is an invisible variety that cannot be subjugated by concepts”. The researchers are convinced that “no moment of cinematic reality is similar to another, everything real is a continuous heterogeneity (the degree of difference between the members of a certain population), a heterogeneous continuum” [19, p. 276].

We consider it expedient to specify those important complexes and elements of visual means that are included in the pictorial structure of the film. The basis of the film image is the subject-material environment of the frame design. The organization of the frame design is carried out not only by the production designer, but by a whole team of artists whom he manages. In addition, composition is considered to be another important means of expressiveness in cinema as a stylistic principle of organizing a film image. The composition of the staff has undergone major changes in recent decades. The director, cameraman, and artist in close cooperation work out the basic principles of compositional construction of the frame

design, provide the overall stylistic solution of the film. There are also such visual means that are the prerogative of the cinematographer only and are in the plane, in particular, the organization of the intra-frame mise-en-scene, camera dynamics, lighting, etc.

The figurative language of an author's film depends on the nature of the talent of the author-director, on his attitude to the world, other arts. Directors with an active authorial beginning most often focus their creative potential precisely on the visual means of the film. They demonstrate a high level of freedom of self-expression, try to organize cinematic material in an original way. Sometimes the text of the script appears to such film authors as the initial source material of maximum self-expression, as can be seen, for example, in the work of F. Fellini, M. Antonioni, P. Almodovar, D. Lynch, S. Parajanov, Yu. Illenko, and others.

We can state that the specific construction of each shot by the director (whose language is always unhurried, verbose, thorough), as well as the use of rather complex and intricate camera movements create something like a diaphragm around the filmed object, which at the same time complicates this object, allows to connect it with the surrounding reality in the most irrational and even magical way, and at the same time it makes it possible to extract living, authentic materials from reality.

Ukrainian director-author Valentin Vasyanovych has a first degree as a cameraman, which is why he calls himself a director-cameraman. He usually writes the script and relies on his own "view" in terms of frame design, location of filming equipment and background. The director builds a cinematic story, screen mise-en-scenes and relies primarily on the images in the frame, not only on the script and dramaturgical material. The artist does not give the drama of the film the main role. He usually does not create a cinematic story on paper, but operates



with carefully constructed, clearly constructed frames and forms a narrative from a powerful conglomerate of mise-en-scenes created in the author's imagination. This creative method is more valuable for the author-director, as it provides an energy core, sensuality, emotional coloring and a unique chronotope.

It is obvious that the foundations of the visual culture of his films (appreciated by the international audience and crowned with awards from various prestigious film forums of the world, in particular, the Venice International Film Festival) are laid precisely in the environment of real shooting locations and carefully selected interiors. V. Vasyanovych, together with the artist, looks for creative tips on how to build cinematographic scenes, shots directly on the set, on locations, in expeditions. It is this creativity that brings him international success.

The figurative language of the film in the frame arises first of all from that original artist who is able not only to reproduce a certain phenomenon, but also to feel and notice the most essential and important things in it together with creative like-minded people. In the monograph "Cinema Paradigm" Yu. Illenko wrote: "It seems to me that the language of cinema is the primary language of the world. Like all other languages of various arts, film language can do a lot of nonsense, but its esoteric role is aimed at the main activity, justified and nurtured by one goal: to capture, "express", create an image" [8, p. 199].

According to the Italian director and theoretician Pier Paolo Pasolini, "cinema, or the language of images-signs, has a dual nature: it is at the same time extremely subjective and extremely objective (within the bounds of irresistible and crude naturalistic fatality) . These two moments, different in nature, are closely adjacent to each other, they cannot be separated even in a laboratory" [18].

