

UDK 792.028.3 (477)

Burlutskyi Andriy
Candidate of Art,
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts

**SCENIC SPEECH IN THE «NEW UKRAINIAN THEATRE»:
SPECIFICITY OF FUNCTIONING**

The paper identifies specificity of forming and functioning of scenic speech in the period of formation of the «new Ukrainian theatre», whose framework chronologically unites the «silver» era (the 1920s) and the Ukrainian soviet theatre (the political theatre of the 1930s–1950s, the theatre of war time, the theatre of aesthetic innovations of the 1950s–1960s, and the «searching» theatre of the 1970s–1980s).

Key words: Ukrainian theatre, scenic speech, characteristic features.

The identification of the characteristic features of evolution, functioning and specificity of Ukrainian art as a socio-cultural phenomenon is among the main directions of search for ways of further development of national artistic culture, one of the clearest manifestations of which is the Ukrainian theatre. The national teatrology has great achievements, particularly in the area of defining the specific features of the national theatre. However, a big number of problems remain unexplored.

In our opinion, one of the leading places in the field of knowledge connected with national theatrical culture is given to scenic speech, which is one of the most important components of art, because this is speech that reflects socio-cultural factors of a certain era. Therefore, the identification of specificity of the Ukrainian scenic speech as a defining phenomenon of the national theatre is a very urgent and significant task of contemporary national art. In particular, the purpose of this publication is to clarify the specificity of formation and functioning of scenic speech in the Ukrainian theatre of the 1920s–1980s.

Those few studies that are concerned with the Ukrainian scenic speech are mostly applicative by nature and are primarily intended for modern actors mastering certain professional skills. There is almost no research in which scenic speech would be regarded as a socio-cultural phenomenon and that would consistently reflect its evolution.

The specificity of formation and functioning of scenic speech is considered in the context of the «new Ukrainian theatre». In the historical aspect, what we call the «new Ukrainian theatre» is the era that represented the theatre as a holistic well-established socio-cultural phenomenon yet having a significant potential for development and formation. Chronologically, this refers to the period from the beginning of the twentieth century until now.

From this perspective, the period of formation of Ukrainian scenic speech can be divided into two stages: the «silver» era of the Ukrainian theatre (the Ukrainian Renaissance, the modern Ukrainian theatre, and Les Kurbas theatre) and the Ukrainian Soviet theatre (the political theatre of the 1930s–1950s, the theatre of war time, the theatre of aesthetic innovations of the 1950s–1960s, and the «searching» theatre of the 1970s–1980s).

The name of the first stage is based on the characteristics defined in the works of native scientists. In Particular, A. Drak, exploring the theatre of luminaries, named the following era the «silver age» [6, 6] of national theatrical art. N. Kornienko [11] and V. Zabolotna [8] suggest calling this period the «classical avant-garde» and the «Ukrainian Renaissance». At the turn of epochs takes place a functional reorganization of culture, and thus the theatre, the «change of code and cipher of culture», when the culture (read: the theatre) needs to establish new orderliness and balance, and that is where the person appears who gives «the name to the epoch» and «makes the process of ordering more intensive» [11, p. 163–164]. So it was about Les Kurbas, who became a prominent personality of the era of modern national theatre.

The durable policy of «tsarism» narrowed the Ukrainian drama down to the village material, and the luminaries of the Ukrainian theatre «turned it into the trump card of self-affirmation of their nation», which formed the basis of the characteristics of the «golden» age. However, in the early twentieth century the Ukrainian professional theatre, which had already been established and formed, undergoes a crisis: it was high time for Ukrainians as a nation to rise «above the national and local problems» [8, p. 5]. The luminaries, later supported by the representatives of the new artistic generations, stood against «traditional villageness» of Ukrainian theatrical culture. Thuswise, Lesia Ukrainka expressed the idea of obtaining intelligentsia as «turning the brain to the Ukrainian nation»: «We want to see new plays depicting not only the life of an uneducated part of our nation; we want the theatre... to broaden our mental outlook, illuminating issues that touch the soul of the intellectual of our times» [22, p. 84–85].

