

This is one of the brightest examples of how IT and theatre can work together in real time.

2. “Hamlet” — The Wooster Group (USA)

Technologies: video art and synchronization with digital copies of actors.

Idea: actors perform their roles while synchronizing their movements with previously recorded video of another cast, creating a dialogue between “live” and “digital” characters.

3. “Kanata” — Robert Lepage (Canada/France)

Technologies: multimedia projections and interactive scenery.

Idea: the stage space “comes alive” and quickly transforms into different worlds through complex lighting and projection work. Robert Lepage is considered one of the key directors of hybrid theatre.

However, the digital format also brings some challenges. The feeling of “live presence” can be lost — the magic when the actor and the audience breathe the same air. Therefore, the main task for modern theatre artists is to preserve emotional connection even when the audience watches from the other side of the screen. To achieve this, directors search for new artistic solutions, work with close-ups, chamber stories, and create intimate visual images.

In conclusion, hybrid theatre is not only a technical innovation but also a deep change in the way theatre artists think. It allows theatre to keep the living energy of the stage while opening the door to an unlimited digital space. Perhaps this combination of tradition and technology will create the theatre of the future — open, bold, and truly modern.

*A. Makhlun*

**UKRAINIAN MUSICAL CULTURE OF THE XX CENTURY  
THROUGH THE PRISM OF SOVIET REPRESSIONS (1919-1991)**

*A. Махлун*

**УКРАЇНСЬКА МУЗИЧНА КУЛЬТУРА ХХ СТОЛІТТЯ  
КРИЗЬ ПРИЗМУ РАДЯНСЬКИХ РЕПРЕСІЙ (1919-1991 РР.)**

Radical social and political turmoil thoroughly shaped the development of Ukraine’s musical heritage throughout the twentieth century. Moreover, it was the Soviet regime’s merciless drive for control that left the deepest mark. For decades, from the 1920s to 1991, writing music was not exclusively an art; it was a high-stakes negotiation with power. With agencies like the NKVD and KGB keeping a close watch, the soviet state doctrine penetrated every corner of a musician’s world. The permanent scrutiny created a culture of fear, actively deciding which musical doors to open and which to keep shut, which composers could write, what music was deemed acceptable, and even the survival of the institutions that supported them.

In the context of the Soviet system, art was considered a means of spreading ideology. Eventually, many musicians, composers, scholars, and performers faced ruthless censorship. Socialist realism became their judge. The suppressers used their favorite weapon — accusation of formalism, an overall term used to blame any hint of innovation, modernist exploration, or even a pronounced expression of national identity. For the Ukrainian musical community, this was not simply politics but a nightmare for most musicians. They lived in persistent fear: their life’s work was unexpectedly banned, their premieres were cancelled without any warning, and their names were dragged through the mud in orchestrated public shamings. Archives full of Ukrainian music did not just disappear; the state deliberately destroyed them.

The repressions directly affected the fates of artists, leading to arrests, deportations to the Gulag, executions, and mass burials, particularly in Bykivnia. A significant portion of the creative elite was forced either to cease their activities or to resort to so-called “internal emigration”, adapting their artistic expression to the dictates of the official doctrine, which caused irreversible interruptions or serious distortions in the development of certain compositional schools, and also led to the irretrievable loss of a significant part of the cultural heritage.

One of the first tragic episodes of persecution of the Ukrainian intelligentsia in the cultural sphere was the loss of composer Mykola Leontovych, the author of the world-famous arrangement of the Christmas carol “Shchedryk” (known as “Carol of the Bells”). On January 23, 1921, the artist was killed in his father’s house in the village of Markivka in Podillia. According to recent research, this murder was committed by an agent of the Soviet state security, the Cheka. This case was among the first manifestations of the Soviet authorities’ repressive policy towards Ukraine’s cultural elite.

In the 1930s, the wheel of repression gained momentum. A victim of this intensification was Hnat Khotkevych, a multifaceted personality: writer, musician, bandurist, and researcher of Ukrainian folklore, among other things. He did much to popularize the bandura style and enrich national musical traditions. In 1938, Khotkevych was arrested by the NKVD after being convicted for being a member of a counter-revolutionary organization and espionage on behalf of Germany, and was executed that same year.

A similar fate befell Vasyl Verkhovynets, an artist who was a composer, conductor, choreographer, folklorist, and author of a work on the theory of Ukrainian folk dance, whose scientific research and creative achievements influenced the development of Ukrainian choreographic culture. In 1937, Verkhovynets was arrested for “participation in a counter-revolutionary nationalist organization”. During merciless interrogations, he confessed to organizing an anti-Soviet protest in Poltava in 1919, leading an insurgent organization in Poltava in 1928-1930, and espionage on behalf of Poland. In 1938, he was executed.

