

LITERARY STUDIES. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

УДК 821.161.2-32:808.1]316.75М.Хвильовий
[http://dx.doi.org/10.31548/philolog14\(2\).2023.09](http://dx.doi.org/10.31548/philolog14(2).2023.09)

«Брудні руки» і муки провини: роздуми про долю особистості в новелі «Силуєти» Миколи Хвильового

“Dirty Hands” and Troubled Conscience: Reflections on the Fate of Individualism in the Short Story “Syluety” by Mykola Khvylovy

Євген ЛЕПЬОХІН, кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри філології
Eugene LEPOKHIN, PhD in Philology, Associate professor of the Philology Department
e-mail: eugene.lepokhin@pnu.edu.ua
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6941-7467>

Коломийський навчально-науковий інститут Прикарпатського національного університету імені
Василя Стефаника, м. Коломия, Україна
Kolomyia institute of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Kolomyia, Ukraine

Abstract. *The paper focuses on the complex issues of the short story ‘Syluety’ (1923) by Mykola Khvylovy (1893–1933): the study of the motif of hands, the examination of how the traumatized characters experience spatiality (the space of a room), the dialectic of the body suffering from the consequences of the 1917 revolution, the indirect influence of filmic practice (inter-frame editing, the camera position of the narrator) on the artistic manifestation of the writer’s individual style. The religious, namely Christian, aspects previously described by Yurii Bezkhutryi were further elaborated. Special attention has been given to the characters of Dema and Veronika, who correlate with the author in terms of both biographical and artistic aspects, as well as some psychoanalytic features. The exceptionally complex deep-seated feelings of the characters touch upon the intersection of the fictional “reality” of the work of art and the reader’s present reality, as this piece of narrative is a vivid example of the analysis of relations between people in terms of their dissatisfaction with day-to-day reality and their desire for the ideal. Much like a cinema screen on which a film runs, presenting to the viewer what is to be seen and how it is visually perceived, Mykola Khvylovy conventionally does this in his fiction. The short story under study is a drama of the commonness of social reality, where the characters have already crossed the threshold of their private illusion (desire for change, desire to be needed, desire to love) to face disappointment (phobia) and then proceed to a next level of illusion. The study employs a system of biographical, systemic, hermeneutical, cultural, historical and poetic methods, justified by the specific nature of the survey, its object and subject. The findings are to prove useful to all those involved in the study of the Ukrainian writer’s signature world-view; the analysis of the Ukrainian literature of the first half of the twentieth century development; for experts in artistic anthropology and cultural art.*

Keywords: *body, consciousness, social, character, art, purpose, ideology, montage, frame, scene.*

Introduction and Literature Review.

Mykola Khvylovy was one of those in the spotlight of innovative artistic endeavours of the Ukrainian literature during the 1920ies. It was the time when some Ukrainian writers had already reappraised much of the conventions and aesthetics of the 19th century realism doctrine coupled with the tenets of the Naturalist fiction (short fiction in lieu of large novels, portraying the typical character amidst the totality of the social reality not necessarily meant to represent the underlying social content of existing reality, among other things). Having traced the features of the European modernism in the Ukrainian fiction prior to the Bolshevik

Revolution of 1917, Maxim Tarnawsky pointed to the two prominent ones: narration technique refinement and thematic preoccupations with art and sexuality [32, p. 134]. In terms of art, it meant that modernist writers do not enunciate social criticism as the historical class struggle as the Marxists understood it, albeit as social antagonism and struggles of a sole person whether it is a representative of an exploited industrial working class, or bourgeoisie; they are on equal footing, for “Modernism legitimized art as an autonomous pursuit that had nothing in common with the “masses” and which was to be measured by European (not simply nativistic) standard” [21, p. 261]. The

treatment of these subjects was further elaborated in the post-revolutionary war writings, when the artists and Mykola Khvylovy in particular, tried to fuse the representation of the direct social and political content of the existing reality and aestheticisation, intense figurative representation that effaces issues of social-political actuality.

Khvylovy's short story *Syluety* broods over certain key themes, chief among them the contemporary condition of the Ukrainian body intellectual during the transitional state of the society, in which the civil war had just finished, and the people have to face the practicalities of post-war everyday life. As Yurii Bezkhutryi puts it, the Ukrainian writer does not tackle the issue of creative freedom in the short story in full, albeit he undertakes some approaches to it [3, p. 176]. Khvylovy, in his own right, struggles to convey the idea of focusing on interiority of a person under study at first in terms of expressionism and impressionism spotlighting, for instance, the conflict of moral sense not with creativity *per se*, but with serving the political evil of the day, the power of the Great Other, as Vira Ageyeva contends [1, p. 24]. The writer strived to get direct access to the spirit of Western Europe with the intention to develop further the original, notably national identity in terms of literary discourse. He took care to place his protagonists in an environment habitual both to them and to his, that of post-civil war, having a profound effect on the characters. In *Synii Lystopad*, e.g., as Mykola Kodak argues [5, p. 114], while not pursuing the comprehensive coverage of existence and the characters' immersion in everyday life, the writer instead crafted a dramatic short story focused on the ideological search of a person [5, p. 114]. In *Syluety*, Khvylovy proceeded with this stance of his to represent the submersion of the individual under the beginnings of state socialism in the collective, which strives to obliterate differences among the members of its collectivity and the way each person deals with the consequences of their previous social activity. To gain integrity, a person has to find his / her way from seductions of realism; for the artist Dema, as well as for Khvylovy himself, as Olena Musliienko contends [11, p. 136], reality, creativity is not a snapshot of a something perfectly realistic (readable, tangible), but an attempt to seize a moment that is each time new, different and beautiful in its movement.

The present paper serves a further guideline for those approaching the comprehension of Khvylovy's portraying of the period along with the spectacle aspect of a person's physical and moral exhaustion commenced, in particular, with the papers "Cultural and historical context and consciousness of the individual: the destructive forms of the world reception in the short story "The Sheds outside the City" by Mykola Khvylovy" (2016) and "The song remains the same": Mykola Khvylovy's "non-canonical" short stories and "canonical" writer's style" (2022).

Methods. The study employs a system of biographical, systemic, hermeneutical, cultural, historical and poetic methods, justified by the specific nature of the survey, its object and subject.

Results and Discussion. One of the characters, Veronika, is the victim of the beliefs she has been indoctrinated. In the short story, Khvylovy anticipates the oscillation between true socialism and the current perverse version of it represented by Veronika:

Uncle Varfolomiy even stung, "Why aren't you so placard-like?" Veronika retorted, "This is not the time to look this way, one should look even deeper, as Stefan says. I've grown up thereafter. I'm not a young girl anymore." [14, p. 139]¹

The rhetoric of the story implies that the "romance of revolution" twisted against every disillusioned character of the short story and Veronika in particular, for the meaning they attributed to it came back to them completely reversed. The female character of *Syluety* conducts autodestructive activities, which lends itself to self-destruction glorification, due to the aforementioned disenchantment. She lives a life of recluse with no regular and plain stock of clothes, a complete contrast to her former self at the beginning of the Bolshevik Revolution in the matrix of which she has put faith together with her brother Stefan. At first, the state socialism agitational task succeeded in strengthening her political and social consciousness. However, she found a way out from this trap, for she became aware of no satisfactory conclusion. Though, the time of rigid party control as well as an introduction of standard and requisite ideology that quenched and discredited was

¹ Here and subsequently, unless indicated otherwise, translations from Ukrainian and Polish are by Eugene Lepokhin.

way ahead, Veronika finds herself guilty of her naïveté; the short story is not a transcript of an uncanny 'becoming' of a communist, but of moral responsibility for choosing the wrong ideological pattern. Stefan reproaches her for trying to be a martyr, to resemble those morally devastated and not supporting intelligentsia. She replies:

"Stefan! It is eloquence, phrase-mongering." And then she retracted, "But I'm wrong. Not the case. Brother, we have picked the only way but different paths. I'm going along this one, and you're treading that one – they ought to cross somewhere." [14, p. 140]

Veronika is man-made by the party ideologists, the embodiment of the patriarchal state socialist rhetoric, and that, trained as she is to be the State's instrument of revolution, she can be considered an extension of male technology. For reasons unknown, she transcends into a post-revolutionary body. She is stripped of any subjectivity; her past is sporadic and blurry. Concurrently, she is one of those beings, as per Paul Ricoeur, that act, for she has taken heed to the ideological precepts at first, "which, in the form of advice, recommendation, and instruction, teach how to succeed – hence, how to do well – in what one has undertaken. Precepts, to be sure, are not all moral ones – far from it: they can be technical, strategic, aesthetic, and so on" [29, p. 169–170].