Drama of this kind soon began to appear (Lesia Ukrainka, O. Oles, M. Voronyi, M. Kulish, V. Vynnychenko, etc). «The revival of theatre should come through a new actor and director» [16, p. 25], and this figure in Ukrainian theatre was Les Kurbas, that is why the «silver» era of the Ukrainian theatre can be rightfully regarded as the «theatre of Les Kurbas». The undoubtedly exceptional role of the teachings of Les Kurbas on art of transformation, in contrast to the traditional art of dramatic identification, we will consider only to the extent to which it can be useful in order to highlight the features of the genesis of the Ukrainian scenic speech in the theatre of those days.

The analysis of the specificity of formation of scenic speech of this epoch is impossible without identifying the key socio-cultural factors that determined it. They include:

1. Alterability of the surrounding existence. Circumstances in which theatre «was only an instrument of the social system» [10, p. 20] made it extremely sensitive to changes and influences, which were quite rapid in this historical period. Due to this fact, theatrical traditions were unable to reach the level of «school» or «doctrine». Of course, this is also characteristic of the scenic speech of this era.

2. Failure to bring the system of Les Kurbas to the level of a method. The abovementioned socio-cultural regularity led to the fact that Kurbas had no time to algorithmize his teachings – even to lay them out in a usual form – because his system was still in search, in the process of creating. Therefore, during this period «there are no definitive statements» about the principles of scenic speech, as well as about other theatrical phenomena [14, p. 64].

3. The period of artistic search. One of the main features of the theatrical situation of that period is that scenic art in the territory of the extinct Russian Empire reached significant quantitative scale: «this great number of theatres, theatre-studios, theatrics, theatrical performances, and theatrical schools will hardly be observed in any of the following epochs» [17, p. 5]. Scientists think that the reason for that is the fact that a large number of «dark» (illiterate) people living in the difficult post-revolutionary period perceived theatre as almost the only means of social communication, the most effective method of mass effect. All of this is typical of the Studio of Les Kurbas, The Berezil, and later of the «Young theatre».

4. Language problems. Contradictions between Upper Dnieper and Galician actors in the Theatre of Les Kurbas led to a chain of language issues because of the difference between these two types of Ukrainian mentality. First of all, the creative method of Les Kurbas had brought him to «injections of German impressionism», [8, p. 6], which was familiar to Galician actors, who grew up mostly on German and Polish culture, and strange to Upper Dnieper actors, having grown mainly on Russian culture. Secondly, the language problem in the Les Kurbas Theatre appears directly, especially in the context of teaching. Galician actors «speak with a different tonality, and think by means of a different syntax» [15, p. 14]. This specificity should have been overcome by Kurbas himself too, because even some of his students in their memoirs admitted that at the beginning of the studies they sometimes did not understand their stage director. Indeed, Kurbas's notes of his lectures for directors contain a large number of «German aesthetic terms, Polish words, Russian borrowings» [15, p. 14], which prevented adequate comprehension of presented thoughts. And, finally, Hnat Yura, the actor and director, the first follower and, later, the opponent of Kurbas's idea of art, repeatedly accused Kurbas of «low language culture» in The Berezil, but Les «did not give this circumstance real importance» [15, p. 14], indicating only that a lot of actors speak Russian outside stage. Indeed, studying the works of Les Kurbas, we barely found any thoughts about scenic speech.

5. The matter of translation. At that time, translated drama mostly didn't comply with the requirements of theatricality: Ukrainian translations of classical drama were too heavy, outdated, archaic, and contained speech patterns that were hard to pronounce on stage.

So, taking into consideration the abovementioned factors, we can summarize that the slow and complex process of elaboration of universal principles of theatrical language policy in the Les Kurbas Theatre was very difficult, but its progress is evident at two levels: mastering literary pronunciation by the actors representing Galician dialect and refinement of language in drama. It happened when the Les Kurbas Theatre reached the first acme of skill, showed its great artistic power (approximately the end of the 1930s). However, the end of the «silver» age of Ukrainian theatre coincides with The Berezil losing the group of its founders for political reasons, which led to the destruction of the balance between the two national Ukrainian types – Galician and Upper Dnieper – actors, the fruitful collaboration of whom was undeniable (at least in terms of The Berezil).