The repressions did not spare the performing arts either. Mykhailo Donets, a prominent Ukrainian opera singer (bass), soloist with the Kyiv Opera and professor at the local conservatory, was one of the finest performers of Ukrainian and world opera. In 1941, he was arrested by NKVD representatives on charges of anti-Soviet activity and Ukrainian nationalism and was executed that same year.

Even after the end of World War II, the Soviet leadership continued its policy of strict cultural control. A vivid example of this is the fate of the Ukrainian artist, pianist, and educator Vasyl Barvinsky. In 1948, he was arrested on charges of anti-Soviet activity and sentenced to ten years in corrective labor camps. Following his arrest, most of his musical scores were destroyed. After returning from exile in 1958, the composer set about reconstructing his works from memory.

In addition to direct physical pressure, ideological censorship also significantly impacted the development of Ukrainian music. One of those who felt this pressure was Borys Lyatoshynsky, one of the most important Ukrainian symphonists of the XX century. After the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party adopted a resolution in 1948, his work was sharply criticized for “Westernism” (formalism), which forced the artist to rework the finale of his Symphony No. 3 to give the work an ideologically acceptable sound.

Other composers also experienced such control. Viktor Kosenko, a Ukrainian composer and pianist, left a significant mark on piano and chamber music. However, his works were criticized for their excessive individuality of style and “intimacy” (chamber music), which did not conform to the dogmas of the time’s cultural doctrine.

Thus, the repressions against Ukrainian musicians in the XX century took various forms — from the physical destruction of artists to ideological pressure and the banning of creative work. These processes led to the loss of a significant part of the cultural heritage and interrupted the natural development of the Ukrainian compositional school. Despite this, the work of many artists has been preserved and today constitutes an important part of the national musical culture.

СЕКЦІЯ:  
УКРАЇНСЬКЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО ТА СВІТОВА ЛІТЕРАТУРА  
В КОНТЕКСТІ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ ХХІ СТОЛІТТЯ

*А. Балуч*

**«СЯЙВО» СТИВЕНА КІНГА В «СЯЙВІ» СТЕНЛІ КУБРИКА**

*A. Baluch*

**STEPHEN KING’S “THE SHINING” IN “THE SHINING” BY STANLEY KUBRICK**

Порівняння «Сяйва» Кінга і фільму Кубрика — це класичний випадок, коли з однієї історії виходять два абсолютно різні твори.

Кіно і література взагалі живуть за різними законами. Тому сенси зсуваються, акценти міняються, а психологія героїв іноді стає просто невпізнаною. У «Сяйві» ця різниця просто величезна. Книга — вона тепла, дуже людська, з болем, з надією на те, що людина може вибратися з власного пекла. Фільм — крижаний, математично точний, де людина взагалі не в центрі. Там править простір, тиша, звук, кадр.

У Кінга все тримається на душі. Страх — це не привиди й готель, а те, що всередині: алкоголізм Джека, його дитячі травми, страх стати таким, як батько, який бив. Джек намагається триматися, пише, любить дружину й сина — і все одно падає. Але падає трагічно, оскільки в нього є вибір, є момент, коли він міг би зупинитися. Готель просто підливає оливи у вогонь, підсилює те, що вже тліло в людині.

Кубрик робить інакше. Джек Ніколсон з самого початку — це вже напівбожевільний тип з посмішкою, від якої йде мороз по шкірі. Немає поступового занурення в божевілля. Зло в ньому вже сидить, готель його просто випускає назовні. Тому глядачу важко за нього переживати — він не жертва, а вже готове знаряддя.

Венді в книзі — сильна. Не в плані м’язів, а в тому, що вона бере себе в руки, захищає дитину, бореться. У фільмі Шеллі Дюваль грає її як завжди перелякану істеричку. Родина з осередку тепла перетворюється на місце, де всі один одному загроза.

Денні і його «сяйво» — теж по-різному. У Кінга це не просто суперсила, а глибока чутливість, емпатія, розуміння людей і світу. Ми бачимо історію часто саме його очима. Кубрик робить з цього візуальний ефект: хлопчик бачить привидів, кричить, бігає. І все. Без пояснень, без глибини — тільки для напруження.

Готель «Оверлук» у романі — майже персонаж. У нього є своя історія, пам’ять, злі наміри. Він маніпулює, підсилює слабкості. У Кубрика — це просто лабіринт.