We will remind you that in the 1960s, the development of cinematography in tandem with directorial research was marked by discoveries in the field of pictorial decision of the

film, primarily through frame construction. So, for example, the desire for life-like authenticity of the shot, the desire to capture the relaxed atmosphere of life in its deliberate natural “unstructuredness”, filming that is similar to chronic-documentary shots, determined and long-term fixed the main principles of “documentary style” in game cinematography, which remain to this day with variable success are used by directors, in particular, Ukrainian ones (M. Slaboshpytskiy, I. Tsylyk, S. Loznytsia, V. Vasyanovych, M. Vroda, Yu. Rechynskiy, D. Sukholitkyi-Sobchuk).

The influence of documentary in the 1960s and 1970s was manifested, first of all, in a change in the principles of the compositional construction of frames, namely in the desire for loose, unfinished compositions, at first glance careless (as, for example, in the films of representatives of the French and German “new wave”, as well as Czech and the Polish “new wave”), which immersed the events of the films in an apparently accidentally and unexpectedly caught life. To the same extent, the indicated approach in the organization of an outwardly “disorganized” frame was related to the creation of the light atmosphere of the picture. So, for example, even deliberate “illuminations” in the image (which is an obvious technical defect from the point of view of the generally accepted and until now cinematographic aesthetics) turned into those powerful stylistic elements with the help of which the illusion of real life was achieved. This led to the expansion of professional operator terminology, in which the term “functional lighting” appeared. Thus, already in the second half of the 20th century, cinematographers and, above all, directors-authors quickly mastered the basic principles of “documentary aesthetics” of frame design in feature films, and at the same time, the palette of cinematic visual aids was divided into two groups.

Film directors of the “documentary” style used sharp techniques in their creative arsenal that transformed the

surrounding reality. The authors of the paintings of the so-called “poetic-painting” direction, on the contrary, tried in every way to overcome the asceticism of the “chronic-documentary” frame. For this purpose, they used a wide range of color palettes – from frankly decorative, ornamental to refined painting. This was largely facilitated not only by artistic and aesthetic factors, but also by technical factors, primarily related to the quality of color reproduction on film and the use of close-ups of the image (which led to the search for a more perfect cinematographic language that would correspond to the new, as at that time, type thinking).

In the second half of the 1960s, the new cinematic space of the image in the frame influenced the change in the nature of the use of light and color by filmmakers and caused the search for new principles of compositional construction of the frame, opened up attractive prospects for the implementation of the best traditions of fine art. This can be seen in the Ukrainian model of auteur cinema (better known as poetic cinema). The directors of poetic cinema presented in the visual culture of the frame a specific color range, an exquisite composition, a refined plastic expressiveness, a unique stylistic form.

In the article “Serhiy Parajanov's Cinema Painting and Fine Art”, O. Yamborko points out that “in the conditions of the Soviet era, the accusation of decorativeness had a double meaning”, because decorative art at that time “became the territory of a certain creative freedom for artists and gave them the opportunity to work with conventional forms and speak in a symbolic language”. The researcher notes that such a “breakthrough led to the expansion of the stylistic platform, the deepening of visual semantics, in particular the visual arts, and the appearance of a number of non-conformist works, as happened in poetic cinema, whose “Aesopian language” of associative images revealed diametrically opposed ideas and contents” [20, p. 49].

Director and cinematographer Yuriy Illenko was closely associated with Ukrainian poetic cinema. His subjective camera, as well as “the play of light and shade and colors, dynamism and an attempt to capture the mood and its smallest changes with the camera” [20, p. 17] in the film “Shadows of Forgotten Ancestors”, despite the difference of opinion with the director Serhii Paradzhanov, really gave the artists “the universe to own” [10, p. 38].

Y. Illenko demonstrated his “special attention to form, to intellectually complicated film image, metaphor, hyperbole” [13, p. 296] already in his first independent work “The Well for the Thirsty”. He sought to film not a scripted text, but to “create a discourse” [10, p. 116]. The young director not only confirmed his mastery of well-learned and personally invented methods of visual expressiveness, but in each new film he increased the richness of the cinematic language in the structure of the frame. The screen language of his films was closely related to the national experience of the past, absorbed centuries-old traditions of national culture. Yu. Illenko was convinced that the toolkit of screen language includes “image focusing, or sharpness, depth of field, bleaching, flooding, double exposure, zooming, darkening, displacement, contrast, filtering, blurring, diffusion – all of these are actualized in the text techniques become linguistic moments, create an instrumental style of expression” [8, p. 224].

