

UDC 007:070.009.7.097

TELEVISION WRITING ON CURRENT AFFAIRS AND DOCUMENTARIES IN THE COVERAGE OF THE SIEGE OF MARIUPOL

MELNYKOVA-KURHANOVA Olena,

PhD (Social Communications), Associate Professor, email: mel05@ukr.net¹;

YATCHUK Olha,

PhD (Social Communications), Associate Professor, e-mail: yatchuk.olga@gmail.com².

¹ National Aviation University, Liubomyra Huzara ave, 1, Kyiv, Ukraine, 03058.

² University of Customs and Finance, st. Volodymyr Vernadsky, 2/4, Dnipro, Ukraine, 49000.

The article analyses documentaries and journalistic videos about the siege of Mariupol during the Russian-Ukrainian war. The authors have reviewed and systematized studies on documentaries by foreign and domestic scholars. Ten documentaries and eight journalistic videos about the siege of Mariupol were analysed. The features of the films are identified, in particular, attention is paid to symbols, the image of the hero, and the image of the author. The features of documentaries and journalistic stories were compared by the following criteria: duration, method of collecting information, specific features of video materials, choice of characters, and journalistic techniques. The documentaries about the siege of Mariupol include footage of citizens from social media, journalists and photographers who took their archives out of the city, etc.

Keywords: documentary, television writing on current affairs, journalistic image, communications in a siege of the city.

ТЕЛЕПУБЛІЦИСТИКА Й ДОКУМЕНТАЛІСТИКА У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ ОБЛОГИ МАРІУПОЛЯ

У статті проаналізовано документальні фільми та публіцистичні відеосюжети про облогу Маріуполя під час російсько-української війни. Авторами було розглянуто та систематизовано дослідження з документалістики закордонних та вітчизняних вчених. Проаналізовано десять документальних фільмів та десять публіцистичних відеосюжетів про облогу Маріуполя. Визначено особливості фільмів, зокрема звернено увагу на символи, образ героя та образ автора. Порівняно особливості документальних фільмів та публіцистичних сюжетів за критеріями: тривалість, метод збору інформації, специфічні риси відеоматеріалів, вибір героїв, публіцистичні прийоми. Документальні фільми про облогу Маріуполя містять кадри містян із соціальних мереж, журналістів і фотографів, які вивезли свої архіви з міста, тощо.

Ключові слова: документалістика, телевізійна публіцистика, публіцистичний образ, комунікації у блокадному місті.

Introduction. War coverage through video recording of facts and events, and eyewitness testimonies, including those of victims and survivors, is an important tool for attracting the attention of the audience. The combination of a publicistic image and an evidentiary picture, factual basis, expressive and convincing characters helps to immerse the viewer in the real reality of a certain period and make them feel like an accomplice to the event, an interlocutor and a sympathiser [1, p. 21]. Mariupol is the only city in Ukraine that was relatively quickly besieged by the enemy during the Russian-Ukrainian war. After a week of the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine, the city was completely left without electricity, mobile and internet communications, as well as water, heat, water, and food [2, p. 183]. This complicated the work of journalists and documentary filmmakers, as there was a risk to life

© Melnykova-Kurhanova O., Yatchuk O., 2023

while recording the events. There is also the problem of the reliability and verification of some material that can be used from social networks or messengers.

Documentary filmmakers cover and convey the entire spectrum of war and the human being in it. Modern methods of recording events during the war, highlighting the publicistic image of the city under siege and its inhabitants as the heroes of documentaries are *the relevance of the study*.

The *aim* of the paper is to determine the peculiarities of television publicism and documentaries in the context of covering the city siege during the war.

To achieve this aim, it is necessary to solve the following *tasks*:

1. to study the scientific works of domestic and foreign scholars on the topic of the research;
2. to analyse documentaries and TV stories about the siege of Mariupol, in particular, the peculiarities of recording and documenting the event and people's testimonies about the siege of the city and war crimes against humanity;
3. to identify the peculiarities of television journalism and documentary during the Russian-Ukrainian war on the example of the coverage of the siege of Mariupol.

V. Korobko, O. Halych, A. Kovalenko, M. Rabiger, M. Renov, V. Nichols and others have studied publicistic and documentary films. Researchers have highlighted the peculiarities of documentaries and feature and publicistic genres on television. However, they did not consider the recording of facts and events, specific features of documentaries and journalistic videos during the coverage of the war, in particular, the city under the siege.