The problem with Veronika is that those who created her in terms of revolutionary body regard her as a mere commodity. Her value as such is an instrumental one, despite having an intrinsic value, as each single human being has got. Similar to hundreds of thousands of other young people, her body was to incarnate the values of the recently established Soviet state. It turns out it was irrational of her to act in this manner as well as of others alike. Veronika was not merely used as a means of advancing new ideological values, as an instrument for one's will, but mentally abused of it. The distortion of values central to the culture has affected her emotionalized identity; consequently, her "good life" as a revolutionary has been compromised. Ricoeur contended that the notion of the "good life" with and for others does not necessarily entail self-esteem, for "the evaluation of certain actions judged to be good are carried back to the author of these actions" [29, p. 172]. Veronika's case is that of solidarity, on a broader plane, the whole

story is more comprehensible to people who share the same cultural memory or are well aware of the undercurrents of the discourse. The reader is fully unaware what Veronika was doing at a time of war, nor does the narrator comment on her atonement stance and moral standing; though it is apparent, she was disenchanted with the outcome. In Ricoeurian terms, the "good life" of Veronika during the revolution was unfulfilled; it turned out to be "time lost." Thus, she chooses to be a sort of Spartan. Uncle Varfolomiy spots her on the street "[...] in rubber overshoes on her bare feet, without a scarf, in some archaic style of an overcoat" [14, p. 139]. Suffering infused on her is not irrational *per se*, for the idea of a higher finality will never cease to be internal to human action, argues Ricoeur [29, p. 179]. Veronika surely displays some sort of psycho-trauma rooted in her childhood. She recalls the time when she was a little girl and her mother was suffering from syncope. Veronika would call for a doctor:

You know, I cared a lot for my mother. And I wanted her to take a liking to me, completely, so that I would melt. I would lie by her side, cuddle up against her so close that I wanted to get into her body, to become one... And so, the doctor would come, mother was dead, pale as a ghost, and she was being revived. And then I endured. I would walk up to the door, push my little hand through the opening, and then press it enough to shed tears of pain. And then, you know, it was easier for me. This is the joy of endurance, grandma! [14, p. 137]

The mother figure holds significance to the case, to infant development, for the child has grown up with perverse symptoms. We do not know anything else from her past, whether she was solicitous or irritable, affectionate or frustrating, kind or strict. Apart from the aforementioned flashback, the narrator informs us Veronika's parents left for Bulgaria, once the revolution broke out, and cursed their children. Veronika's injury of hands reveals something of the character's psyche; they serve as a highly sensitive instrument to suggest what the character is feeling. She intersubjectively communicates her experience in terms of somatic affection. For instance, in Alfred Hitchcock's *Marnie* (1964) the titular character had her issues with her mother. As an adult, Marnie was stealing from a succession of male employers to try to purchase her mother's love, which is reminiscent of Veronika's eagerness to make

her mother show a liking to her and thus inflicting pain to herself to experience her mother's woes. The hands expose how vulnerable she is owing to her covert erotic feelings towards mom; they do also manifest her yearnings for revolution and probably remorse for not have used them properly. While examining Khvylovy's fiction through the frame of the disease metaphor, Olena Mostepan contends [10, p. 58] Veronika displays the masochistic behaviour, where her self-induced injury and austerity of recluse life suggests a subconscious identification of the revolutionary idea with the overpowering mother object, an attempt to draw closer to it, and a fear of losing it.

One also assumes that Veronika has finally found solace and a substitute for her mother figure in the person of Grandmother Khrystyna; she is fond of caressing her grey hair whilst grandma posits Veronika should find some young fellow, for she looks haggard and feeble. By inflicting pain on herself, Veronika acknowledges her corrupted will, intimates her guilt; she reverses this and escapes from the power of immorality in which she finds herself. Hands are capable of bringing humanness and unleashing the brutality, as well as compelled to perpetrate acts of violence against others. In her role of a social outcast, the hands behave in suppressed fashion.

Interestingly, in our view, is the fact that the hands' motif manifests itself symmetrically in the short story – it is displayed in gender opposition with mutual undertones. Local artist Dema is also incapable of using his hands effectively. He strives to paint something monumental, grand, and sublime but is unable to make it and, as in the case of Veronika, it is open to debate whether he is impotent temporarily (some artist block) or permanently. The hands are not maimed or injured, nor does he use them for bullying or imposing some patriarchy. His past, both childhood and adolescence, compared to Veronika's, is unknown. He is just struggling to paint in a way akin to Joseph Grand's (Albert Camus *La Peste*, 1947) refinement of his manuscript first sentence. The problem with Dema, as well as with all the principal characters of the short story, the victims of the system in their special way, is that he has lost the power to draw, to re-establish the link between the actuality and artistic representation; his hands have been "deprived" of their "autonomous will." The

frame that surrounds an artistic representation traditionally acts as a limit. What lies inside is, according to convention, the work of art (the representation), and the real world (the represented) dwells outside. The process of painting, as the management of placing on the canvas successive scenes, cannot evolve into its finished product (the picture itself); therefore, Dema does not translate his artistic thought into the medium of expression, no matter how hard he tries. The logic of state socialism paradigm has conquered all provinces of post-revolutionary life; hence, "Dema stands beside the easel and looks distressingly at the lines. He says, 'When will I finally do the painting?..'" [14, p. 132]. This is most acutely conveyed in the scene when he is able to write seemingly unrelated words on the canvas, though it takes place in Uncle Varfolomiy's oneiric vision. Thus, the fundamental feature of the character's personality to advance aesthetics through visual images is replaced by means of male language. Missing or losing agency and control over one's artistic drive is exhibited through the hands as instruments of presentation. Both Veronika and Dema are hapless toys of revolution; they are unable to control the consequences of it, though Veronika believes she is in some way responsible for everyone's fate. Unlike Dema, the guilt haunts Veronika, and it has a strong social connotation. The guilt revolves around the issue that it occurs due to Veronika's actions that do not conform to certain cultural standards of society (these actions remain out of the short story's narrative).