The accomplishments of Les Kurbas as a stage director pushed his scenic incarnations into the background, so there is little information about Kurbas the actor in the relevant literature. However, the study by V. Vasylyko, «The Sadovskyi Theatre», contains some memories about Kurbas as a novice actor, including those about his scenic speech. According

to V. Vasylo, Kurbas had a «pleasant baritone». In his pronunciation there was also a prominent Galician hard «V», sometimes transforming into «U», and a hard «R». Playing the role of Gnat in «Beztalanna» (written by I. Karpenko-Karyi – I. B.), Kurbas delivered the famous «Zradyla!» («Betrayed!») in the second act, doing it a lot better than any other performer of this role. In the fourth act, Kurbas performs the date scene dearly and passionately, but without shouting, almost in whisper» [3, p. 98]. In the «Revisor», playing the part of Khlestakov, as V. Vasylo noted, Les was especially brilliant performing the scene of inebriety, although «his speech, which was active, energetic and easy just a while ago, gradually became weak and tongue-tied... The more tongue-tied he was, the more foreign words the actor used, ... which were difficult for him to pronounce» [3, p. 111].

So, the main features of scenic speech of Les Kurbas were:

- a pleasant baritone;
- noticeable Galician accent;
- sophisticated consideration and interpretation of the proposed circumstances while implementing the character's speech;
- the ability to reproduce various peculiarities of speech and use non-verbal language characteristics.

Chronologically, the «silver» age of Ukrainian theatre refers mostly to the Soviet period in the national culture. However, we emphasize the concept of research of the Ukrainian scenic speech formation, according to which the period of Soviet art, beginning in the 1930s, is characterized by some radical transformations both in the socio-cultural situation of the Soviet Union in general and in the Ukrainian theatrical culture in particular. That is why we consider this stage of formation of the Ukrainian scenic speech separately.

At that very time, Ukrainian theatrical culture, as well as other spheres of national culture, acquires its relative structural completeness, and, as noted by Les Kurbas, «a special type of actor of exceptional stylistic flexibility was created: Buchma, Krushelnytskyi...» [2, p. 238]. I. Chernychko, a researcher of the cultural sphere of Ukraine of this period, noted that «the development of Ukrainian theatrical culture was regulated not only by the action of appropriate mechanisms of «external pressure» – legislative, censorial, administrative, etc ...but it was adjusted by the functioning of «internal» mechanisms of self-organization, self-regulation of the two branches of the national culture» [21, p. 46].

Summarizing the achievements of Ukrainian theatre of that time, we can identify different genres and various styles of dramaturgy, different types of directing schools, school of acting of a high level, different models of theatres, and, most importantly for this study, certain traditions of theatrical expression.

It was the Soviet stage of Ukrainian theatrical art that brought it into another period of development – the period of forming a new model of existence of the sphere of national culture, which was developed in complicated conditions of administrative and censorial regime. However, this factor, as eventually happened in the previous eras, worked largely to its benefit. I. Ohienko was of the opinion that actually it is unknown what a national culture could have been «if we'd approached it by beaten tracks, if we had created it by free hands» [19, p. 264]. The «colonial» status of the Ukraine of that time caused the development of its culture through the «conflict of cultures» or «culture war» [23, p. 238] (in the research into

schemes of global cultural development S. Huntington regards the conflict of cultures as one of the main factors, while the term «culture war» is used by E. Smith to refer to «colonial» relations like Soviet and Ukrainian).

In the early twentieth century Ukrainian theatrical culture, and especially scenic speech, acquired new momentum – the Ukrainian language was scientifically recognized as independent by Imperial Academy of Sciences: «Ukrainian people should have the same right as Great Russians to speak publicly and publish in their native language» [21, p. 117], and it was the theatrical space of national culture that was the area in which scenic speech developed and pictured the image of Ukrainian national life. But it should be taken into account that neither «colonial» status of Ukraine nor its political and legal system had undergone significant changes by that time.

For a more accurate and detailed analysis of Ukrainian scenic speech of the Soviet period, we will divide it in accordance with the defined concept into certain stages, exploring innovations in the area of scenic speech. As a result, we can distinguish the following historical and cultural periods:

- the Ukrainian theatre of the 1930s-1950s (the political theatre);
- the theatre of war time, the theatre of the 1950s-1960s (the theatre of aesthetic innovations);
- the theatre of the 1970s-1980s (the «searching» theatre).