Yu. Illenko made his debut as a director, co-author of the script and cameraman of the film “The Well for the Thirsty”. He adopted such an important principle of poetic expressiveness as the materialization of the image of the sphere of human memory and thereby made a successful attempt to develop an avant-garde, as for the 1960s, line of associative-poetic cinematography. The Polish researcher Janusz Gazda in the article “Ukrainian School of Poetic Cinema” noted that the master's imagination “does not easily obey the rules, it is crazy,

agitated, as if baroque, easily crosses the boundaries of realism, uses poetic and fairy-tale visions, is unrestrained in its metaphorical and symbolic” [7, p. 18]. We can say that the components of the avant-garde of that time were present in Yu. Illenko's film in the entire frame structure: the deliberate destruction of traditional drama (the screenplay by I. Drach), the presence of an impressively sensitive passionate subjective camera, the use of associative montage, an almost provocative demonstration of amazing plastic freedom in the frame, the use of the most diverse, rich in content visual intonations, flexible rhythm, the creation of a unique color range (rather unusual in its colors), striving for maximum compositional saturation of the frame plane.

In the monograph “Cinema Paradigm” Yu. Illenko noted that the creative act is the summation of the director's personal abilities and professional level into a single cinematographic system. He defined the editing of the film as the main goal that the artist sets before himself and that forms his attitude to the idea of the work and the choice of means of its realization. The artist attached special importance to the motivation that prompts the director to certain arguments in the context of visual culture. The director was convinced that “the choice of cinematographic material, the use of creative tools to create an artistic image, the adaptation of the artistic apparatus to the realization of the director's goal – all this is directly related to the design of shots and their montage, which exists in the imagination of the director” [8, p. 52] .

Yu. Illenko actively reformed screen language as a director and cinematographer. In his own films, he turned the film camera into a full-fledged participant in the action, “a kind of character” [20, p. 19]. The director defended (or renewed) the right of cinematography to be the art of “the moving image with an emphasis on the image itself” [2, p. 50]. It is important to point out that the poetics of Yu. Illenko's films are determined

by his worldview and worldview. In addition, the artist preferred those visual means that adequately conveyed his personal view of reality.

We will remind you that in the second half of the 1960s characteristic changes took place in the system object – camera – frame in the image structure of films of the Ukrainian model of auteur cinema. Cinematographers essentially created a new conditional reality of the image in the frame, operated with powerful means of reality transformation, resorted to subjectivation not only of the camera's gaze, but also of the filmed object. It is not by chance that in every tape (as in the early period - “The Well for the Thirsty”, “Evening at Ivan's Bath”, “The White Bird with a Black Mark”, and in the later period – “Swan Lake. Zone”, “Prayer for Hetman Mazepa”) Yuri Illenko, showed his own understanding of the world and consistently asserted “the right to reflect personal empathy in search of personal meaning, the right to reevaluate universally significant traditional canons, value norms and ideals on the basis of one's own world experience” [4, p. 345]. It is interesting that the master recreated his own sense of the world on the screen, but used well-known forms of screen language that had already developed in the art of cinema. He creatively reinterpreted them and offered his author's palette of visual means: pictorial, compositional and sound. The director believed that “the search for an impeccable form is always a conflict with the usual form” [9, p. 52].