Dema, on the contrary, is more optimistic, though, as Yuriy Bezkhutryi posits [3, p. 180], the quote from the Book of Daniel 5:26–28 suggests he implicitly condemns the current social reality he is a part of. The short story itself was written at a specific juncture of social and political change, and the words *Mene, Teke, Peres* allegorically refer to it. His hands express or embody the idea of guilt, for he perceived oneself as an artist of annals, whereas Veronika was one of the instruments of advancing new ideology in the name of public-spirited service to the Party. They do not question the Party and its rhetoric. Concurrently, they do not claim directly they have dropped their adherence to the Party line. Khvylovy is very eloquent in avoiding any straight remarks as to the illogicality of an ideology gone mad, the exponent of which he also was. Therefore, we have two persons (in

fact, there are three more ones – Uncle Varfolomiy, Veronika's brother Stefan and the old lady Khrystyna) with shattered *ego*, since there occurs a rupture between reality awareness both overt and internal one. Frequently one may stumble upon the cognition aberration because there occurs disturbance between knowledge (rationality) and emotions (irrationality), they clash with each other. Dema considers himself an artist of revolution, he admits it was easy to paint on the subject of uprising, and now he wonders when he succeeds to drawing mundaneness. Both Veronika and Stefan reply that it has more complicated to portray a heroic daily routine than a heroic feast, and the young woman does also underscore that Dema will not be able to depict the present day, for it is not a heroic daily routine any more but heroic endurance instead. As Svitlana Lenska puts it, in 1922, the Ukrainian writer felt unable to find himself in the post-revolutionary everyday life, opposing the dynamic and passionate upsurge to the static workaday routine [8, p. 192]. Therefore, the problem with Dema is that it is essential to fathom whether he is truly an artist or merely an artisan. Plato defined the difference between them in terms of the former creating an object according to an inner image or an ideal type, whereas the latter has a material prototype whose mirror image he fashions or reproduces. In Norman Mailer's (2013) terms, we spot the difference between an artist and a social producer, the capacity to reproduce what is in front of the eyes and to visualize, to picture the dynamism of everyday life, the process of change. Whether Dema is one or another is left unknown. Concurrently, there are good grounds for believing that Mykola Khvylovy himself was apt enough to mirror the social and political change in his pieces of fiction, for instance, in *Yurko* (1922), *Baraky, shcho za mistom* (1923), *Shchaslyvyi sekretar* (1931), *Ostannii den* (1931) etc. Mailer posits:

An artist who is not ahead of his time is not an artist – he is merely a social producer [...] The Stalinists by converting their artists to social producers have exercised the crippling vanity of total society for they have made the error, I believe, of assuming that society can foresee the future when only man can do that [...] That is the artist's purpose – to open doors – and it is arrogance for the bureaucrat, no matter how intelligent, devoted, and subjectively convinced of his moral purity he may be (I take the

exceptional bureaucrat), to decide that the artist's function is to describe the glories of the room in which one remains [27, p. 24].

The Ukrainian writer was definitely ahead of his time as regards the outcome of revolution – the liminal point in establishing the era of state socialism – obliteration of human individuality, signalling its duplicitousness and hypocrisy due to power relations and discourse practices influence on identity or body image construction (see, for example, *Ivan Ivanovych*, 1929). Dema's case is pivotal in that respect that it clearly outlines Mr. Mailer's argument, he is literally in the room struggling in his endeavours to assert an identity as an artist, in other words, to reclaim power over his body image as an artist the reader as well as the other characters are to perceive him to be, for in his view, i.e. subject to his self-image, Dema regards himself as an artist. Akin to Khvylovy, who sounds the death knell of the private domestic body space, private self from the state socialism public space, Dema cannot escape it by withdrawing into the private world of his imagination, locking reality out, for then he would only be locking the haunting visions in.

The space of a room is Dema's inhabited domestic space of anxiety and failed attempts at creation ("[...] Dema stands beside the easel, once again glancing dreary at it. 'Only lines.' Nothing more. 'Simply lines'") [14, p. 138], ideological debates, a platform for dialogue which may proceed further after some ramble, the space within which the narrative unfolds. The Ukrainian writer does not indulge himself in visual shorthand. The portraying of the residence place is restricted to dashes of interior props that connect what is communicated with what is implied. Mimetic representation of the area conveys the spatial experience to the readers; it captures the feelings of the narrator, what he presents and conveys through the frame of impressionism:

...The bachelor's room is a real mess. For instance, there is: *Das Kapital*, dried fish, galosh, jam, oils, Michelangelo – it has got everything in there!

In the corner, there are pale spots of a bustling city day. In the corridors, the residents' screams can be heard, whereas the roadway rattles and clatters outdoors. The city has arisen, and the motors tear along as well as the pavements hurry. The tinkling, the clatter, the roar filled every secluded corner. Colossal southwestern clouds hovered over the city [14, p. 134].

Dema's inability to paint suggests that

he unconsciously does not want to contrive the actuality, to distort the perception of the world around him. Mykola Khvylovy was keenly aware of what this sense is for every single artist living under state socialism – to give preference to a social or political agenda over an aesthetic one. Hence, the room is a secure, albeit frustrating, inhabited space, for the room itself acts as a frame with a limited nature of any act of insight.

Another thing to note is that the majority of Khvylovy's characters are those "alienated" intellectual bodies who used to be on a historic streak both undertaking some military action and executing a public awareness campaign, and now find themselves aside, disillusioned, traumatized. The Ukrainian writer was a participant of World War I himself, as well as more involved in civil strife:

In his pre-revolutionary early days, Mykola Khvylovy adhered to that type of intelligentsia that lived among the bulk of our people, gained understanding of them and selflessly worked for them. Among his contemporaries, he differed only in the fact that he was exceptionally talented, had a great memory and an insightful view of an artist into human life [7, p. 27].

In his letters to the eminent Ukrainian scholar, poet and translator Mykola Zerov, Khvylovy points to his diagnosed neurasthenia as the consequence, *inter alia*, of the three tormented years of military campaign he was a part of within 1915–1917 [13, p. 852]. The plot of his fiction narrative revolves around post-revolutionary conditions in Ukraine depicting the entrapment of a man; in our situation, Dema is caught in a room, which is transformed into a concentration of addressed references. His task is to teach others anew how to perceive the world through his art, but he is temporarily incapable of rendering it. The extradiegetic narrator does it in his stead, for he depicts the natural conditions at the time of Dema's desired creation, which are suggestive of revealing his psychological profile:

And anaemic rays hit the easel and headed wanly to the door. The street emitted a smell of benzene. Stefan is collecting his books – it is a quarter of an hour before the lecture begins. Dema is staring enthusiastically at the sky from where the sun broke through [14, p. 131–132].

Concurrently, we may presume Dema is in the state of neurosis, for he is removed from his armour of a combat artist and dons

that of a routine one that fails to protect his psychosomatic, sensitive body from exposure to the mundane. However, there is no direct evidence of his involvement in the war, but the emotional backwash of it is still being felt. As an artist, he should use his hands, but he turns out to be ineffective in it (pp. 132, 137, 138), for they are stained with guilt of picturing atrocities of war presumably, their disability signifies castration anxiety. Therefore, his mundane artist persona does not correspond to his mental representation of his body, namely his self-image of heroic art chronographer. In that instance, we may speak of Dema as a mirror of the Other with differences, namely of Khvylovy himself. Firstly, as most scholars, such as George G. Grabowicz [18, p. 169], Vira Ageyeva [2, p. 289], have pointed out, Khvylovy's pieces of fiction are largely autobiographic and self-referential narratives. In the aforementioned letters to Zerov, the author of *Syluety* admits Veronika's hands self-injure is a recount of his personal experience [13, p. 852]. Thus, similar to the way cinema (film) projects intersubjective experience, communicates human subjectivity, and addresses the audience on the screen, a written narrative also does so by going beyond what has been captured and organized on a paper sheet. The five characters of the short story represent the fragmented projection of the then estate to whom the real author belonged, reveal and interpret hidden psychological processes. Maksym Nestelieiev, for instance, claims that the particular issues associated with Khvylovy's artistic career are liable to the tenets of Maxim D. Schroyer textobiography concept within the framework of psychobiography [12, p. 119]. The latter provides an opportunity to comprehend the works in terms of the author's relations with his mother and father.

Dema's confinement mirrors anxieties regarding the current punitive system of state socialism. Therefore, as Yuri Bezkhutryi posits, his retelling of Kipling's short story *Rikki-Tikki-Tavi* (1894) to Stefan suggests Dema uses the symbolism of mongoose fighting the snakes to showcase the moral of the tale by virtue of the fact that "[...] self-sacrificing struggle for 'justice' that makes even a person of 'no consequence' a great one" [3, p. 181]. As to state practices of authoritarian subjugation, it means that even a "disciplinary body" may be prone to become spontaneous, instinctive, beyond control and therefore confront the state's oppressive will.

The state of perpetual tension is generated by the implied author [20, pp. 288–300], for he renders the characters' ideological orientation in it.