The beginning of the 1930s is characterized by conditions that I. Chernychko called «historically, politically, nationally, socially and culturally deformed by external factors», «colonial» and «stateless» [21, p. 113]. This is the period during which the main artistic method prevailing in Soviet culture for more than half of the next century – socialist realism – is being formed and theoretically grounded. It arose from the desire to create a dominant artistic method, «which would define and regulate the artistic process in the country and ... would become a single unified creative style» [9, p. 279]. Its main component and factor of assessment is the phenomenon of «nationality»; however, the postulating of that term turned out to be twisted: in actual practice, such epithets as «realistic» and «true» are seen not as an image of the true life of the people, but as «an average rate art» [4, p. 293] – generalized, intelligible, understandable to philistine majority. Some researchers even believe that this method can be described more accurately as «social mythologism – twisting the image of the reality, showing it as a figment of someone’s concerned mind, and, desirably, as rosy and correct as possible» [18, p. 2].

The degree of innovative research, which was high during the «silver» era of Ukrainian theatre, obviously diminished because of the politicization of the entire cultural sphere (which is why we call this period of the Soviet theatre «political»). Emphasizing the trend where politically motivated ideology is more valuable than professional skill, we still do not judge the scenic speech of low-grade «theatrical units» as it was not their representatives who formed the core of Ukrainian theatres, but actors and directors that did not downshift from their «high class excellence» [14, p. 111].

The worldview of the theatre audience of the day was formed largely from interpretations of the classics, not newly formed drama of the time, which was notable for its exclusive «political uniqueness» [14, p. 98]. Dramatists would frequently resort to

historical topics, where they examined the events of the socio-cultural situation of the day from the standpoint of historical retrospectives (e.g., the plays by I. Kocherha, «Yaroslav Mudryi» and «Svichchyne vesilli»).

The reunification of Western lands of Upper Dnieper region of the late 1930s – early 1940s expanded the «geography» of Ukrainian theatres, but again exacerbated the problems of coexistence of these two types of Ukrainian culture, which was inevitably felt in the field of scenic speech.

It was at that time that the «main stage» of Ukraine was taken by the Ivan Franko Theatre, which had largely inherited Kurbas's tradition and accumulated all the best creative forces of Ukraine. Characteristic of this period is «the phenomenon of acting glory»: the glory of the Soviet performing artists significantly differed from the Hollywood stars, for instance; it is rather similar to adoration, worship of martyrs redeeming the sins of others, and public faith in actors due to real or proclaimed high moral dignity and fairness of the latter [4, p. 312].

With the start of World War II, the main directions of Ukrainian theatre troupes are regular performances of withdrawn theatres, frontline crews, and activity of Ukrainian theatre ensembles in seizure.

Having been retrieved to Uzbekistan, the Franko Theatre together with the local Mukili Theatre staged «Natalka-Poltavka» in Uzbek, and M. Krushelnytskyi staged the Uzbek drama, «Nadir», in the Fergana Drama Theatre. Thus, although this period was not marked by any outstanding art findings, yet, the creative work was carried out, and most crucially, there was significant development of scenic speech.

One should particularly consider the characteristic features of scenic speech of Ukrainian theatres during the occupation period, disproving the viewpoint that «theatrical life under German pressure was reduced to more or less random performances of household and ethnographic troupes that had no artistic value» [7, p. 863]. As proved in the relevant study by V. Haidabura, «this period of development of Ukrainian theatre is a clearly defined system, carved, above all, in the history of anti-fascist and anti-Bolshevik spiritual resistance» [5, p. 341].

Meanwhile, Ukrainian artists, being almost in a situation of «cultural vacuum», [5, p. 334] managed to create the new national stage. It was characterized by two main trends: firstly, by a deliberate distance from the model of Soviet culture, and secondly, by simultaneous contact with two audiences, – Ukrainian and German – as «people were, in fact, going through two wars – the one against Hitlerite fascism, and people's liberation war, which was waged by Ukrainians against the USSR regime» [5, p. 322]. However, despite the major role played by Ukrainian Nationalists in this period, the Ukrainian theatre of that time cannot be regarded as their exclusive activity. It is rather the result of the integration process, which had to unite people with antagonistic social positions.

It should be noted that during the occupation of Ukraine Hitler sanctioned legitimacy of performing arts with intent to use them for his own needs. However, according to the estimates, the approximate proportion of drama theatre attendance was as follows: about thirty percent were Germans, while about seventy percent were Ukrainians [5, p. 326]; therefore, we can conclude that the theatre served as a means of communication with its people.