The object of the article is documentaries and journalistic television essays about the siege of Mariupol in the Russian-Ukrainian war, which were broadcasted from March 2022 to June 2023.

The subject of the research is the peculiarities of Ukrainian television publicism and documentaries in covering the tragedy of a city under siege, using the example of Mariupol as an example.

The innovation of the research lies in identifying the features of documentaries and publicistic videos about a city under siege during the war, in particular in comparing methods and approaches to recording and documenting the lives of people in a city under siege, as well as war crimes against humanity.

Research methods. To research the peculiarities of documentary and television publicism, we used monitoring to find and systematize documentaries and TV stories from March 2022 to June 23, content analysis on the example of ten documentaries (20 Days in Mariupol, Mariupolis 2, Mariupol 2022, Air Breakthrough to Azovstal. The Sky”, “Mariupol. Chronicles of Hell”, “Mariupol. Stories of people”, “Mariupol...Outside the zone”, “Mariupol. Exclusion Zone”, “Mariupol. Lost Hope”, “Rage Allows Me to Breathe” and eight publicistic television essays (“48 Days of Hell in the Records of an Ordinary Mariupol Resident”, “It seemed that an atomic bomb was thrown at us. The story from inside the drama theatre during the air strike”, “Mariupol. Escape from hell”, “Mariupol. 20 days of hell”, “Evacuation from Mariupol: by bus to hell and back”, “A photographer from Mariupol about life under shelling, a boy’s diary and revenge of the “DPR””, “She managed to get out of the exhausted, tortured Mariupol, but her husband went missing”, “Imagine”). We used the theoretical method to analyse the research of domestic and foreign scholars on documentary and writing on current affairs. The main films about the siege of Mariupol were analysed using the descriptive method, and the comparative method was used to compare the features, techniques and tools used in documentary and publicistic films. Thus, the results of the study were obtained using theoretical, descriptive, comparative methods, systematic monitoring of documentaries and journalistic videos about the city under siege on the example of Mariupol. The peculiarities of these films were identified, in particular, by the following criteria: duration, method of information gathering, specific features of video materials, choice of characters, journalistic techniques.

Results and discussion. The issue of researching the peculiarities of documentary is presented in the dissertation study by V. Korobko [3], who examined the classification

of documentary genres from the point of view of various research studies. Despite the various classifications presented in the works of M. Rabiger [4], V. Korobko believes that it is appropriate to use the functions on which the material presented here is based, namely the classification developed by M. Renov: 1) to record, reveal or preserve; 2) to persuade or promote; 3) to analyse or investigate; 4) to express” [5]. However, B. Nichols argued that “one subgenre provides a general outline of the structure of the whole film, but it is not the only part to fully characterise the film. Thus, a film in the poetic style may contain elements of observational or descriptive documentary” [6]. These conclusions are shared by V. Korobko: “the main criterion is to document a fact or event that relates to any part of the reality of human existence on the TV screen, so it can have many subgenres and not have clear signs that would emphasise for the society the reality and importance of the facts that are in documentary” [3, p.85].

The experience of filming military events can also be found in the history of Ukrainian cinema in the works of O. Dovzhenko, such as *The Battle for Our Soviet Ukraine* (1943, with Y. Solntseva and Y. Avdeenko) and *Victory on the Right Bank of Ukraine* (1945, with Y. Solntseva), where the director managed to find his own poetic way – to use vivid images in combination with contrasts, where the image of Ukraine was embodied in the usual symbol of the sunflower [7]. French film critic M. Oms wrote: “...the sunflower is a symbol of Ukraine, as the lark is of France or the maple leaf is of Canada” [8, p. 66]. Documentary materials in Mariupol also received their own poetic symbols: Azovstal, the Drama Theatre, the maternity hospital.

The study of documentary filmmaking by M. Moore, whose works influenced the political aspects of society, is considered in the contemporary study by Kellokoski Ilari, where documentary filmmaking is considered in the context of the paradigm of rational, factual or propaganda influence: “Persuasion is an act situated between argumentation and propaganda, or rationality and emotion; however, the boundaries are porous, and there is no clear consensus on the definitions of these terms. Emotive content is traditionally associated with persuasion and propaganda, whereas rationality is associated with argumentation. However, as the concepts of rational propaganda and moral emotions demonstrate, the issue is not as clear-cut as it might appear.” [9, c. 158]. Further research allowed the author to classify witnesses, narrative carriers, identifying six categories: “1) witness illustrators, 2) media representatives, 3) experts, 4) emotional subjects, 5) antagonistic characters, and 6) the performing director” [9, p. 159].