In accordance with such a creative position, Yu. Illenko sought to “intensify” color in the frame design. He used special methods of color illumination: solarization, color filters, smoke, burning and repainting of natural nature. The artists with whom the director collaborated sometimes repainted the landscapes in the films (with the aim of enhancing the color, turning it into a tougher and local one). In this way, the director achieved not only the sharp allegorical color, but also, desperately searching

for ways to overcome the naturalistic rendering of color on the screen, forced the viewer to “actively participate in the drama not only with the help of narration, but also with the beauty of images, stylization of composition and color”. [12, p. 26], presented its rich imaginative possibilities. Thus, we can assume that “the screen as a generalized model of imagined reality” [26, p. 265] is actually the entire unlimited surrounding world.

Yu. Illenko saw the world primarily in frames, and this is the uniqueness of his peculiar, so to speak, “constructive” screen work of a cinematographer. Today we can talk about the paradoxical combination of two principles in his films: on the one hand, an unstoppable thirst for life, the sensuality of sight and hearing – the source of powerful plastic and musical images; on the other hand, attempts to convey the material element with the help of ancient patterns and stable ritualistic forms of life. The director actively overcame the traditional system of imagery, characteristic, for example, of literary prose, which sometimes replaced cinematographic thinking. After all, in cinema, the medium of artistic information is a multifaceted audiovisual system of exploring the world and man in the compositional elements of frames, built according to the laws of painting and photography and exquisitely combined into episodes, scenes, meaningful parts of the film.

Yu. Illenko was looking for his own visual form of films for a long time. This complex creative process flowed through the careful (sometimes paradoxical, in some ways unrestrained) construction of each frame. Of course, the artist's work was not without unfortunate defeats, since in the synthesis of cinematic means of expression, the process of building and preserving the overall intonation line of the film work occupies a special place.

We are talking about such a conventional line that enables the distribution of a peculiar force of “sound” and the most successful location of dramatic accents, dynamics and range of action, a diverse system of tonalities, tempo, rhythm,

etc. According to the conviction of the American researcher D. Stone, in the course of creative experiments, the new visual means in the artist's works were far from always in the optimal unity with the content for the audience's perception, despite the “powerful meditative manner of the director, which opened unexplored spatial perspectives, dissolving conventional boundaries between “external” and “internal”, between real and imaginary [27, p. 24].

In view of the above, we consider interesting the reasoning of the Ukrainian philosopher and culturologist S. Krymskyi, who in the article “People's Dolls” makes a bold assumption that today the visual arts, in particular the art of cinema, is “in the same situation in which it was in the 1860s the year when photography appeared”. The researcher is convinced that it was at this time that the fact that such an “objective, devoid of subjectivity image of the external world has no meaning of its own became obvious. At the same time, it was as if the realistic quality of painting was compromised, since photography still achieves this better”. The scientist points out: nowadays it is possible to ascertain the phenomenon of such a cultural and artistic situation, which is quite closely “connected with virtual reality”. In our opinion, S. Krymskyi's emphasis on the original meaning of the term “virtual”, which in translation from English should be interpreted as “actual” is also correct. And this gives reason to consider virtual reality not as a probable or imaginary reality, but as an actual reality. So the researcher comes to the conclusion that “virtual reality has now become an alternative to cinema, and cinema must look for its new ontology in the same way that fine art once looked for a new ontology after the emergence of photography. After all, the cinematography of the inner world arose – virtuality” [28, p. 221].

**Conclusions.** In our research, we have shown that the formation and development of visual language in cinema is



influenced by such factors as: the nature of the talent and individuality of the director-author; genre laws; historical regularities of the film process. It has been determined that the plasticity of the screen image is one of the most important and complex spheres of cinematic expression. It is indicated that the result of collective creativity over dramatic material is synthesized in the plasticity of the screen.