At the beginning of the functioning of occupational theatres low-skilled personnel and harsh conditions led to a low artistic level of performances; as for scenic speech, the actors worked mainly using a prompter. Thereafter, ideological and aesthetic explorations and artistic achievements somewhat rehabilitated the occupational theatre. Gradual stepback of the Nazis first caused forced expansion of the German language into theatre troupes, and then overall destabilization and dispersal of these theatres.

Characteristic features of scenic speech in occupational theatres were:

1. The content of performances had to be laid out in the summary in German and agreed by relevant authorities, which allowed translators to draw the Germans' attention away from certain themes of some plays and in this way communicate with the Ukrainian part of the audience.

2. Handbills and posters were printed in two languages – Ukrainian and German.

3. It was the stage that served as a carrier of verbal influence of Ukrainian texts and songs as means of national self-expression.

4. The combination of professional and amateur trends (acting talent and spontaneous talent of performers).

5. Representationalism of Ukrainian theatrical culture for the European audience. We can assume that occupational theatres were the first step in the process of European viewers getting acquainted with the phenomenon of Ukrainian theatre and Ukrainian speech, as the audience was represented, besides the Germans, by British, French, American, and Italian prisoners of war.

The potential of the Ukrainian stage functioning during the seizure, and therefore the role of scenic speech in it, is a necessary element in understanding the socio-cultural significance of theatre in the process of nation-building and humanization of the society.

At the turn of the 1940s – 1950s Ukrainian theatre is characterized by two trends – staging prominent works of art, mostly classics, and along with it «monotonous, helpless representations made in the tradition of entertaining ethnographic and household spectacles with many cliches and stereotyped vocal and dancing divertimento» [4, p. 126], therefore, as we can see, in these difficult times for the national culture the tradition of «buggy trouser» theatre is partly coming back again. These trends undoubtedly had an impact on the relaxation of the requirements for scenic speech.

This is clearly evident from the analysis of the Ukrainian drama of this period, where expressive originality is more of an exception (it is possible to cite only a few examples: «Makar Dibrova» and «Kalynovyi Hai» by O. Korniiichuk, «Spring» by M. Zarudnyi, «Prosecutor's Daughter» by Y. Yanovskyi, «Without Naming Names» by V. Mynk, and some others). This process was saved by innovative theatrical interpretations of Ukrainian classics. So, for example, the new reading of «Stolen Happiness» by I. Franko directed by H. Yura «was this edge for the Ukrainian theatre abroad where realism enriched with philosophical understanding of life mushroomed into a high symbol» [1, p. 9].

A special place was occupied by the on-stage embodiment of the so-called «real-life» genre – staging plays in which the central place is occupied by images of «political leaders» such as Lenin or Stalin, and politically motivated creation of plays and films about historical figures on whom the modernity was projected (such embodiments as images of Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, etc.).

However, at that time, the cheerful stage figures were some kind of incentive for a positive attitude to life, which appeared to be a non-aesthetical factor, through which Soviet art became a cult in a way.

Characteristic features of scenic speech in the Ukrainian Soviet «political» theatre were:

1. The presence of revolutionary phraseology – using certain neologisms in plays and speech of the characters that are associated with the ideology of the day, and thus putting them into practice nationwide.

2. The problem of «duality of trends» – significant art finds along with «scenic creations of baggy trouser theatre», which, in terms of scenic speech, were characterized by «artificially declamatory pathos instead of elevation, ecstatic melodramatics instead of emotional inspiration, grotesque instead of folk humor» [4, p. 299].

3. Poetic language in some dramatic pieces (dramatic poems by Lesia Ukrainka, dramatic works by I. Kocherha), which requires the actor to resort to specific performing language features.

Regarding the period of the 1950s – 1960s, in Ukrainian theatre, there are two opposing views over its nature. The first one declares regeneration after harsh conditions of war, overcoming drawbacks, consistent progress on the principle of «higher and better». Another view, expressed during the «stagnation» period (the late 1970s – early 1980s), negates almost all the achievements of the Ukrainian of the day, because, as noted by some researchers, there was «no «thaw» in Ukraine at all» [20, p. 19]. We agree with the art historian, A. Poliakov, who distinguishes between the theatre and general socio-cultural situation of that time in Moscow and in the periphery. What is more, in Ukraine, due to excessive «ideological vigilance», obstacles were even more powerful than in other republics.