Recent scholarly research on the subject of intelligence is not widespread, one of the related works is the dissertation of Kadum Leon Leith, who examined the peculiarities of directing an extreme documentary. It is in this work that the author identifies the multilevel influence of the extreme in documentary filmmaking, where extreme social upheaval (such as war), extreme perceptions of the viewer and the conditions of extreme filmmaking combine to create a new and distinctive genre of documentary. Analysing the films of Iraqi documentary filmmakers, Kadum Keon Leith has identified such features as “the interweaving of the film’s dramatic plot with the director’s personal drama, the presence of the maximum intensity of moral and ethical attitude to the chosen problem, the strengthening of the subjective factor as a result of changes in the role of the author-director to a participant-witness of events, the combination of the author’s role and the character, the indirectness of forms and methods of recording” [10, p. 205].

However, documentary works related to war often violate the classical notion of violence and humanity, where the object of attention can be both the mutilated bodies of the victims and rather sensitive content. However, in the study by A. Kerner and J. Knapp, which examines more manifestations of the corporeal on the screen, it is stated that “Extreme cinema is full of sounds and images that throb and shudder” [11, p. 159].

Most often, documentary materials on television could be presented in the format of docudrama, “exploited to steer a very large audience towards political and societal issues that

needed national consensus to be addressed, but questions about the neutrality of journalism and the legitimacy of the filmic material are key to understanding events” [12].

According to V. Korobko, “Documentary is journalism, but not in the classical sense of ‘informing’, but in combination with artistic forms. The researcher distinguishes six forms of filming, including poetic, observational, reflective, descriptive, participatory/interactive and performative [13, p. 31].

O. Halych interprets documentary as literature based on real historical documents and facts and encompassing three most important areas: memoir, fictional biography, and writerly publicism. The author identifies among the features the author’s comprehension of certain socio-political events and phenomena, or the life of a real historical figure, or an important problem for the life of the people, carried out according to the laws of artistic creativity with the involvement of authentic documents of his time, a deep correlation of the author’s own spiritual experience with the inner world of the characters, the social and psychological nature of their actions [14].

Ukrainian researchers have been monitoring the transformation of journalism genres during the Russian-Ukrainian war. For example, according to V. Vasylenko, the dominant information group influences the reader’s choice of relevant genres in feature publicism. The contemporary content of journalistic materials, in particular about volunteers, soldiers, victims and survivors of the war, is implemented in the restored genres, including the war diary, feature essays with elements of interviews, reportage-memoir, critical review and essay [15, p. 33].

When studying the form of a war diary, researchers define emotions and emotional states as a specificity of narrative, means of reproducing subjectivity, compositional features, a way of communicating with characters, readers and auto-communication [16, p. 17]. The emotional and sensual is achieved through evaluation, poetry, description, retrospection, slogans, appeals, and expression of one’s own feelings [16, p. 25]. According to A. Kovalenko, the communicative potential of the diary is aimed not only at creating the effect of presence through documentary reproduction of the course of the war, but also at the social effect caused by the understanding of war as a social phenomenon [16, p. 24].

O. Rosynska identifies the key narratives that are broadcast in television documentaries in Ukraine and Poland in the context of reflecting the interaction between the two nations, and also raises the topic of the depiction of war in film. The author identifies the narrative of war and the enemy [17, p. 62].

Ukrainian researchers consider documentaries from the historical and literary aspects. In particular, they highlight the reflection of national identity declared in documentaries [18, p. 77].

The documentaries about the siege of Mariupol include footage of citizens from social media, journalists and photographers who took their archives, aerial footage and reportage from the Azov Regiment’s press service, as well as photo and video footage from Associated Press journalists. Some stories used footage taken by the occupiers of Mariupol. However, the footage was verified and, after checking the accuracy of the location and time, was included in the film.