It has been clarified that in further scientific research, the unique author's cinematography of Yu. Illenko must be considered in the context of the latest technological processes that have been taking place in the last decades in the national cinematography. Changes in the visual culture of modern screen images are evidenced by the significant expansion of the range of expressive means, the intensity and sharpness of visual intonations, the bold introduction of peculiar “dissonant” combinations, the emphasized graphic design of the frame and the contrast of the image, powerful growths and unexpected declines of action, opposition of rhythm, dynamics and statics, which in the context of relentless mastery by young Ukrainian directors (V. Vasyanovych, M. Vroda, M. Slaboshpytskyi, D. Suholytkyi-Sobchuk, I. Tsylyk, N. Aliyev, A. Lukich, Yu. Rechynskyi, M. Stepanska, I. Strembitskyi), the aesthetics of the space of the cinematographic image should reveal interdependent forms of communication with the audience, in particular, through the mastery and free mastery of filmmaking technologies.

### References

1. Balakina, D. (2018). Rivni fotohrafichnoho zobrazhennia suchasnosti [Levels of modern photographic image]. *Ekonomika i kultura Ukrainy v svitovykh hlobalizatsiinykh protsesakh:pozytsionuvannia i realii: tezy dopovidei III Mizhnar. nauk.- prakt. konf., Kyiv. 21-22 berez. 2018 r. Kyiv: KNUKiM, 18-21 [in Ukrainian].*

2. Briukhovetska, L. (2006). Operatorske mystetstvo Yurii Illienka [Cinematography by Yuriy Illenko]. Kino-Teatr. 1 (63), 50-54 [in Ukrainian].
3. Zhukova, N. (2010). Elitarnist yak komponent kulturotvorennia: dosvid neklasychnoi estetyky [Elitism as a component of cultural creation: experience of non-classical aesthetics]: monohrafiia. Kyiv: PARAPAN [in Ukrainian].
4. Ihoshkina, N. (2003). Kinomystetstvo yak vyd khudozhnoi tvorchosti [Cinematography as a kind of artistic creativity]. Praktychna filosofiiia. 2, 149-154 [in Ukrainian].
5. Illienko, Yu. (1999). Paradyhma kino [The paradigm of cinema]. Kyiv: Abrys [in Ukrainian].
6. Illienko, Yu. (1999). Ahasfer abo Khronika druhoho pryshestia Khrysta [Agaspherus or the Chronicle of the Second Coming of Christ]. Dnipro. 10, 35-85 [in Ukrainian].
7. Illienko, Yu. (2008). Dopovidna Apostolovi Petru Yurka Illienka [Reporting to the Apostle Peter Yurka Illenka]: v 2 kn. Ternopil: Bohdan, 1, 346 [in Ukrainian].
8. Koshelivets, I. (1964). Shestydesiatnyky [Sixties]. Suchasna literatura: zb. st. Miunkhen. 3, 295-300 [in Ukrainian].
9. Krylova, V. Heroi yak uosoblennia liudskoho "ya" v kinomystetstvi [The hero as the personification of the human "I" in cinematography]. Available at: [http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/6899/1/Krylov % d 0 %b0.pdf](http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/6899/1/Krylov%20d0b0.pdf) [in Ukrainian].
10. Kukorenchuk, V, Priadko, O. (2018). Fotohrafiia yak mova suchasnoho spilkuвання [Photography as a language of modern communication]. Ekonomika i kultura Ukrainy v svitovykh hlobalizatsiinykh protsesakh: pozytsionuvannia i realii: tezy dopovidei III Mizhnar. nauk.- prakt. konf., m. Kyiv, 21-22 berez. 2018 r. Kyiv: Vyd. tsentr KNUKiM. 120-123 [in Ukrainian].
11. Liebidiev, O., Priadko, O. (2013). Plastychnist kinematohrafichnoho zobrazhennia ta yii skladovi [Plasticity of

the cinematographic image and its components]. *Naukovyi visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu teatru, kino i telebachennia imeni I. K. Karpenka-Karoho*. 3, 160-168 [in Ukrainian].