We will try to organize new growth of the «thaw» period that directly affected the specificity of scenic speech:

1. Democratization of the management structure of the theatre: the command-administrative style of the management is gradually being replaced with the creative style; the opinion of NGOs, arts councils, results of auditions, seminars for directors and playwrights are taken into account.

2. Expansion of training of artists. Scenic speech is a leading subject in all theatrical universities.

3. Expanding the range of topics of plays: addressing acute and socially important conflicts, hence expanding genre and stylistic palette of plays, public attention to plays.

If we summarize the trends of this period concerning scenic speech, we can highlight two characteristic features. Firstly, the translation and staging classical drama in Ukrainian is being actualized, as noted by O. Krasylnykova, it gave both directors and actors, as well as the audience, the opportunity to «abstract from the time and place of events» [14, p. 44]. And secondly, during this very period those rare names of the artists of the «silver» age of Ukrainian theatre – Kurbas and M. Kulish – are being reinvented; however, the lack of new theatrical ideas, mostly directorial, is strongly felt because almost none of the talented artists of the 1930s – 1950s left any students-successors.

According to N. Kornienko, the period between the 1970s – 1980s and partly the 1990s in the history of Ukrainian theatre could be called the «searching» period, as, in consonance with her definition, «the chain of times was broken» [12, p. 342] – there is a

collapse of totalitarian and socialist model of objective reality, a conflict between traditional culture and new types of consciousness. And it was the period of the late 1970s – early 1980s that marked the aggravation of the crisis.

In theatrical sphere it is reflected by such distinctive features as another increase in the relevance of staging «immortal» Shakespeare's tragedies, not those «tragedies of enlightenment» («Hamlet», «King Lear»), but the ones that accord with the socio-cultural situation of the era, «tragedies of downfall» [12, p. 346], especially such as «Richard the Third» and «Macbeth».

On stage, this is a time of political allusions, characterized by the use of tools and techniques of not only theatrical, but also the entire range of purely spectacular genres, which could not but affect the reduction of the role of such a «classical» means of influence upon the viewer as scenic speech. From this perspective, the Ivan Franko Theatre, whose director, S. Danchenko, was seen as «a balanced programmer», has an obvious advantage over other theatres [13, p. 146]. However, according to many researchers, it was the very trait of his, based on the experience of the national scenic culture, that helped the performances of high level of excellence to survive, which is certainly true of scenic speech heard from the mouth of B. Stupka, B. Kozak, F. Stryhun and other prominent Ukrainian actors and actresses.

The latter half of the 1980s – 1990s was the era of search for national identity. The theatre of the time «embodies the deep, hidden attraction to ethical principles of integrity of the human, world, universe» [12, p. 343]. This opinion is proved by the analysis of verbal, lexically new culture of the period (taking into account the goal of our research, especially drama). At that time, «artistic culture is doing its best to compensate for under-embodiment of the individual and the nation» [12, p. 347]. In terms scenic speech, this type of culture is characterized, above all, by mutual adaptation of different traditions, unique overlay, «application» of several cultures (it can be expressed, for example, by mixing different languages in the script of a play).

Another very important feature is what N. Kornienko called «semiotic citation method» [12, p. 348]. It involves inserting alien fragments into cultural texts, which is thought to encourage new mental images, altering the content of the principium. For example, in the «Hamlet-Labyrinth» by O. Liptsyn, which was staged at the Les Kurbas Centre in 1996, the text is not attached to specific characters; it flows freely from Ophelia to Gertrude, from Hamlet to Guildenstern, etc. We think that this trend can be seen as the beginning of the transition to new artistic principles – those depicting the socio-cultural situation of postmodernism.

So, the «silver» era of Ukrainian theatre (Ukrainian Renaissance, modern Ukrainian theatre, the Theatre of Les Kurbas) is characterized by its existence in a climate of variability of objective reality, artistic search, language problems associated with two types of Ukrainian mentality – Galician and Upper Dnieper – and failure to bring the system of Les Kurbas to the level of a method. The Ukrainian Soviet theatre period is characterized by divergence of theatres into such major cultural phenomena as the Ukrainian theatre of the 1930s – 1950s (the political theatre), the theatre of war time (occupational and frontline theatres), the theatre of the 1950s – 1960s (the theatre of aesthetic innovations), and the theatre of the 1970s – 1980s (the «searching» theatre). Each period has its own specific features in terms of scenic speech.