For example, the documentary “20 Days In Mariupol” was released in 2023 [19]. It was directed by Mstyslav Chernov. The unique documentary video and photo material was collected in Mariupol from 22 February to 15 March 2022 by Associated Press journalists Mstyslav Chernov, Yevhen Malolietka, and Vasilisa Stepanenko. The documentary presents a real picture of life under siege in Mariupol, which was completely besieged by the Russian Federation. The documented facts, people and events confirm the crimes of the Russian army against humanity. These are 94 minutes that refute the hostile Russian narratives against the Ukrainian city of Mariupol. The video materials have been checked for authenticity and originality, so they can be used in the European Court of Human Rights. The journalists recorded the first shelling of the Left Bank of Mariupol, then moved to other districts of the city. They captured the life of civilians in basements without water, electricity, food or heat. Filming in hospitals confirmed the large number of wounded and dead from shelling and air strikes

in the city. They also showed the work of the Ukrainian military and police who helped the citizens of Mariupol. The journalists documented how Russian tanks were targeting high-rise buildings in Mariupol. The journalists also recorded how a maternity hospital and a hospital were destroyed by air strikes. The documentary features the author Mstislav Chernov, who shares his emotions about the dead children and his worries about his daughters, whom he has not seen for a long time. The documentary won awards at Sundance, CPH:DOX, the Greg Gund Memorial Award, and the Cinema for Peace Award, and the filmmakers won the 2023 Pulitzer Prize.

The Lithuanian filmmaker Mantas Kvedaravicius was also under siege and made a documentary film, *Mariupolis 2* [20]. He showed the war and the life of the people of Mariupol under siege through the example of a shelter in one of the city's Baptist churches. The filmmaker documented the everyday life, activities and worries of the residents and, through some of the characters, showed the image of Mariupol residents who survived the shelling. The film shows the shelling of the Azovstal plant and the right bank of the city for an hour and a half. In particular, a 10-metre-long crater from an aerial bomb and five destroyed private houses are recorded. One of the most powerful images is that of dead pigeons and brightly coloured parrots. Mariupol residents loved to breed all kinds of birds. The author acted as an observer. Mantas Kvedaravicius was executed in Mariupol by the Russian military.

One of the first documentaries released in 2022 was "Mariupol. Chronicles of Hell" [21]. This is a volunteer project of an 81-minute film directed by Liza Tatarinova. The author's image is formed by the image of the city, and the introduction begins with the phrase "Hello, I am Mariupol". The destruction of the city, the killing of people, shelling, and burned houses are described by a voiceover on behalf of Mariupol. In addition to documentary footage from open sources, Associated Press footage, there are social media videos and eyewitness videos recorded on their phones. Using the interview method, several eyewitness stories are presented through parallel editing.

In the documentary "Mariupol. Human Stories" by the BBC in 2023, Mariupol residents share their stories and reflections for 58 minutes. [22]. In the film, witnesses tell about the air strikes by Russian aircraft on Mariupol. It is based on the story of a mother and son. It is also noted that the films and stories of Mariupol residents are used. At the same time, footage of peaceful pre-war Mariupol is presented. Among the characters were an early TV show host, a music teacher, an artist, a nurse, a military wife, etc. The film also chronicles the events of 24 February 2022. The issue of enemy propaganda and negotiations with relatives from Russia are also reflected in the film. Some of the protagonists provided their phone recordings and appeals at the outbreak of the war, when the internet and electricity were available. Videos of official addresses by the Russian president are also used to confirm the crimes. Among the video sources are materials from social media groups, including Telegram channels, as well as Ukrainian, Mariupol, Donetsk, and Russian TV channels.

The documentary "Mariupol. Unlost Hope" [23] was released in 2022 with a length of 62 minutes. Directed by Maksym Lytvynov, the documentary was produced by the Association of Ukrainian Producers. Five Mariupol residents tell their experiences of living inside the city under siege. Using the artistic technique of painting Mariupol like an artist, a storyline is created. The image of the narrator conveys the feelings of Nadiya Sukhorukova, who kept a diary on social media during the siege of the city. It is the author's journalistic descriptions of the fall of shells and bombs that convey what the citizens of Mariupol experienced. Documentary footage of city residents who had just left the siege was used. A volunteer, journalists, a translator, and drama theatre actors are the protagonists of the film, who testify to the crimes of the Russian Federation against humanity. The film also describes the shelters at the Philharmonic and the Drama Theatre. The filmmakers were able to convey what people were going through in Mariupol, which was already under siege and constant shelling by Russian aircraft in early March. The fact that people were deprived of any connection became the idea behind the documentary.