12. Manokha, I., Fetisova, K. (2010). *Perspektyvy psykholoho-dyskursyvnykh doslidzhen u suchasniï psykholohii mystetstva* [Perspectives of psychological and discursive research in modern psychology of art]. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats Instytutu psykholohii imeni H. S. Kostiuka NAPNU*. Kyiv, 162-169 [in Ukrainian].

13. Serhii Paradzhanov i Ukraina (2015) [Serhii Paradzhanov and Ukraine]: zb. st. i dokumentiv / uporiad. i red. L. Briukhovetska. Kyiv: KMA [in Ukrainian].

14. Skrypnyk, L. (1928). *Narysy z teorii mystetstva kino* [Essays on the theory of cinema art]. Kyiv: Derzh. vyd-vo Ukrainy. 43-44 [in Ukrainian].

15. Skurativskiy, V. (1996). *Kino yak "vidkryttia liudyny"* [Cinema as a "man's discovery"]. *Filosofska i sotsiologichna dumka*. 1-2, 65-98 [in Ukrainian].

16. Skurativskiy, V. (1997). *Ekranni mystetstva u sotsiokulturnykh protsesakh XX stolittia: geneza, struktura, funktsiia* [Screen arts in sociocultural processes of the 20th century: genesis, structure, function] : u 2 ch. 2. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo "Ivan Fedorov"[in Ukrainian].

17. Skurativskiy, V. (2017). *Z kinoznavchoho zapysnyka: Statti v zhurnali "Kino-Teatr"* [From a film study notebook: Articles in the magazine "Kino-Teatr"]. *Kinematohrafichni studiï* Kyiv: "Kino-Teatr"; "ART KNYHA", 184 [in Ukrainian].

18. Stanislavska, K. (2012). *Spetsyfika postmodernistskoi vydovyshchnosti. Ukrainska kultura: mynule, suchasne, shliakhy rozvytku* [Specificity of postmodern spectacle]: zb. nauk. prats: Naukovi zapysky Rivnenskoho derzhavnoho

humanitarnoho universytetu. Rivne: RDHU. 18, 263-267 [in Ukrainian].

19. Ukrainske kino: yevroformat. Khronika hromadskykh obhovoren 1996-2003 rokiv (2003) [Ukrainian cinema. chronicle of public discussions 1996-2003]. Kinosotsiologhiia Kyiv: Altpres, 528 [in Ukrainian].

20. Cherkov, H. (2010). Transformatsiia realnosti v epokhu dyhitalnykh tekhnolohii [Transformation of reality in the age of digital technologies]. Naukovyi visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu teatru, kino i telebachennia imeni I. K. Karpenka-Karoho: zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv, 7,128-135 [in Ukrainian].

21. Chmil, H. (2003). Avtorske kino Kiry Muratovoi [Author's cinema of Kira Muratova]. Mystetstvoznavstvo Ukrainy: zb. st. Kyiv: SPD Kravchuk V. K., 003, 3, 341-349 [in Ukrainian].

22. Chmil, H. (2016). Hra z realnistiu v ekrannomu naratyvi [Playing with reality in the screen narrative]. Suchasne ukrainske kino vid vidtvorennia do tvorennia novoi realnosti: materialy nauk.-metodych. konf., m. Kyiv, 9 lystopada 2016 r. Kyiv: IPSM NAMU, 22-23 [in Ukrainian].

23. Shevchuk, M. (2018). Istoriia i kultura riznykh chasiv u filmi “Kaminnyi khrest»[ History and culture of different times in the film “Stone Cross”]. Kino-teatr. 2 (136), 42-43 [ in Ukrainian].

24. Gazda, J. (1970). Ukrainska szkola kina poetychniego Ekran. 9, 17-18 [in Polish].

25. Konrad, K., Korcelli, J. (1973). Operator zypatrzana ewolucje sztuki filmowej. Kino. 6, 23-36 [in Polish].

26. Pasolini P. The Cinema of Poetry. Available at: <https://dilipshakya.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/pasolini1976-cinema-n-poetry.pdf> [in Italian].