Prospects for further study of Ukrainian stage speech are connected with problems of forming a new cultural identity. Changes of ontological foundations of existence of speech in the general cultural field cause a change of roles and functions of verbal culture in all forms of art, which actualizes further research into the subject.

References:

1. L. Beletskaia. *Ukrainian Soviet drama theatre* / L. Beletskaia. – Kyiv : Vyshcha Shkola, 1984. – P. 224.
2. *The Berezil: Les Kurbas. From the creative heritage.* – Kyiv : Dnipro, 1988. – P. 518.
3. V. Vasylo. *Life devoted to the Theatre* / V. Vasylo. – Kyiv : Mystetstvo, 1984. – P. 407.
4. H. Veselovska. *Method as a style and style as a method* / H. Veselovska // *Methodological search.* – Kyiv : LDL, 2003. – P. 276–320.
5. V. Haidabura. *Performing Arts in Ukraine during the German Nazi occupation* / V. Haidabura // *Ukrainian theatre of the twentieth century.* – Kyiv : LDP, 2003. – P. 322–341.
6. A. Drak. *Heritage we never attained* / A. Drak // *Ukrainian Theatre.* – 1994. – № 1. – P. 6–8.
7. *Encyclopedia of Ukrainian Studies. General part.* / *Republished in Ukraine.* – Kyiv : Dovira, 1995. – Vol 3 – P. 1026.
8. V. Zabolotna. *Back to yourself* / V. Zabolotna // *Ukrainian Theatre.* – № 5. – 1993. – P. 5–6, 15–16, 18.
9. M. Kagan. *Systemic approach and humanitarian knowledge: Sel. articles.* / M. Kagan. – Lviv : Publishing House of the Leningrad University, 1991. – P. 384.
10. A. Klekovkin. *System* / O. Klekovkin // *Ukrainian Theatre.* – № 1 – 1997 – P. 18–21.
11. N. Kornienko. *Les Kurbas: The rehearsal of future* / N. Kornienko. – Kyiv : Fakt, 1998. – P. 469.
12. N. Kornienko. *The searching theatre* / N. Kornienko // *Ukrainian theatre of the twentieth century.* – Kyiv, LDP, 2003. – P. 342–363.
13. N. Kornienko. *Ukrainian theatre on the eve of the third millennium. Search* / N. Kornienko. – Kyiv : Fakt, 2000. – P. 160.
14. A. Krasilnikov. *History of Ukrainian theatre of the twentieth century* / O. Krasilnikov. – Kyiv : Lybid, 1999. – P. 208.
15. N. Kuziakina. *Galician actor: the necessary creative shapes* / N. Kuziakina // *Ukrainian Theatre.* – № 5. – 1993. – P. 13–15.
16. *Les Kurbas in theatrical work, from the viewpoint of contemporaries.* – Baltimore – Toronto: Torch, 1989. – P. 1026.
17. A. Liahushchenko. *Les Kurbas. Creative work of the artist in the mirror of two eras* / A. Liahushchenko // *Ukrainian Theatre.* – № 2. – 1996. – P. 2–3.
18. I. Melnychenko. *Social realism in preventive ideology* / I. Melnychenko // *Literary Ukraine.* – 1989 – 21 January. – P. 2.
19. I. Ohienko. *Ukrainian culture* / I. Ohienko. – Kyiv : Lybid, 1991. – P. 467.
20. A. Poliakov. *Truth and Falsehood of «Khrushchev thaw»* / A. Poliakov // *Ukrainian Theatre.* – № 2 – 1996. – P. 19–23.
21. I. Chernychko. *Transformation of the cultural sphere* / I. Chernychko. – Kyiv : RVPS of Ukraine, 1998. – P. 146.
22. I. Chernychko. *Ukrainian theatrical art of the second half of the nineteenth – early twentieth century* / I. Chernychko. – Kyiv : Fakt, 1998. – P. 362.
23. *Slavik Drama. The Question of Innovation proceedings of Slavik.* – Ottawa, 1991. – 682 p.