The sequel to this documentary, “Mariupol. The Lost Hope” was followed by the story of one of the protagonists, entitled “Rage Allows Me to Breathe” [24]. The story is based on the story of Ksenia Kayan, who lost her son during the siege of the city. The heroine shares her life after leaving the blockaded city. The idea of the documentary was that the heroine is optimistic about living on and the film gives strength to other survivors to live on.

The documentary films “Mariupol... Outside the Zone” (48 min.) and “Mariupol. The Exclusion Zone” (52 mins) record testimonies and various stories of survival during the siege of the city, filtration by the Russian Federation, and even captivity [25]. The video includes social media footage and archival footage. The song for the film was composed by a musician from Mariupol, Andrii Holovan. The author used various interview techniques, including filming the testimony of a soldier anonymously with a blackened face and voice changes. In the second film, there is a parallel storyline of the author getting a tattoo of Mariupol in Ukrainian on his arm.

One of the first documentaries, “Mariupol 2022”, was released by Oleksandr Ratushnyi in 2022 [26]. The video is seven minutes long, but all the footage is the author’s own, shot in the absence of electricity and any type of data connection. During the siege of Mariupol in March 2022, the chief cameraman of Mariupol TV lived with his family in the shelter of the Mariupol Nautical Lyceum. The documentary was broadcast on the Mariupol TV YouTube channel.

The documentary “Air Breakthrough to Azovstal. The Sky” by Artem Shevchenko was released in 2023 [27]. The 47-minute film reveals unknown details of the DIU’s unique airborne special operation in enemy-held Mariupol. Seven combat sorties to Mariupol are depicted with the help of archival videos of the heroes, comments from the military, and video of battles in Mariupol. Documentary footage adds to the understanding of warfare in a city under siege.

Writing on current affairs about the siege of Mariupol is represented by portrait video essays. The film “48 Days of Hell in the Records of an Ordinary Mariupol Resident” [28] is 28 minutes long and tells the story of a man who managed to leave occupied Mariupol. He is an ordinary guy who survived the siege of his hometown for 48 days. He went to visit his relatives under explosions, he heard planes dropping bombs on the city, he saw Russian tanks shooting at houses. He rescued others and saw the bodies of civilians in the yards, helped the wounded get to the hospital, encountered the occupiers, survived and recorded it in his diary. The journalist Maria Zemlyanska from the Bihus.info website appears in the film and tells and comments on the hero’s story. The author also uses staged footage of the boy writing in his diary with a pencil. Direct quotes appear on the screen with the help of moving text. The video also uses archive footage.

Another film, “IMAGINE”, is a documentary video diary of Mariupol during the full-scale Russian invasion of 2022, including life on the Left Bank and documentary footage of the destroyed city centre [29]. The film was written and directed by Vladyslav Pyatin, who used his family’s example to show how they survived the siege and occupation of the city. The film lasts 15 minutes. The documentary footage interrupts the plans with the author’s text. The video is accompanied only by music.

“It seemed like an atomic bomb was dropped on us”: the story from inside the drama theatre building during the air strike” [30] is a video by Yevheniia Nazarova for Radio Liberty. The heroes of the essay are the Grebenetsky family from Volnovakha, who witnessed the bombing of the Mariupol Drama Theatre. On 5 March 2022, the family arrived at the Mariupol Drama Theatre, from where, according to them, the evacuation of the civilian population was to be organised. The family stayed there until 16 March, when Russian troops attacked the building of the Drama Theatre. As a result, Natalia’s husband was killed. On 23 March, Natalia and her son Yevhen were able to leave the blockaded city on foot. This family story is told through interviews with the characters in the story, documentary footage from open sources and the archive.

In the video essays “Mariupol. Escape from Hell” [31] and “Mariupol. 20 Days of Hell” [32] tell the story of Iryna Khomenko and her family from Mariupol. The protagonists of the stories tell about the shelling, air raids and destruction of the city under siege, share their experience of survival in the basement and show their shelled car.

The essay “She managed to get out of exhausted, tortured Mariupol, but her husband went missing” [33] was produced by the War Stories project of the Witness programme. The protagonist tells her story of survival during the siege of the city and the disappearance of her husband via a telephone video. The video consists of photographs, archival footage, and videos from social media.

DW Ukrainian presented stories about famous Mariupol residents. For example, “Evacuation from Mariupol: by bus to hell and back” [34] is a story about Mykhailo Puryshch, who turned his nightclub in Mariupol into a bomb shelter and took people out of the city in a shot-up bus. Mikhaïl tells about the blockaded city and the “road of life” out of the city. The story uses video footage of the hero himself and archival videos, as well as an interview with the hero.