The appliance of filmic practices proves to contribute to imitation in verbal form of the aesthetics of cinema art form, the individualisation of the writer's manner of style, emphasising national features of the Ukrainian modernism among other things [4, p. 167–190] on par with decoding representation or reference to pictorial art in the literary text, e.g. to render the mental condition of the artists-protagonists traumatized by the war experience when analysing the relevant paintings [25]. Following Christine Schwanecke's designations of three variables of filmic modes in literature (providing replies to so-called three wh-question for analysing the relations) [31] and that of Irina O. Rajewsky's intermedial reference to film (the notion of 'reference via transposition', which arises for construing on non-explicit discursive analogies between both media) [28], we envision the short story to be the set of sequences (scenes) constituted by shots and guided by montage pattern in the form of continuity style of editing mainly akin to film consisting of a series of shots edited together to make a coherent visual story [17]. Each shot acquires a different shade of meaning according to its place in the sequence. When Uncle Varfolomiy falls asleep on the train, he dreams of talking to his nephew and niece in the room. A long shot [19, p. 352] lays out the main characters of the short story and, on one side, establishing the Uncle as the link between different previous (non-diegetic) events and characters together; this is the functional purpose of the image of Uncle Varfolomiy in the narrative structure, as Yuri Bezkhutryi posits [3, p. 178]. On the other side, it delineates the overall space of the room: the door, the window, the easel, and Dema's position. We further insinuate that as they (Varfolomiy – Veronika; Stefan – Varfolomiy; Khrystyna – Varfolomiy) converse [14, pp. 131–132], shots alternate between them, following a convention known as shot/reverse shot (or shot/countershot) [15, pp. 233–234]. These dialogues are partially complex to communicating the themes associated with the characters, their attributes, the settings, the controlling images, for they contain references to the concerns of the historical moment the implied reader-spectator (specifically, the

contemporary one) might not be aware of them yet. During the interaction between Varfolomiy and Veronika, not affecting the spatio-temporal diegetic continuity of the dream sequence, the gaze of the non-diegetic narrator inserts on the easel that is lit by 'anaemic' rays, goes on to Stefan who is getting ready for his lectures, and tracks up on Dema looking through the window above himself into the sky as if for original insight. This explanatory shot of easel and window alludes to the film frame and the camera, the first is associated with a flat, geometrical display – a picture cut off from the spatial continuum, and the second with the imbrication of point-of-view and subjectivity. It also reveals the character's predilection for looking through a window, gazing at the materiality and plenitude of moving images for what will satisfy the character's stirred desire of representing ordinary people very closely as they go about their everyday lives instead of some profound sensation. However, the scopic mastery renders just a blank space within a framed canvas. Chronological presenting of sequences is the method of handling order in the short story. The narrative progression in it suggests a linear movement from one scene to another, but often there are perceptually disruptive transitions, e.g., when Uncle Varfolomiy has already-mentioned dream of talking to the siblings and their acquaintances while sleeping on the train:

Khrystyna is a grey-haired old woman who doesn't understand words of wisdom. Then, of course, Veronika triumphs. Uncle Bartholomew waves his arms and –

bam!

– he ran to the station without saying goodbye, to get on the suburban train, to return to the abandoned station, to the Cheka department of transportation, to have tea with a distant friend, and then back home to his classes.

...Once again the room. There travel the winds somewhere, there lie resilient snow someplace. And suddenly the fog starts steaming outside the window. On the gray background in the mist, there looms a figure. This is Dema. Dema stands beside the easel and looks distressingly at the lines. He says, 'When will I finally do a painting?..' Then there goes a city night, somewhere the watchman's rattle hits alarmingly. Then the rattle ceases. The dawn is anaemic,

lustreless, and grievous. Dema stands near the window; constricting his head, the black circles under his eyes staring about with a vacant gaze. Uncle Varfolomiy asked, 'Stefan, hasn't he messed with his mind?' Dema approached and wrote,

'Mene, Teke, Peres...'

... Veronika screamed somewhere.

Uncle Varfolomiy woke up [14, pp. 132–133].

The rupture (abrupt cut to Varfolomiy's advance to the station) jars the 'seamless' continuity of sequence. This segment also denotes the *mise-en-abîme*, a dream inside a dream reduplicating internally Uncle Varfolomiy's journey in a fast-forward manner, and subsequently enunciating Dema's shortage of source of inspiration. The privileging view, available only to the omniscient narrator outside the diegetic universe, identified as an optical viewpoint akin to what the camera shows and signifying his godlike power over the world of the story, leads us to imagine this oneiric scene, which increases the tension. A cut shifts to the interior of the room; in a parallel montage we are led by the camera look folded into ours (the readers' as spectators') to perceive the sonic dynamism of moving winds outdoors as well as a certain feature of the snow as ifs for punctuating effect; cut back inside to the close-up shot of the fog outside the window, implying the sense of mystery and the unknown. In the next shot, some object of blurred contours and texture (that might appear for blank white canvas on the easel) with the outlines of someone's silhouette against it is framed via a medium long shot [15, p. 189], linking both shots by stressing the tonal value of monochromatic colour design. The implied reader-spectator, adopting the projected narrative world, identifies the silhouette as Dema. A cut to a medium close-up [26, p. 92] of him enables the implied reader-spectator to comprehend his facial expression that of anxiety and the object (empty lines on the canvas) that prefigures it. A shift to the exterior; it is dark, shadowy, rather unpleasant because of the nightfall. The noise of the night is intensified by the sound of the watchman's rattle, which the narrator denotes as 'alarming' thus matching the unnerving ticking of it to the sense of mystery of what might be going on in the spaces behind the window, it stops. Continuity cut to the dawn, resonating the character's momentary state on the border

between consciousness and unconsciousness. Another medium close-up of Dema articulating his body-based anxieties coupled with perceptual dislocation. A shift to a medium two-shot [26, p. 92] of astonished Varfolomiy asking Stefan about the psychotic state of his friend; their presence in the scene is unfelt for Dema; cut back to Dema. In one eyeline match [15, p. 234], the implied reader-spectator tracks him approaching the easel and writing on it, and then we see what he has written. An inexplicable scream that the narrator attributes to Veronica implicates some menace and contributes to the feeling of being an incapacitated victim. Uncle Varfolomiy awakes.

Another instance of utilizing editing techniques to build the temporal continuity and to mark the start / end of a particular narrative moment or transition to the parallel action line is evident in the next scene:

...It is dark in Poiarni Posolki. Now and again, the dogs howl; now and then, a cobblestone road revives. It is damp in the room; an oil lamp burns low.

...At the same time, across the town beyond the river, Dema stands near the easel, and then he approaches the window and looks distressingly out in the dense spring mist. Heaps of heavy silent clouds hover tacitly over the roofs. Across the street, in the bar called "Now!" the door keeps opening incessantly, and (how's it gonna be in Gorky?) 'both the restless and the quiet alike' are let out and let in.

Dema comes up again to the easel and looks distressingly out in the dense spring mist [14, p. 137].

On the discursive level, we recognize the overall paratactic relationship of clauses, alternating imagery, which is balanced by the conventional film language appliance. At the grammatical level, syntactic redundancy is realised through the equivalence of grammatical forms of predicate clauses, word order, and the same type of syntactic structure of sentences. Nataliia Kondratenko posits [6, p. 91] the misuse of repetitious components (formal and semantic) does not fulfil an aesthetic function in the text, but is aimed at rendering a special artistic world in which the same events are reiterated, and communicative situations are duplicated. In this way, the artistic discourse of the non-classical paradigm models a global picture consisting of the same type, monotonous, almost unchanging situations. A distance shot

[19, p. 352] of the locality where the camera glides over it (“...It is dark in Poiarni Posolky. Now and again, the dogs howl; now and then, a cobblestone road revives.”) cuts back to the room (“It is damp in the room;”), where Veronika has just recalled her suppressed psychological tension (hands injury), shifting in to the lamp (“...an oil lamp burns low.”). We advance to another room (location A2), where the action occurs simultaneously (cross-cutting) [19, p. 102] as within location A1. There is a medium long shot of Dema. The camera tracks him up to the window, establishing him as the authoritative and narrative centre of the scene. It suggests his particular looking in hard sky as a reinforcement of grief over the loss of something greatly valued, and no artistic response to the call for creation of a new visual alphabet comprised of heroic daily routine subject matter. The character gives a brooding glance, connoting a boundless yearning for a distant place, away from his material prison of the very room and the deterrent of natural origin that prevents his vision. Next instant, we get away to another Dema’s point-of-view shot, that of surveying the visitors of a place where alcohol is served.