27. Stone, J. (1989). Surrealistic chuckle from the Ukraine. New York Times. September, 15, 24 [in Ukrainian].

**Галина Петрівна ПОГРЕБНЯК,**  
доктор мистецтвознавства, доцент,  
Національна академія керівних кадрів  
культури і мистецтв,  
Київ, Україна,  
ORCID: 0000-0002-8846-4939,  
e-mail: galina.pogrebniak@gmail.com

## **ВІЗУАЛЬНА КУЛЬТУРА РЕЖИСУРИ АВТОРСЬКОГО ФІЛЬМУ**

**Анотація.** Метою статті є визначення режисерського інструментарію дизайну кадру у візуальній культурі авторського фільму. У розробці теми було застосовано комплексний підхід, використано методи систематизації, порівняння, верифікації, компаративного й текстологічного аналізів. Аналітичний метод та метод образно-стилістичного аналізу у своїй єдності, було скеровано до розгляду мистецтвознавчого аспекту проблеми. Проаналізовано статті і монографії вчених, які досліджували особливості візуальної культури екранних мистецтв. З'ясовано, що дослідники схильні до думки, що режисери авторського кіно здійснюють експерименти у сфері зображальної форми. Розглянуто взаємозв'язок і взаємовплив фотографічного та аудіовізуального мистецтва. Виявлено, що зображення в екранних мистецтвах є результатом колективної праці і має колективне авторство. Особливості візуальної культури авторського фільму простежено на прикладі кінострічок Юрія Ілленка. Доведено, що візуальна культура авторського фільму безпосередньо залежить від світогляду режисера. Виявлено характерні ознаки авторського фільму, обґрунтовано домінування уваги режисерів-авторів до специфічного погляду митців на світ, створення власної

суб'єктивної картини світу, пошук власної візуальної мови, презентації авторської екранної форми. Проаналізовано візуальну культуру авторського фільму та показано, що зображення, дизайн кадру є основним носієм кінематографічної виразності. Уточнено, що систему виразних засобів і прийомів зображальної культури авторського фільму складають: композиційна побудова кадру; динаміка руху кіноапарату; знімальні ракурси; монтажні ходи; звукові, світлові, колористичні рішення; предметно-матеріальне середовище кадру; мізансценування; дизайн кадру. Наукова новизна дослідження полягає в тому, що режисерська творчість досліджується в контексті зображальної культури дизайну кадру і вперше постала предметом спеціального дослідження; доведено доречність використання системного методу у вивченні особливостей авторської пластичної кіномови; здійснено комплексний аналіз та виявлено особливості дизайну кадру в авторській фільмовій творчості.

**Ключові слова:** візуальна культура, екранні мистецтва, режисер, образотворче мистецтво, дизайн, автор, конструювання, кадр

### Список використаних джерел

1. Балакіна Д. Рівні фотографічного зображення сучасності. Економіка і культура України в світових глобалізаційних процесах: позиціонування і реалії: тези доповідей III Міжнар. наук.- практ. конф., Київ. 21-22 берез. 2018 р. Київ: КНУКіМ, 2018. С. 18-21.
2. Брюховецька Л. Операторське мистецтво Юрія Іллєнка. Кіно-Театр. 2006. № 1 (63). С. 50-54.
3. Жукова Н. Елітарність як компонент культуротворення: досвід неklasичної естетики: монографія. Київ: ПАРАПАН, 2010. 244 с.