Video essay “Photographer from Mariupol about life under shelling, a boy’s diary and revenge of the ‘DPR’” [35] DW Ukrainian published on its YouTube page a story about a photographer from Mariupol, Yevhen Sosnovsky, who stayed in the destroyed city and left on 30 April 2022. Among the pictures is the diary of an eight-year-old boy who wrote about the deaths of relatives and pets in the basement in Mariupol. Yevhen shared his unique photos with DW and told his story. In addition to the video of the interview with the hero, the archival footage includes photos of Mariupol taken by photographer Sosnovsky.

Thus, we compared the features of documentaries and journalistic stories by the following criteria: duration, method of information gathering, specific features of video materials, choice of characters, journalistic techniques (see Table 1).

Table 1. Features of documentaries and journalistic stories about the siege of Mariupol.

№	Criterion	Documentaries about the siege of Mariupol	Journalistic stories
1	Duration	from 7 min. to 94 min.	from 12 min. to 28 min.
2	Method of collecting information	Documentation of events and facts on photo and video media, interviews with eyewitnesses, military, police, doctors, rescuers; interviews with witnesses	Interviews with witnesses
3	Features of video materials	Archival videos, creative interruptions, footage with text, photographs, graphic drawings of the city; full in-house video of the city's siege	on-site filming (for example, a shelled car after leaving the occupied territories), archival videos, videos from social media, video of the protagonist
4	Choosing heroes	Victims, survivors, eyewitnesses.	Those who were under siege and those who rescued Mariupol residents recorded the destruction of the city.
5	Publicistic techniques	The image of the author, the image of the city, individual images of the destroyed drama theatre, maternity hospital, and the Azovstal plant	The image of the author as a journalist, the images of the characters through their stories.

The documentaries often use symbols that emphasise the peculiarity of the city. The authors of the films emphasised the destroyed drama theatre, maternity hospital and Azovstal as symbols of Mariupol under siege. We have reviewed amateur documentaries of 7 and 15 minutes, which were created and edited from original video by Mariupol residents who were under siege and occupation. With the help of the protagonists of the documentaries - their relatives and children - they conveyed the tragedy and a realistic picture of what was happening during the siege. We also analysed the documentary *20 Days in Mariupol* by Associated Press journalists who stayed in Mariupol until mid-March. Their videos made it into the global and national news, and were used by other documentary filmmakers. The live footage, tragedy and real emotions of the people under siege create the effect of the audience's presence.

Conclusions and Perspectives. The peculiarity of the Ukrainian city of Mariupol is that the city was under siege by the Russian Federation with no electricity, internet or mobile communications. Mariupol was attacked by all kinds of shells, including aviation bombs. Therefore, it was impossible for authors, journalists and documentary filmmakers to record the events because they needed to survive. However, in 2022, the first documentaries about the siege of Mariupol appeared. Several of the films have the word "hell" in their titles.

The documentaries about Mariupol are rich stories of witnesses to the siege and destruction of the city. These stories are intertwined, but they convey the chronology of the events. The interview method is used to reveal the characters as individuals. One of the films also uses hidden filming to tell the story of a soldier.

The documentaries use creative publicistic techniques to help link several stories. For example, quotes from an eyewitness diary, drawing a picture of Mariupol, and getting a tattoo with the inscription Mariupol. The image of the author is implemented with the help of a narrator, for example, the city "I am Mariupol", the author of the diary, a witness, and the journalist himself, who is a Mariupol resident.

The journalistic video materials use the journalistic genre of essay. These are individual stories of witnesses to the siege of Mariupol, accompanied by interviews, archival footage, videos from social media or videos from local, national, foreign and Russian TV channels. In these videos, the author's image is embodied in the image of a journalist.

The results of the study can be used in teaching courses such as "Publicistics", "Documentary", "Television genres", "History of Ukrainian Journalism", and in writing term papers. In the future, the study can expand the geography of documentaries released in Ukraine after the full-scale invasion of Russia on 24 February 2022. It is also promising to study journalistic books by Mariupol authors about the siege of the city, published in 2022 and 2023.

1. Yatchuk, O. (2018), *Interactive Television: Social and Communication Models and Technologies: a Monograph*, UMSF, Dnipro, 2018, 136 p.