... They went out on the porch. The sky receded into the distance. The stars played an incredible intangible symphony. They went to the river. Uncle Bartholomew walked them to the shore, and the rest of them went with Veronika to the performance. As they were leaving the city, Uncle Bartholomew, who was walking behind everyone else, called out to Stefan. He was waving his arms, worried.

...Carts trundled out of the city. They clattered in the damp spring haze. There was a bright star in the east. It smelled (Dema said) like lemon peel. Factory lights were scattered in the distance. Dema felt sentimental:

- This is not from Luke, but out of the uprising. There’s one extract from it based on the tune: “Hey, through the valley, hey, through the broad valley the Cossacks are marching”. And it’s because I hear the distant stomp of imaginary horses. Because a little girl laid her head on my heart, and I see the birth of a new life [14, p. 142].

The characters appear on the front plane and the sky is in the background with the clouds moving away from them; it gives a physical perspective on the stars projecting their concordant interplay of visual rhythms.

The camera follows them as they walk to the river, traditionally a trope for spiritual cleansing and simultaneously chaos. Some go with Veronika to the theatre. The camera shifts to Bartholomew negotiating anxiously with Stefan. Cut to the exterior long shot of the people riding the carts in the foreground and the shot of the star in the background plane. This is taken from Dema’s optical standpoint that is further reinforced by his odour comment. Another line of his is explained in the notes, namely, “This refers to the evangelist Luke and the insurgent truths that allegedly replaced the truths of the Gospel.” [1, p. 767]. He also accompanies it by quoting the line from the Ukrainian historical song of the 17th century “Hey, on the hilltop those reapers reap” the mimetic function of which is to evoke the feeling of revolutionary romanticism especially under the conditions of lost and found statehood. It is not quite apparent why he indulges his emotions that way, when and where he met the girl who was tender enough to lean her head on Dema’s chest, who she is, whether it is a hint he is on the way of psychological adjustment to the ‘normal life’ and steering away from the remains of grim travails of combat. The protagonist’s illusive response has produced new knowledge of the facts of life, of the necessary disillusionment that awaits at the far end of each necessary illusion and the requirement to transgress the limits of individual tragedy.

The window might stand for all those apertures that serve as thresholds between the two realms, in the case of Dema the separation of art and life for the purpose of affecting the social space. It is a sort of interpenetration of interior and exterior, of subjectivity and objectivity, as well as a direct observing of life from a safe and chilly distance. Dema’s ideological stance is marked by instability, the agility of his mind, for he unconsciously becomes aware of his opposition to ethics and the bodily regulation of the life under state socialism; a paintbrush embodies a sword that symbolizes his unconscious revolt against the fundamental inequity of the state socialist rhetoric world, hence ‘Mene, Teke, Peres...’. What is art? What is its purpose, aim and *telos*? In terms of a narrative one, it may correspond to both the pursuit of private perfection and serving human liberty, as Richard Rorty has put it [30, p. 145]. As far as the fine arts is concerned, it means art is deeper than simply an illustration of real life, though the case of Dema speaks of

his search for public response and stir, since he believes he has something to put it to. Dema resembles Khvylovy himself, for both are artists in their respective field and both relate to an autobiographic subject matter. The two of them array their works with meditations on the essence of art; moreover, it is common knowledge that pictorial art and writing convey a certain message, though their degree of expressiveness may vary. The works of the two are embedded in the social context, whereas painting, in the loose sense, was more available to the masses for it was depicting some modern socialist epic and, as Paul Klee once posited, it made the real life visible rather than reproduced one [23, p. 182]. Roman Ingarden went further, claiming that:

Thus, the picture is inherently an instantaneous work of art in terms of the temporal form of the objects portrayed on it. In other words, these objects are always depicted only at one moment of their intended existence, if at all it comes down to identifying the temporal moment in the picture. It occurs only when a picture depicts an event, i.e., in pictures with a literary theme. It is always only an uncertain present, at most with a certain perspective on the past and the future, the range of which depends on the kind of event which is visually depicted in the picture [22, pp. 51–52].

What he meant is the point put forward by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in his treatise on aesthetics *Laokoon* (1766) – the notion of time pertains to the realm of literature whereas space belongs to painting, against what the Polish scholar argued. However, in Dema's case, we observe the very sense of Ingarden's comment in terms of moments of poetic insight that engender the temporal "snapshot" of a fateful moment. The designated moment portrays the captured artistic space that is not the same as the real one, for behind all those glorious moments of the Soviet body politic moulding coupled with presumable heroic exploits and colossal stoicism of devotees, there were coveted the sufferings the vulnerable Soviet body underwent. Families were ruined as well as friends' former personal relationships; the writer underscores the inability of his character, who survives the intestine war physically, to adjust psychologically to so-called "normal life." The incapacity to draw contends with the language as one of the basis of the alienation between the self and the world (Lacan), constituting a distinction between outer and inner realities. His portraying of real life was, in fact, depicting of a

condition of spatial illusionism. The setting of his pictures equates time as well as space of the "narrated" events, since they portray the current juncture; there is no differentiation between them. Then, the temporal characteristics of literature lead to the concept of the plot (literary theme in Ingarden's terms), which for Khvylovy is reduced to the immediate aftermath of revolution (the plot of *Syluety*), the here and now, whereas for Dema it revolves around the not too distant past, and they relate to each other in terms of a mutual described event – the revolution, civil war. Since after the end of the revolution, both "artists" have traded their places, so to say: ex-combatant Khvylovy writes whilst Dema struggles with his artist's block. In the majority of his works, the Ukrainian writer posed moral tests and paralleled everyday life perception and perception of artistic representation.

The Christian intertextuality of the short story spoken about by Yuriy Bezkhutryi does also correlate with the hands' motif as well as the spectacle of the body overall. Christ was crucified, i.e., his hands and legs were fastened with nails and therefore neutralized. Though Jesus used both his hands and words to heal, to preach, to advocate the ideas of divine love and joy, it turned out to be insufficient; thus, he had to be martyred, to be publicly executed. Politicized torture or politicized elimination of ordinary state socialism devotees and supporters was still to be, albeit Khvylovy manages to anticipate this "corrective" form of social regulation, *inter alia*, in this short story.

All the characters are subjected to some sorts of retributive actions both overtly and subliminally, for the story may be interpreted as the parable of metaphysics of the afflicted body, afflicted by an ideology of state socialism. The Ukrainian writer shifts the emphasis from the unsubtle ideology of the ruling power structures in general to the doctrine of interpersonal relations distinguished by shame, atonement, and anger, takeover. From a revolutionist, Veronika transforms into a victim; being imprisoned by her sense of guilt, she creates her own way to control the borders of normality, discipline, and punishment. Even her replies both to Uncle Varfolomiy and to her brother Stefan are restrained, self-controlled, and austere. It is possible to interpret her aforementioned remark about the martyr's way of life at the time, as well as other characters, in terms of the differentiation Slavoj Žižek has made between the subject of desire and the subject of drive. According to a Slovenian

philosopher, the divergence of meaning lies in that the subject of desire focuses on the goal-oriented action whereas the subject of drive concentrates on the aim of an action [34, p. 73]. Therefore, the goal of the revolution was to mobilize people for a new start, new freedom, to turn the society into a new political unity. The ethical accountability for historical practice of new order establishment is made clear by Veronika's aim to look after the working class represented by granny Khrystyna and to cloister herself. Veronika's behaviour logic derives from the reason for the words she uttered, regarding one possible way and different paths. Newly developed consciousness comes from the fact that Veronika does not shift the guilt on anyone else but her; there are no traces of some sort of self-pity. The psychological and *ad hoc* impulses make her become stronger and more confident in her beliefs, though not insane, but with permanently twisted consciousness and irreversibly deformed psyche. The first name – Veronika – alludes to the legend of the saint who wiped Christ's face on the way to Calvary and found an image of his face (*vera icon* – true image) imprinted on *sudarium*. Therefore, 'Veronika' is an anagram of *vera icon*. As Yuri Bezkhutryi underscores:

Her evolution occurs in a bizarre-psycho-pathic "God's fool" way. She misreads "the present day", which turned out to be discordant with the impracticable projects drawn on placards, not as "heroic daily routine" but as "heroic endurance". The pleasure of such patience is masochistic in nature [3, p. 182].