4. Ігошкіна Н. Кіномистецтво як вид художньої творчості. Практична філософія. 2003. № 2. С. 149-154.
5. Ілленко Ю. Парадигма кіно. Київ: Абрис, 1999. 416 с.
6. Ілленко 1999-а Ілленко Ю. Агасфер або Хроніка другого пришествя Христа. Дніпро. 1999. № 10. С. 35-85.
7. Ілленко Ю. Доповідна Апостолові Петру Юрка Ілленка: в 2 кн. Тернопіль: Богдан, 2008. Кн. 1. 346 с.
8. Кошелівець І. Шестидесятники. Сучасна література: зб. ст. Мюнхен, 1964. Вип. 3. С. 295-300.
9. Крилова В. Герой як уособлення людського «я» в кіномистецтві. URL: <http://enpuir.npu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/6899/1/Krylov%20%b0.pdf>
10. Кукоренчук В., Прядко О. Фотографія як мова сучасного спілкування. Економіка і культура України в світових глобалізаційних процесах: позиціонування і реалії: тези доповідей III Міжнар. наук.- практ. конф., м. Київ, 21-22 берез. 2018 р. Київ: Вид. центр КНУКіМ, 2018. С. 120-123.
11. Лебедєв О., Прядко О. Пластичність кінематографічного зображення та її складові. Науковий вісник Київського національного університету театру, кіно і телебачення імені І. К. Карпенка-Карого. 2013. Вип 3. С. 160-168.
12. Маноха І., Фетісова К. Перспективи психолого-дискурсивних досліджень у сучасній психології мистецтва. Збірник наукових праць Інституту психології імені Г.С. Костюка НАПНУ. Київ, 2010. С. 162-169.
13. Сергій Параджанов і Україна: зб. ст. і документів. Упоряд. і ред. Л. Брюховецька. Київ: КМА, 2015. 288 с.
14. Скрипник Л. Нариси з теорії мистецтва кіно. Київ: Держ. вид-во України, 1928. С. 43-44.
15. Скуратівський В. Кіно як «відкриття людини». Філософська і соціологічна думка. 1996. № 1-2. С. 65-98.

16. Скуратівський В. Екранні мистецтва у соціокультурних процесах ХХ століття: генеза, структура, функція: у 2 ч. Ч. 2. Київ: Видавництво «Іван Федоров», 1997. 240 с.
17. Скуратівський В. З кінознавчого записника: Статті в журналі «Кіно-Театр». Кінематографічні студії. Вип. 8. Київ: «Кіно-Театр»; «АРТ КНИГА», 2017. 184 с.
18. Станіславська К. Специфіка постмодерністської видовищності. Українська культура: минуле, сучасне, шляхи розвитку: зб. наук. праць: Наукові записки Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету. Рівне: РДГУ, 2012. Вип. 18. С. 263-267.
19. Українське кіно: євроформат. Хроніка громадських обговорень 1996-2003 років. Кіносоціологія. Київ: Альтпрес, 2003. 528 с.
20. Черков Г. Трансформація реальності в епоху дигітальних технологій. Науковий вісник Київського національного університету театру, кіно і телебачення імені І. К. Карпенка-Карого: зб. наук. праць. Київ, 2010. Вип. 7. С. 128-135.
21. Чміль Г. Авторське кіно Кіри Муратової. Мистецтвознавство України: зб. ст. Київ: СПД Кравчук В. К., 2003. Вип. 3. С. 341-349.
22. Чміль Г. Гра з реальністю в екранному наративі. Сучасне українське кіно від відтворення до творення нової реальності: матеріали наук.-методич. конф., м. Київ, 9 листопада 2016 р. Київ: ПСМ НАМУ, 2016. С. 22-23.
23. Шевчук О. Л. Український і світовий кінематограф. Українська і зарубіжна культура. Київ, 2002. С. 105-109.
24. Gazda J. *Ukrainska szkola kina poetychniego*. Ekran. 1970. № 9. S. 17-18.
25. Konrad K., Korcelli J. *Operator zypatrzana ewolucje sztuki filmowej*. Kino. 1973. № 6. S. 23-36.



26. Pasolini P. The Cinema of Poetry. URL: <https://dilupshakya.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/pasolini1976-cinema-n-poetry.pdf>
27. Stone J. Surrealistic chuckle from the Ukraine. New York Times. 1989. September, 15. P. 24.