2. Melnykova-Kurhanova, O. (2022), «Social communications in blockaded Mariupol: features, types, types of communicators», *Information, communication, society*, Lviv Polytechnic, Lviv, pp. 183–184.

3. Korobko, V. (2021), *Television Documentary as an On-screen Spectacle: Doctor of Philosophy: speciality 061 Journalism*, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, 2020, 225 p.

4. Rabiger, M. (2004), *Directing the Documentary*, Focal Press, Michigan, 627 p.

5. Renov, M. (1993), *Theorising Documentary*, Psychology Press, NY-London, 261 p.

6. Nichols, B. (2001), *Introduction to Documentary*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 223 p.

7. Nebesio, B. (1995), *Alexander Dovzhenko: A Guide to Published Sources*, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta Press, Edmonton, 105 p.

8. Oms, M. (1968), «Alersandre Dovzhenko», *Revue Premiere Plan*, no. 44, 130 p.

9. Kellokoski, I. (2023), «Persuasion through people: The rhetorical categories of documentary subjects in Michael Moore's films», *Nordic Journal of Media Studies*, vol. 5(1), pp. 154–171.

10. Leith, K.L. (2018), *Features of Directing an Extreme Documentary Film*, 17.00.04 - Cinema. Television : defended 2019-03-15, I. K. Karpenko-Kary Kyiv National University of Theatre, Cinema and Television, Kyiv, 205 p.

11. Kerner, A. & Knapp, J. (2016), *Extreme Cinema: Affective Strategies in Transnational Media*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781474402910> (accessed 06 June 2023).
12. Fournier, G. (2014), «The War Game and Who Bombed Birmingham?: usage politique du mode réflexif», *Revue LISA/LISA e-journal*, vol. XII-Nº1, available at: <https://doi.org/10.4000/lisa.5641> (accessed 06 June 2023).
13. Korobko, V. (2017), «Television documentary and its types», *Visnyk Kharkivskogo Nacionalnogo Universytetu imeni V.N. Karazina. Serija «Socialni komunikacii*, iss. 11, V.N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Kharkiv, pp. 30–35.
14. Galych, O. (2006), «Terminology of Contemporary Documentary», available at: <http://eprints.zu.edu.ua/919/1/06goatsd.pdf>. (accessed 06 June 2023).
15. Vasylenko, V. (2023), «Journalism is in extreme terms. Transformation of genres», *Obraz*, vol. 1 (41), pp. 25–35.
16. Kovalenko, A., Telpis, D. (2022), «Psychological dimension of modern ukrainian military diaries», *Obraz*, vol. 3 (40), pp. 17–28.
17. Rosinska, O. (2022), «Narratives of Polish-Ukrainian interaction in Polish documentaries», *Obraz*, vol. 3 (40), pp. 51–62.
18. Raybediuk, H. (2020), «National-centred dominants of the documentary of Ukrainian dissident poets», *Naukovyj visnyk Izmajil'skogo derzhavnogo ghumanitarnogo universytetu. Serija «Filologichni nauky»*, iss. 47, pp. 71–80.
19. Chernov, M. (2023), «20 Days In Mariupol (trailer)», available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9H_Fg_5x4ME (accessed 01.06.2023).
20. Kvedaravicius, M. (2022), «Mariupolis 2: new clip of Mantas Kvedaravicius's final documentary», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fhMOXZr2lbY> (accessed 01.06.2023).
21. Tatarinova, L. (2022), «Mariupol. Chronicles of Hell», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s3hs4fbIWnQ&t=3466s> (accessed 01.06.2023).
22. BBC documentary (2022), «Mariupol. Human stories», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hoaXCtskDBU> (accessed 01.06.2023).
23. Litvinov, M. (2022), «Mariupol. Lost hope», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q05wJtU6uEs&t=67s> (accessed 01.06.2023).
24. Litvinov, M. (2023), «Rage allows me to breathe», available at: <https://megogo.net/ua/view/21703647-mariupol-lyut-dozvolyaie-meni-dikhati.html> (accessed 01.06.2023).
25. Stambulya, G. (2022), «Mariupol. The exclusion zone», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=29I-y56X6F4&t=1s> (accessed 01.05.2023).
26. Ratushnyi, M. (2022), «Mariupol 2022», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jdozR6eOp6E&t=2s> (accessed 01.04.2023).
27. Shevchenko, A. (2022). «Air breakthrough at Azovstal. The sky», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nApR7M-ijTU&t=2s> (accessed 01.05.2023).
28. Zemlyanska, M. (2022), «48 Days of Hell in the Records of an Ordinary Mariupol Resident», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJVNdA63Rwo> (accessed 01.06.2023).
29. Pyatin, V. (2022), «IMAGINE documentary video diary of Mariupol during the full-scale Russian invasion of 2022», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kcYtM6g2KBk> (accessed 01.05.2023).
30. Nazarova, E. (2022), «It seemed like an atomic bomb was dropped on us»: the story from inside the drama theatre building during the air strike - the Hrebenetsky family», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CgaC6TOuVw> (accessed 01.06.2023).
31. Khashchi (2022), «Mariupol. Escape from hell», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BFWijyBxLTk> (accessed 01.06.2023).
32. Shhuka N. (2022), «Mariupol. 20 days of hell», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XGhyOni-hbs&t=47s> (accessed 01.06.2023).
33. Svidok (2022), «She managed to get out of the exhausted, tortured Mariupol, while her husband went missing», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xYgxzc8LsCo> (accessed 01.06.2023).
34. DW Ukrainian (2022), «Evacuation from Mariupol: by bus to hell and back», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NgSbZOkJUeI> (accessed 01.06.2023).
35. DW Ukrainian (2022), «A photographer from Mariupol about life under shelling, a boy's diary and revenge of the «DPR», available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MBS6rFqt1IE&t=3s> (accessed 01.06.2023).