The case of Veronika is an ambiguous one, for it shows that false and erroneous logic, to say the least, prevailed in the then proletarian society, it won over the average man or woman. Since the fates of mental power, intellect and morality are indissoluble, corruption or loss of one inevitably results in failure and damage to the other. Concurrently, it ought to be noted that whilst Dema endlessly repeats his tries to draw, albeit to no purpose, hence no joy of creation, Veronika speaks of "joy of endurance" that may be indicative of her childhood trauma, hence a rigid, focused consciousness of the subject of drive pursuing enjoyment. In her case, as claimed by Bezkhutryi, a masochistic one.

The nature of Veronika's childhood trauma has repercussions for the heroine's own sexuality. Žižek contends:

The point is *not* to remember the past

trauma as exactly as possible: such "documentation" is a priori false, it transforms the trauma into a neutral, objective fact, whereas the essence of the trauma is precisely that it is too horrible to be remembered, to be integrated into our symbolic universe. All we have to do is to mark repeatedly the trauma as such, in its very "impossibility", in its non-integrated horror, by means of some "empty" symbolic gesture [33, p. 272].

So, what Veronika does is that she accepts the actual, devoid herself of the majority of things: leaves the dwelling she shared with her brother, turns down any sort of assistance or help from him, wears some rags, rejects all the proposals of Uncle Varfolomiy and settles in the outskirts. Her "empty" symbolic gesture is that of refusal and denial; meanwhile her alienation may be indicative of some sort of self-loathing, for it may be quite possible, her concern for Khrystyna (a double) is a juxtaposition of her affection for her mother. She re-enacts the knowledge about her aim; Veronika's actions and deeds reveal her essence, though for her brother it seems phony and akin to donning a mask.

Conclusions and prospects. It goes in the short story that all people, young and elder ones, are tied to the threat of violence – both physical and mental one, to the inescapable set of anxieties about the social order itself. If there is some struggle or conflict described, it is an internal one, for there are no external-embodied forces that need to be fought with, the short story is set in the aftermath of the revolution. The characters, most prominently Veronika and Dema, are in the state of fray, the aims, and matter of the struggles they wage may seem subjective solely. The plot of their strife is an ontological, existential, psychological one.

In *Syluety*, Khvylovy blends true to facts history and artistic fiction where the characters acquire self-consciousness. It is linked to the *topoi* of divide, boundary, limit – consciousness is focused, obsessed with the false idea of prosperity in the country of the socialist order. The thoughts, inferences, suppositions, mental suffering etc. and their referential content are indicative of not too distant history and modern time's dialogism. The psychological aspect (partly, a psychoanalytical one) is essential for Khvylovy-artist, for the dialectics of the soul makes the character sentient, credible, and

relatable. The moral and psychological disputes in the short story render the writer's suppressed ambiguity between romantic *beau idéal* of "intangible Commune" and the practical policy of the state socialist society. The Ukrainian writer was observing the characters' quality of behaviour in post-extreme historical circumstances, which had disrupted the flow of their lives in order to communicate things that might have evaded human experience and knowledge, were hidden behind a smokescreen of political correctness. Khvylovy took care to place his protagonists in an environment habitual both to them and to the implied reader. Environments achieve significance through their ability to bring out individuality. The *habitus* of the characters, formed within the framework of their social locations, instils in them a set of manners and a *Weltanschauung* based on and reconciled to their positions [16, p. 305]. The writer's account of events has a certain sociological, psychological and moral meaning. Exceptionally intricate intimate experiences of the characters address the proximity of fictional "reality" of the literary read and the contemporary reality of the recipient, for the current story is a fine example of Khvylovy's study of the relationship between people in terms of their interdependency on variables in everyday reality. Eventually, the characters' awareness of inconsistencies they have become a part of is tightly linked to their romanticism apotheosis. Both male and female characters are traumatized; the reader is privileged to get to know their issues. The hands' motif that permeates the short story is a twofold one – the distinction between male (Dema) and female (Veronika) hands. In the studied narrative, the female hand solicitously

cares for another woman, whereas the man's hand is portrayed as devoid of its creative power. There's even more to that, due to the obvious erotic overtones (Veronika's infatuation with the mother figure), the gal's refusal to accept any sort of helping hand from the male characters might be indicative of her "masculine" impulses when it comes to assistance. Besides, her self-inflicted pain, as a child, may suggest castration anxiety.

The short story was written during the phase when Khvylovy displayed a mastery command of a jittery, counterpoint style of writing as well as a tendency to impressionism and synaesthesia (see, for instance, *Liliuli*, *Arabesky*, *Pudel*) coupled with a romantic sense of global consciousness, occasionally with a tragic tinge. It does feature the characteristic use of film editing style to render the subtle take of the fiction world as well as the larger-than-life subjects on the premises of the stuff of the everyday life, in particular the case of an artist who was placed between two conflicting demands. There was, on the one hand, the commitment to the concerns of the state socialism realism with a complete obliviousness to the metaphorical quality of the works with the formal character of external reality representation, and, on the other one, the separation of art as the Modernist ideal of aesthetic purity and mundane life itself. The prospects of further studies should revolve around the issue of acoustics manifestation (implied sound, noise, music utterances, nondiegetic sound) in the fiction of Mykola Khvylovy, the way these sounds structure the narrative space in which they play a part and how literature, in general, grapples with sound and expands acoustic worlds.

Список використаних джерел

1. Агеева В. Примітки. Микола Хвильовий. Новели, оповідання «Повість про санаторійну зону». «Вальдшнепи». Роман. Поетичні твори. Памфлети. / Вступ. ст. упоряд. і приміт. В. П. Агеевої; Ред. тому М. Г. Жулинський. Київ: Наукова думка, 1995. С. 767.
2. Агеева В. Елегія для безґрунтовних романтиків. Віра Агеева. Апологія модерну: обрис ХХ віку. Київ: Грані-Т, 2011. С. 228-316.
3. Безхутрий Ю. М. Хвильовий: проблеми інтерпретації. Харків: Фоліо, 2003. 495 с.
4. Горболіс Л. М. Міжмистецькі контакти

українського тексту: монографія. Суми: Вид-во СумДПУ імені А.С.Макаренка, 2021. 312 с.

5. Кодак М. Микола Хвильовий як митець-психолог. Луцьк: Твердиня, 2008. 196 с.

6. Кондратенко Н. В. Синтаксис українського модерністського і постмодерністського художнього дискурсу / за ред. К. Г. Городенської. Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго, 2012. 323 с. URL: <http://dspace.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/9267/1/Kondratenko.pdf> (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

7. Костюк Гр. До нового трактування біографії М. Хвильового. Микола Хвильовий:

Твори у п'ятьох томах / заг. ред. Григорія Костюка. Нью-Йорк – Балтімор – Торонто: Об'єднання Українських Письменників «Слово» і Українське Видавництво «Смолоскип» ім. В. Симоненка, 1986. Т. 5: с. 15–38.