УДК 007:070.009.7.097

ТЕЛЕПУБЛІЦИСТИКА Й ДОКУМЕНТАЛІСТИКА У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ ОБЛОГИ МАРІУПОЛЯ

Мельникова-Курганова Олена, канд. наук із соц. комунік., доц.,

Національний авіаційний університет, просп. Любомира Гузара, 1, Київ, 03058, Україна, email: melo5@ukr.net.

ORCID – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1364-0264>.

Ятчук Ольга, канд. наук із соц. комунік., доц.,

Університет митної справи та фінансів, вул. Володимира Вернадського, 2/4, Дніпро, 49000, Україна, e-mail: yatchuk.olga@gmail.com.

ORCID – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5642-9450>.

Вступ. Висвітлення війни за допомогою відеофіксації фактів і подій, свідчень очевидців, зокрема постраждалих і тих, хто вижив, є важливим інструментом для звернення уваги аудиторії. Поєднання публіцистичного образу й доказової картинки, фактологічної бази, виразних переконливих героїв допомагає занурити глядача в реальність певного періоду, відчутти себе співучасником події, співрозмовником, перейнятися співчуттям, зокрема це стосується Маріуполя в облозі.

Мета дослідження – визначити особливості телевізійної публіцистики та документалістики в контексті висвітлення облоги Маріуполя під час війни.

Об'єктом дослідження є документальні фільми й публіцистичні телевізійні нариси про блокаду Маріуполя в російсько-українській війні, які вийшли з березня 2022 р. по червень 2023 р. **Предметом дослідження** – особливості української телевізійної публіцистики та документалістики у висвітленні трагедії міста, яке було в облозі (на прикладі Маріуполя).

Методи дослідження. Для дослідження особливостей документалістики та телевізійної публіцистики було використано моніторинг з метою пошуку та систематизації документальних фільмів та телесюжетів з березня 2022 р. по червень 2023 р. За допомогою описового методу розглянуто основні фільми про облогу Маріуполя, а за допомогою компаративного було порівняно особливості, прийоми та інструменти, які використовувалися в документальних та публіцистичних фільмах.

Результати. Документальні фільми про облогу Маріуполя містять кадри містян із соціальних мереж, журналістів і фотографів, які вивезли свої архіви, аерозйомок тощо. У деяких сюжетах використовувалися кадри, які були зняті окупантами, проте ті кадри верифіковувалися й після перевірки на достовірність використовувалися у фільмах.

Висновки. Отже, у документальних фільмах використовувалися творчі публіцистичні прийоми, які допомогли зв'язати кілька історій: цитати з щоденника очевидця, малювання картини Маріуполя, набивання тату з написом Маріуполь. Образ автора втілюється за допомогою оповідача, наприклад, міста «Я – Маріуполь», автора щоденника, свідка, самого журналіста, який є маріупольцем.

Ключові слова: документалістика, телевізійна публіцистика, публіцистичний образ, комунікації у блокадному місті.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 23.06.2023.