8. Ленська С. В. Українська мала проза 1920 – 1960-х років: ідейно-тематичні домінанти, жанрові моделі і стильові стратегії : дис. ... д-ра філол. наук: 10.01.01. Київ, 2015. 470 с.

9. Лепьохін Є. Культурно-історичний контекст і свідомість індивіда: деструктивні форми рецепції світу в новелі «Бараки, що за містом» Миколи Хвильового. *Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія: Філологія*. 2016. Вип. 2. С. 166–170. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvuufilol_2016_2_32 (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

10. Мостепан О. Творчість Миколи Хвильового в контексті метафори хвороби (Психологічні захворювання у прозі письменника). *Дивослово*. 2013. № 11. С. 56–61. URL: https://dyvoslovo.com.ua/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/15_112013.pdf (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

11. Муслієнко О. Микола Хвильовий («Силуєти», «Сентиментальна історія»): трансформація моделі *Künstlerroman* як стратегія інверсії художнього смислу. *Літературний процес: методологія, імена, тенденції*. 2015. № 6. С. 135–139. URL: <https://litp.kubg.edu.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/177> (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

12. Нестелєєв М. А. На межі: Суїцидальний дискурс українського модернізму: Монографія. Київ: Академвидав, 2013. 254 с.

13. Хвильовий М. Листи до Миколи Зерова / Микола Хвильовий: Твори у двох томах / за ред. М. Жулинського та П. Майданченко. Київ: Дніпро, 1992. Т. 2: с. 840–881.

14. Хвильовий М. Силуєти. Микола Хвильовий: вибрані твори / уклад. Ростислав Мельників. Київ: Смолоскип, 2011. С. 130–143.

15. Bordwell D., Thompson K, Smith J. Film Art: An Introduction [with Connect Access Code], 11th ed. McGraw-Hill Education, 2016. 544 p.

16. Bourdieu P. Men and machines. *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies* / ed. by K. Knorr-Cetina and A. Cicourel. London: Routledge and Kegan

Paul, 2014. Pp. 304–317.

17. Fahle O. Montage. *Handbuch Filmanalyse*. Springer Reference Geisteswissenschaften / ed. by M. Hagener, V. Pantenburg. Springer VS, Wiesbaden, 2017. S. 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-13352-8_4-1

18. Grabowicz G. G. Symbolic Autobiography in the Prose of Mykola Khvylovyyi (Some Preliminary Observations). *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1998. No. 22, Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe. Pp. 165–180. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41036736> (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

19. Hayward S. Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts, 5th ed. London; New York: Routledge 2017. 630 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619729>

20. Handbook of Narratology / ed. by P. Hühn, Chr. J. Meister, J. Pier, W. Schmid, 2nd ed. Berlin; Boston, Mass.: De Gruyter, 2014. 932 s. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110316469>

21. Ilnytskyj O. S. The Modernist Ideology and Mykola Khvylovyyi. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1991. No. 3/4(15). Pp. 257–262. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41036430> (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

22. Ingarden R. W. O budowie obrazu. Szkic z teorii sztuki. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 1946. 69 s.

23. Klee P. Creative Credo. *Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics* / ed. by H. B. Chipp. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968. Pp. 182–186.

24. Lepokhin Ye. “The song remains the same”: Mykola Khvylovyyi’s “non-canonical” short stories and “canonical” writer’s style”. *Literary Process: Methodology, Names, Trend*. 2022. No. 19. Pp. 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2475.2022.19.8>

25. Levytska O., Mocherniuk N. War Discourse in the Biographical Novels About Artists: Intermedial Aspect. *Respectus Philologicus*. 2023. No. 43 (48). Pp. 98–109. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15388/RESPECTUS.2023.43.48.112>

26. Lewis J. Essential Cinema: An Introduction to Film Analysis. Boston, MA : Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2014. xviii, 331 p. URL: <https://archive.org/details/essentialcinemai0000lewi/mode/2up> (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

27. Mailer N. What I Think of Artistic Freedom. *Norman Mailer. Mind of an Outlaw: Selected Essays* / ed. & preface by Phillip Sipiora, intro. by Jonathan Lethem. New York: Random House, 2013. Pp. 21–24.

28. Rajewsky I.O. Intermedialität. Tübingen, Basel: A. Francke Verlag/UTB, 2002. 240 s.

29. Ricoeur P. Oneself as Another / transl. by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992. 363 p.

30. Rorty R. Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 201 p. URL: [https://sites.pitt.edu/~rbrandom/Courses/Antirepresentationalism%20\(2020\)/Texts/rorty-contingency-irony-and-solidarity-1989.pdf](https://sites.pitt.edu/~rbrandom/Courses/Antirepresentationalism%20(2020)/Texts/rorty-contingency-irony-and-solidarity-1989.pdf) (дата звернення: 19.10.2023).

31. Schwanercke Chr. Filmic Modes in Literature. Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music / ed. by Gabriele Rippl. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter - De Gruyter Mouton, 2015. Pp. 268–286. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110311075-016>

32. Tarnawsky M. European Influence in Ukrainian Modernist Prose. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*. 1992. No. 34(1-2). Pp. 131–142. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.1992.11091981>

33. Žižek S. For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as a Political Factor. London, UK: Verso, 1991. 288 p.

34. Žižek S. Living in the End Times. London, UK: Verso, 2010. 416 p.

References

1. Ageyeva, V. (1995). Prymitky [Notes]. In M. Zhulynskyi (Ed.), *Mykola Khvylovy. Novely, opovidannia «Povist pro sanatoriinu zonu». «Valdshnepy». Roman. Poetychni tvory. Pamflety* [Mykola Khvylovyi. Short stories, stories “A Tale about the Sanatorium Zone”. “Woodcocks”. A novel. Poetic works. Pamphlets.] (p. 767). Kyiv: Naukova dumka. [in Ukrainian]

2. Ageyeva, V. (2011). Elehiya dlya bezgruntovnykh romantykiv [An elegy for baseless romantics]. In V. Ageyeva, *Apolohiya modernu: obrys XX viku* [The Apologia of Modernity: The Outline of the Twentieth Century] (pp. 228–316). Kyiv: Hrani-T. [in Ukrainian]

3. Bezkhutryi, Yu. (2003). *Khvylovy: problemy interpretatsii* [Khvylovy: the Interpretation Issues]. Kharkiv: Folio. [in

Ukrainian]

4. Horbolis, L. M. (2021). *Mizhmystetski kontakty ukrainskoho tekstu: monohrafiia* [Interart contacts of the Ukrainian text: monograph] Sumy: Vyd-vo SumDPU imeni A.S. Makarenka. [in Ukrainian]

5. Kodak, M. (2008). *Mykola Khvylovy yak mytets-psykholoh* [Mykola Khvylovy as a psychological artist]. Luts'k: Tverdynia. [in Ukrainian]

6. Kondratenko, N. V. (2012). *Syntaksys ukrainskoho modernistskoho i postmodernistskoho khudozhnogo dyskursu* [Syntax of the Ukrainian modernist and postmodernist artistic discourse]. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim Dmytra Buraho, 2012. Retrieved from <http://dspace.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/9267/1/Kondratenko.pdf> [in Ukrainian]

7. Kostyuk, Hr. (1986). Do novoho traktuvannia biohrafi M. Khvylovoho [On the New Approach to the Biography of M. Khvylovy]. In Hr. Kostyuk (Ed.), *Mykola Khvylovy: Works in Five Volumes* (Vol. 5) (pp. 15–38). New York, Baltimore, Toronto: Ukrainian Writers' Association in Exile and V. Symonenko Smoloskyp Publishers, Smoloskyp Inc.

8. Lenska, S. V. (2015). *Ukrainska mala proza 1920 – 1960-kh rokiv: ideino-tematychni dominanty, zhanrovi modeli i stylovi stratehii* (Doctoral dissertation, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv National University, Kyiv, Ukraine). Retrieved from <http://dspace.pnpu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/16555> [in Ukrainian]

9. Lepokhin, Ye. (2016). Kulturno-istorychnyi kontekst i svidomist indyvida: destruktivni formy retseptsii svitu v noveli «Baraky, shcho za mistom» Mykoly Khvylovoho [Cultural and historical context and consciousness of the individual: the destructive forms of the world reception in the short story “The Sheds outside the City” by Mykola Khvylovy]. *Scientific Bulletin of Uzhhorod University. Series Philology*, 2. 166–170. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nvuufilol_2016_2_3_2 [in Ukrainian]

10. Mostepan, O. (2013). Tvorchist Mykoly Khvylovoho v konteksti metafory khvoroby (Psykhologichni zakhvoriuvannia u prozi pysmennyka) [Mykola Khvylovy's works within the framework of the disease metaphor (Mental health issues in the writer's fiction)]. *Dyvoslovo*, 11. 56–61. Retrieved from <https://dyvoslovo.com.ua/wp->

content/uploads/2016/04/15_112013.pdf [in Ukrainian]

11. Musliienko, O. (2015). Mykola Khvylovy («Syluety», «Sentymentalna istoriia»): transformatsiia modeli *Künstlerroman* yak stratehiia inversii khudozhnoho smyslu [Mykola Khvylovy («Silhouettes» («The Silhouettes»), «Sentymentalna Istorya» («Sentimental Story»): *Künstlerroman* model transformation as a strategy of artistic sense inversion]. *Literary Process: Methodology, Names, Trends* *тодологія, імена, тенденції*, 6. 135–139. Retrieved from <https://litp.kubg.edu.ua/index.php/journal/article/view/177> [in Ukrainian]

12. Nestelieiev, M. (2013). *Na mezhi: Suitsydalnyi dyskurs ukrainskoho modernizmu: Monohrafiia* [On the edge: The suicidal discourse of Ukrainian modernism: Monograph] Kyiv: Akademvydav. [in Ukrainian]

13. Khvylovy, M. (1992). Lysty do Mykoly Zerova [Letters to Mykola Zerov]. In M. Zhulynskyi & P. Maydanchenko (Eds.), *Mykola Khvylovy: Tvory u dvokh tomakh* [Mykola Khvylovy: Works in Two Volumes (Vol. 2)] (pp. 840–881). Kyiv: Dnipro. [in Ukrainian]

14. Khvylovy, M. (2011). Syluety [Silhouettes]. In R. Melnykiv (Comp.), *Vybrani tvory* (pp. 130–143). Kyiv: Smoloskyp. [in Ukrainian]

15. Bordwell, D., Thompson, K., & Smith, J. (2016). *Film Art: An Introduction* [with Connect Access Code] (11th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

16. Bourdieu, P. (2014). Men and machines. In K. Knorr-Cetina & A. V. Cicourel (Eds.), *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies* (pp. 304–317). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

17. Fahle, O. (2017). Montage. In M. Hagener & V. Pantenburg (Eds.), *Handbuch Filmanalyse*. Springer Reference Geisteswissenschaften (ss. 1–16) Springer VS, Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-13352-8_4-1 [in German]

18. Grabowicz, G. G. (1998). Symbolic Autobiography in the Prose of Mykola Khvylovyi (Some Preliminary Observations). *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 22, Cultures and Nations of Central and Eastern Europe. 165–180. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41036736>

19. Hayward, S. (2017). *Cinema Studies:*

The Key Concepts (5th ed.). London; New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619729>

20. Hühn, P., Meister, Chr. J., Pier, J., & Schmid, W. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of Narratology* (2nd ed.). Berlin; Boston, Mass.: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110316469>

21. Illytzyk, O. S. (1991). The Modernist Ideology and Mykola Khvylovyi. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 3/4(15). 257–262. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41036430>

22. Ingarden, R. W. (1946). *O budowie obrazu. Szkic z teorii sztuki*. Kraków: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. [in Polish]

23. Klee, P. (1968). Creative Credo (N. Guterman, Trans.). In H. B. Chipp (Ed.), *Theories of Modern Art: A Source Book by Artists and Critics* (pp. 182–186). Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press. (Original work published 1920)

24. Lepokhin, Ye. (2022). “The song remains the same”: Mykola Khvylovyi’s “non-canonical” short stories and “canonical” writer’s style”. *Literary Process: Methodology, Names, Trend*, 19, 62–70. <https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2475.2022.19.8>

25. Levytska, O., & Mocherniuk, N. (2023). War Discourse in the Biographical Novels About Artists: Intermedial Aspect. *Respectus Philologicus*, 43 (48). 98–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15388/RESPECTUS.2023.43.48.112>

26. Lewis, J. (2014). *Essential Cinema: An Introduction to Film Analysis*. Boston, MA : Wadsworth, Cengage Learning. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/essentialcinemai0000lewi/mode/2up>

27. Mailer, N. (2013). What I Think of Artistic Freedom. In Ph. Sipiora (Ed.), J. Lethem (intro), *Mind of an Outlaw: Selected Essays by Norman Mailer* (pp. 21–24). New York: Random House.

28. Rajewsky, I. O. (2002). *Intermedialität*. Tübingen, Basel: A. Francke Verlag/UTB. [in German]

29. Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as Another* (K. Blamey, Trans.). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1990)

30. Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

31. Schwanecke, Chr. (2015). Filmic

Modes in Literature. In G. Rippl (Ed.), *Handbook of Intermediality: Literature – Image – Sound – Music* (pp. 268–286). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter - De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110311075-016>

32. Tarnawsky, M. (1992). European Influence in Ukrainian Modernist Prose. *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue*

Canadienne des Slavistes, 34(1-2), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00085006.1992.11091981>

33. Žižek, S. (1991). *For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as a Political Factor*. London, UK: Verso.

34. Žižek, S. (2010). *Living in the End Times*. London, UK: Verso.

Анотація. У центрі уваги статті – комплексна проблематика новели «Силуети» (1923) Миколи Хвильового (1893–1933): дослідження мотиву рук, огляд того, як відчувається просторовість (простір кімнати) травмованими персонажами, діалектика тіла, що страждає від наслідків революції 1917 р., непрямий вплив кінематографічної практики (міжкадровий монтаж, позиція камери-оповідача), на мистецьке вираження індивідуального стилю письменника. Були доповнені релігійні, а саме християнські, аспекти, раніше описані Юрієм Безхутрим. Особливу увагу приділено персонажам Демі та Вероніки, які співвідносяться з автором як за біографічними й художніми параметрами, так і за деякими психоаналітичними складовими. У результаті винятково складні глибинні переживання персонажів зачіпають суміжність вигаданої «реальності» художнього твору та сучасної дійсності читача, оскільки цей наратив є яскравим взірцем аналізу стосунків між людьми з точки зору їхньої незадоволеності повсякденною реальністю, прагненням до ідеального. Подібно до кіноекрана, на якому протікає фільм, демонструючи глядачеві те, що має бути побачене, і те, як воно візуально сприймається, Микола Хвильовий умовно робить це у своїй художній прозі. Досліджувана новела – це драма буденності соціальної реальності, де герої вже переступили поріг своєї приватної ілюзії (бажання змін, бажання бути потрібним, бажання любити), щоб зіткнутися з розчаруванням (фобією), а потім перейти на новий рівень ілюзії. У дослідженні використано систему з біографічного, системно-цілісного, герменевтичного, культурно-історичного та поетикального методів, що зумовлено специфікою дослідження, його об'єктом й предметом. Дані результатів здійсненого дослідження будуть корисними всім, хто займається вивченням питання індивідуально-авторського світосприйняття українського письменника, особливостями розвитку української літератури 1-ї пол. XX ст., фахівцям у галузі художнього мистецтва XX століття, фахівцям у галузі художньої антропології.

Ключові слова: тіло, свідомість, суспільний, персонаж, мистецтво, мета, ідеологія, монтаж, кадр, сцена.